

The Catholic Record

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.
United States and Europe—\$2.50.

Publisher & Proprietor, Thomas Coffey, L.L.D.
Editors: Rev. James T. Foley, D.D.
Rev. Thomas Coffey, L.L.D.

Associate Editor—H. F. Mackintosh.
Manager—Robert M. Burns.

Address business letters to the Manager.
Classified Advertising 15 cents per line.

Remittance must accompany the order.
Where CATHOLIC RECORDS box address is

required send 10 cents to prepay expense of
postage upon replies.

Obituary and marriage notices cannot be
inserted except in the usual condensed form.
Each insertion 50 cents.

The Editor cannot be held responsible for
unsolicited manuscript. Every endeavor will
be made to return rejected contributions when
stamped addressed envelopes are enclosed.

The CATHOLIC RECORD has been approved
and recommended by Archbishops Palomo
and Sbarretti, late Apostolic Delegates to
Canada, 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.

LONDON, SATURDAY, JULY 5, 1924

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

Some centuries hence—perhaps
much sooner—this our age will
be looked back upon as one of the most
barren chapters in the history of
education; an age when the mere
acquisition of knowledge and the
training and development of the
mind alone was regarded as the
be-all and end-all of education.

Leopold and Loeb were University
graduates; already honor graduates
in Arts; one was pursuing a post-
graduate course in history, the
other taking the University course
in law. Had it not been for the
foul and unnatural murder of which
they are confessedly guilty there is
not one in a hundred who would not
proclaim them highly educated.
And in accordance with modern
ideals of education they are highly
educated. They have all that our
highest educational institutions can
give or pretend to give. They wear
the laurel crowns of a great Uni-
versity. They had plucked the ripe
fruits of a boasted educational sys-
tem. Only when a loathsome crime
reveals them as sensual degenerates
do men and women begin to see
that these fruits are not only ripe
but rotten; that this so-called edu-
cation is not real education at all.

We would not be understood as
drawing conclusions wider than the
premises. It is not because of this
particular crime that we condemn
modern education. Any system of
education may fail in particular
instances. But modern education
excludes religion and morality based
on religion. It excludes God and
our personal accountability to God.

There may be some vague, imper-
sonal, ethical standards; but there
is no regular course even in this
cold "science of ethics" which
where it obtains at all, is nothing
but a history of philosophic opin-
ions, an ethical hodge-podge which
the student may or may not take
amongst his options. Modern edu-
cation is therefore radically defec-
tive. At best it is merely identifi-
cational to the training of the mind
that there is any discipline of the will
and development of character. It
is now beginning to be generally
recognized amongst the more
thoughtful and observant that the
education which concerns itself ex-
clusively with the mind is lop-sided
and inadequate; is not really edu-
cation at all in the deepest and
truest sense of that much abused
term.

The Chicago crime does not prove
this thesis; but illustrates it admir-
ably.

Our concern is chiefly with our
own Catholic readers. We are
necessarily affected more or less by
the spirit of the age; and conscious-
ly or unconsciously by its ideals and
practice in the matter of education.
It is well that we as well as others
should be shocked into thinking
about education; into seeing
modern education as it is; into
realizing anew the wisdom of the
Church of God that has ever and
always insisted that for us educa-
tion should be first of all Christian.

There is another phase of this
crime that insistently calls for con-
sideration.

This is an age of great scientific
achievement in the matter of useful
mechanical inventions. When we
leave this undisputed field of sci-
entific progress and come to psychol-
ogy, psychiatry, psychoanalysis,
and several other so-called sciences
we may not unfairly call this an age
of scientific superstition.

Here is what the daily papers
tell us that "well known alienists
and psychiatrists hired by attorneys
for the defense" say of the wealthy
and highly-educated murderers:

"The chief emphasis that there
were certain abnormal traits which
entered into the minds of the killers
of young Franks was laid upon Leo-
pold. It was he who engineered the
entire plot and worked out all
the intricate details, in the opinion

of the alienists. And for what
reason?

"Leopold is an experimenter in
human emotions, says the mental ex-
aminers. He wanted to kill a
human being so he could satisfy
himself on the problem of 'what a
man who has committed a cold-
blooded murder thinks about.' He
was curious to know how it felt to
wake up the morning after and
realize he had taken the life of a
fellow-human.

"He had practically no moral
sense, some of the intricate tests to
which he has been submitted during
the last three days revealed, it was
said. His own statement at the
time he confessed, that he 'did it as
easily as he would stick a pin
through the back of a beetle,' is
excellent analysis of his mental
makeup, it was indicated.

"Finally, it was pointed out, he
believes that persons of unusual in-
tellectual attainments, who have
been carefully trained, are above the
ordinary laws of mankind, and that
it is not wrong for them to do what
might be pointed out as being
wrong to an illiterate person.

"If a man of his mental status de-
sires to take a human life for the
sake of knowing more about death
or human emotions, it is perfectly in
order, he believes, one of the tests
revealed.

"Loeb, however, is more able to
distinguish between right and
wrong, in their opinion. He has
some abnormal traits which have
developed since early childhood, and
which no doubt entered into the
mental derangement that caused
him to take part in Leopold's mur-
derous plot."

Without any "intricate tests,"
scientific or otherwise, Dr. Louis C.
Osman told the Medical Society of
New Jersey in convention at Atlan-
tic City that

"These boys couldn't have been
normal and still do that act. A
glance at their photographs
shows that they are not of the
normal type. In such a case as this
I do not think that death should be
the penalty. Instead they should
be sent to an institution, where
they can be taken care of. I believe
in capital punishment in certain
cases, such as murder which has
been deliberately planned.

"Murderous tendencies show a
diseased mind. Such a disease is
curable, however, and the proper
kind of prison activity and reform
can do much in helping these un-
fortunate to see the proper method
of living. It is true that people are
temporarily insane at the moment
they commit murder. That was the
case in the Chicago murder."

This is the sort of thing we may
expect from "scientific" moralists.
Leopold and Loeb were "not
normal"; therefore they should not
suffer the penalty for their crime.

They killed a fellow-human being
to gratify a scientific curiosity.
Thank God that is not quite
"normal" yet even amongst the
most cynical of the disciples of
science. But what do the experts
and Dr. Osman understand by
"normal"? There is the loosest
kind of loose thinking in this border-
land of science simply because
there is no attempt at defining the
terms used. If not to be "normal"
excuses all sorts of crimes, even
murder, the most cold-blooded and
revolting, then it becomes of the
first importance to define what
"normal" means. Dr. Osman lays
it down that "people are tempo-
rarily insane at the moment they
commit murder;" also that "mur-
derous tendencies show a diseased
mind." Yet he professes to "believe
in capital punishment in certain
cases such as murder which has
been deliberately planned." Pass-
ing over the curious confusion of
thought and reasoning here dis-
played it will be remembered that
Leopold and Loeb deliberately
planned this murder since last
November. The only thing that
was left open was the choice of the
victim. But then "a glance at their
photographs shows they are not of
the normal type;" therefore they
are guiltless of crime!

The psychiatrists after "intricate
tests" have discovered that Leopold
has "practically no moral sense." Therefore, again, he ought not to
be punished.

There is no such thing as "moral
sense" except as understood figura-
tively. Moreover it is not the
"moral" guilt of these young
scoundrels that the court or the
jury have to determine. It is their
criminal guilt. Their moral offence
is a sin. That is for God to punish.
Their crime is an offence against the

law of the land which forbids
murder, and prescribes the penalty
if criminals set the law at defiance
and commit murder.

Long before the murder and with-
out any of the intricate tests of
psychiatry, Nathan Leopold, in con-
versation with the Rev. Mr. Lawrence
at a boy scout camp a year ago,
said:

"If I have a better mind than
others and choose to do something
else than they do, that is my privi-
lege. If I could commit a crime
without being caught, I could do so
without compunction of conscience.
It is only a question whether I care
to gamble on possibility of punish-
ment by lesser minds."

And Mr. Lawrence not befuddled
himself nor desiring to befuddle
others with pseudo-science came to
this conclusion:

"Leopold is as sane a man as
I ever met and one of the most
brilliant. He is an atheist who
believes there is no future life or
punishment. He believes he is a
law unto himself."

What the court and the jury have
to determine is simply whether or
not these young men knew that
they were breaking the law of the
land. If they did—and who doubts
it?—then they are guilty and have
incurred the penalty the law pre-
scribes.

It is no part of the duty of judge
or jury to ascertain their moral
guilt before God, whose existence
they deny and whose law they flout
to scorn.

That experimental psychology
and psychiatry and other so-
called sciences have contributed
something of utility to the sum of
human knowledge may be admitted.
But these sciences—if we must
follow the loose usage of the term
and call them so—are, as a rule,
based on evolutionistic philosophy
which denies at once God and free
will. Not always openly, especially
to the uninitiate; but plainly, indeed
inevitably, by implication. All law
and all legal sanctions presuppose
free will, assume free will as an
indisputable fact of human experi-
ence. The atheistic evolutionary
"sciences" that are necessarily
subversive of this great truth
which underlies all legal punish-
ment should get short shrift in a
court of law.

There is nothing new in dulling,
even killing of the moral sense so-
called; nothing new in stifling
conscience so that sin may be com-
mitted with cynical indifference.
The point may be reached when
sinners whose God is their belly
glory in their shame. But a per-
sistent course of shameless sinning
that dulls or obliterates the moral
sense must not be made a reason
for criminals escaping the conse-
quences of their crime. They count
too much on scientific supersti-
tion when they dish up such a
reason under the specious terms of
pseudo-science.

TEMPUS FUGIT

By THE OBSERVER

If Christians would think enough
upon the shortness of life and the
fact that eternity knows no end,
the end of a year would bring them
very serious thoughts and reflec-
tions. Time is passing, and for
many of us most of it is already
past. It seems only a short time
since we were children, and then
the years seemed endlessly long.
We thought that we should never
grow up, and we were very eager
to grow up. Days were as long to
us as weeks are now; and a year
was an endless period.

But now the years are flying, for
us who are past middle age; and
the older we grow the faster the
time seems to pass. Surely there
is a method in this. Surely we are
expected to feel that our time to
die is approaching, and that a few
years will bring us face to face
with the appointed end of all
humanity. It is wholly fitting that
as we grow older we should be
more and more conscious of the
approaching end.

The man who comes to and passes
the end of a year without thinking
of the shortness of time and of
human life, must be unduly
worldly. If a man does not stop
to think of the passage of time
when all the world is taking special
note of the coming of another year,
it is surely a sign that he is too
much taken up with considerations
that belong to this world alone.
Life is only a little while. For,
though in early youth or young
manhood, the years seem to be long
and slow, how short a time it seems

to a man of fifty since he was
twenty, and how quickly the fifties
merge into the sixties, and then,
it seems, the end is right before us.

These are the thoughts that
naturally come to those who think
seriously. But there are old men,
as well as young men, who
seldom or never think of the
fact that their short time
of life is passing fast away.
Most men take it for granted that
they will have a long life—what
the world calls a long life; but as
a matter of fact the average age
of death is somewhere, in the
forties, if we remember the calcula-
tions correctly. That is to say,
that counting the deaths in infancy
the average age of death for all
human beings is somewhere about
what we call middle age or even
below that.

In nature, all things are so
arranged as to keep our thoughts
fixed on the fact of death. That is,
we mean their natural result if we do
not close our minds to the suggestion.
The day brightens and darkens, the
week ends and another takes its
place; one month gives way to
another; one year is succeeded by
another. Men and women get old
before our eyes; the seasons die
and pass; the trees leaf and the
leaves are cast about our feet—dead
and withered. Plants grow and
flower, and turn to dead and de-
cayed rubbish. Everything about
us in life suggests not only life but
death; life first and then the in-
evitable death. The end of life is
acted out before our eyes every day
we live.

We see our friends grow from
childhood to manhood and from
manhood to old age, and see them
die, and help to bury them—and
then we forget that our feet are in
exactly the same road and that we
too must be buried deep in the
ground, and soon; and we do not
know from one day to another how
soon.

If thoughts such as these enter
our minds at the end of a year, as
surely they ought to, how can we
pass a New Year's day without
taking some thought for our future
conduct? One would suppose that
the silent cities of the dead, with
their grim reminders of the cer-
tainty of death, would in them-
selves suffice to keep in our minds
the thought of our last end; but
the human mind is peculiarly prone
to cast out all suggestions which
would make us uneasy or uncom-
fortable.

NOTES AND COMMENTS

THE COMMENTS of the secular
press on the Presidential election
in France are exceedingly curious,
and not a little diverting. Much
is made of the fact that the new
President is a Huguenot, or in other
words, a Protestant—the first to
attain to that highest office in the
gift of the French people. The
fabricator of cable despatches
affects to think this a remarkable
circumstance, as indicating the
decay of religion in France. This
of course is purely gratuitous.

The one point in the event worth
noting is that tolerance is in a much
more advanced state in France than
in either Britain or the United
States. A nation that retains on
its statute book a law against the
accession of a Catholic sovereign,
or one that by a sort of unwritten
law closes the door of its Presi-
dency against an adherent of the
same Faith are, neither of them,
in a position to moralize upon the
working out of the instinct for
religious liberty in other nations.
The press comments referred to are
therefore but the veriest cant.

AND so far from the election of
M. Doumergue pointing to the
decrease of religious influence in
France (as one journal puts it) facts
to the contrary continue to
multiply, notwithstanding the atti-
tude of the governmental authori-
ties. If there is one spot which
more than another may be
described as the pulse of the nation
it is the shrine at Lourdes. Lourdes
is in a sense international, of
course, but it is none the less the
special possession of France. After
the War there were some predic-
tions that there would be a gradual
falling-off in the stream of pilgrims
to Lourdes and that it would never
again assume its pre-war propor-
tions. That the prediction is
falsified is proved by the following
table, compiled by the Osservatore
Romano:

	1922	1923
May.....	58,734	65,341
June.....	57,808	70,688
July.....	88,382	120,189

August..... 154,567 180,522
September..... 152,912 191,108

Totals..... 502,408 627,948

This shows an increase of 125,
440 in 1923 as compared with the
preceding year, and notwithstand-
ing the continued unsettlement of
the political situation in France,
there has been no falling off this
year. And as pointed out before in
these columns what is true of
Lourdes is true of every other
historic shrine in the country.

WHEN LIONEL JOHNSON, that sweet
flower of mysticism and poetry,
died it was reported that his death
was due to a fall in a London
gutter, which broke his neck. Mrs.
Tynan-Hinkson, in her recently
published memoirs, tells the true
story. She describes Johnson as a
"somewhat ghostly figure"—"the
ghostliness of a little monk." The
truth about his untimely death is
that he was sitting at-top of a high
stool at the buffet of the Green
Dragon in Fleet Street when he
inadvertently overbalanced and fell
on the back of his head. The fall
was on a deep Turkish carpet, and
no serious consequences were
anticipated. But as he remained
unconscious he was removed to the
Charing Cross Hospital, where it
was found that his skull was frac-
tured. He died a few days later,
when, a post-mortem showed that
his skull was no thicker than a
child's. "No normal adult skull,"
says Mrs. Hinkson, "could have
suffered such an injury from so
slight a cause." By Lionel John-
son's death Catholic literature lost
one of the choicest spirits of the
nineties.

AMONG MRS. TYNAN'S amusing
Irish reminiscences is the following:
Her father, born and bred in
Ireland, was nick-named "John
Bull." He had, his daughter tells
us, a great idea of "living and let
live." "You might find him any
day talking to a beggar and ex-
changing views with him. Once,
after such a talk he said to the
beggar: 'You say you can't find
work. Take that fork there; go
in to that shed: it needs cleaning
out. I'll give you a shilling for an
hour's work.' The fellow looked
at me," he reported, "with a grin.
Then he turned about and he pointed
towards Dublin." "D'ye see that
town over there in the smoke?"
Well, that town has maybe two or
three hundred roads and streets.
There'll maybe be thirty houses on
an average to each of them. Maybe
wan out o' every three or four
houses will be worth tuppence to me
—on an average. D'ye see,
guv'nor? To hell with your fork
and your shillin' an' your dirty
job.' 'I was so pleased by the
damned philosophy of the fellow,'
said my father, telling the tale,
'that I threw him the shilling and
he went off laughing.'"

TWO ANCIENT IRISH CHALICES

London, May 10.—Two ancient
Irish chalices came under the
auctioneer's hammer in London this
week, and as a result one will be
restored to the Friars Minor in
Dublin, its original owners. The
other will go into the National
Museum, Dublin, and so will be
safe from desecration.

The head of the Friars Minor in
Ireland had made an appeal before
the sale, in the hope that someone
would restore the old chalices to the
Church.

The chalice which has gone back
to the Dublin Franciscans was
given to the monastery at Roseritty
in the seventeenth century by
Malachy O'Queely, Archbishop of
Tuam. It was in this place that the
Franciscans were longest permitted
to carry on their work, owing to
Cianricarde influence. This chalice
was bought by Mr. C. Parker
Cussen, of Dublin, for \$2,300.

The other chalice dates from the
fifteenth century, and is supposed
to have been made for Thomas de
Burgo and his wife Grannia
O'Malley. It was bought by Mr.
J. J. Buckley, M. R. I. A., acting
director of the National Museum,
for \$6,000. The National Museum
at Dublin already is the repository
of many sacred objects of art,
notably the ancient and beautiful
Cross of Cong, which enshrines a
fragment of the true Cross.

CHRISTENED "SUNDAY"

London, May 13.—Signor A.
Pompa is the leader of all the
Italian ice cream merchants in
London, editor of an ice cream
journal and secretary of an ice
cream dealers' federation.

And he thought it appropriate that
his baby boy should be christened
"Sunday." But when Signor
Pompa took the child to St. George's
Cathedral, Southwark, the priest
argued that "Sunday" had no

religious significance and would not
do for a Christian name.

Whereupon Signor Pompa pro-
duced an ingenious argument.
"If I had wanted to call the
child Dominic—Domenico in Italian
—it would have been accepted.
Well Domenico is very much like
Domenica, and Domenica is Italian
for Sunday. After all Sunday
sounds very much like Sunday."
So the priest accepted Sunday on
condition that the baby was given
two other names. It is now
Augustine Harry Sunday Pompa.

UNITED CHURCH BILL

A MINISTER'S PROTEST AND
MR. BOURASSA'S REPLY

National Club,
Toronto, 24th May, 1924.
My dear Mr. Bourassa,
While waiting here for my train,
I write the enclosed to you in the
sincere hope that you will find
space for it in an early issue of
Le Devoir. A letter at this club
will always find me.

Yours very truly,
JAMES D. ANDERSON.

CHURCH UNION

Editor, Le Devoir:

Sir,—I am going to apply a
double test to your patriotism and
fairness as a public journalist, viz.:
to print this letter, in English, in
your valuable and always interesting
journal Le Devoir; and to do so
notwithstanding the fact that it is
a criticism of yourself.

In the first place, I believe you
have not given your usual careful
and deep consideration to the sub-
ject of Church union now before
Parliament. You have advised the
Legislators at Ottawa to vote against
the Union Bill. What does this
mean? It means that you have
asked members of the House of
Commons to interfere in matters
peculiarly concerning the Church.

You have, in this, given wrong and
dangerous advice. Today the boot
is on foot of the Methodists, Presby-
terians and Congregationalists;
tomorrow it will be on the foot of
the Roman Catholics of Canada;
and you will, tomorrow, ask the
House of Commons to throw out a
Bill brought in by the hierarchy of
your Church whose authority you
profess to admire, to accept and to
uphold! The relations between any
and all Churches on the one hand
and the Parliament on the other
must in all cases be the same. But
what you admire, what you are
thankful for, with respect to the
Roman Catholic Church is her divine
authority within the complete
domain of her operations. Rightly
and justly she brooks no encroach-
ment on her affairs by the secular
power. History, the course of the
Western World, proves the justice
and the wisdom of her claim to
spiritual independence. Where will
you be, where will you stand in that
day when the Parliament of Canada
directs the affairs of the Roman
Catholic Church in this Dominion as
a consequence of the vital precedent
made at Ottawa this week in accord-
ance with your appeal? I have
referred to your Church as the
Roman Catholic Church. Until this
week I have never done so, but
always as the Catholic Church.
There is, however, no Catholic
Church in Canada today; for the
moment a Church accepts the domi-
nation of the State it ceases to be
Catholic; ceases to be a co-ordinate
institution and becomes subordinate,
crippled, impaired, fractional and
non-Catholic. Do you realize that?

How could a thoughtful, fair-
minded, clear-thinking man like you,
have done it? It is very true that
you have with you in the course you
have chosen, such doughty oppo-
nents of your Church as the Toronto
Evening Telegram and the iron-
bound Tories of Toronto the good-
good, good; but what must be
thought in the old province of
Quebec of such support being appar-
ently acceptable to the distinguished
grandson of the independent patriot
L. J. Papineau?

But say you, mayhap, this is
ludicrous, morbid imaginings, dis-
torted warped, of the mind.
Not so. Expressed, certainly, with-
out either elegance or force, but
nevertheless the truth. For what
is the situation now? That the
State has asserted its supremacy
within the Church. On the side of
the State is an almost solid bloc
of Roman Catholics. The claim of
the State will not go unchallenged. It
will be fought by a large number
of zealous Protestants throughout
the Dominion and a Protestant bloc
will be formed, is already, I believe,
talked of seriously—even in Toronto.
As the fuel burns, bitterness will
come to the boiling point, and the
Protestant bloc will make it impos-
sible for the Roman Catholic bloc to
obtain for itself what the Roman
Catholic bloc made it impossible for
the three uniting Churches to
obtain. Then will follow conten-
tion, strife and much evil.

Let me pray you to consider these
very probable consequences of
Parliament action.

Yours truly,
JAMES D. ANDERSON.

Toronto, 24th May, 1924.

Montreal, June 4th, 1924.
James D. Anderson, Esq., National
Club, Toronto.

Dear Sir,—Pardon me for not
replying sooner to your letter of the
24th of May; it reached me but five
days later.

To its publication in Le Devoir I
have not the slightest objection. It
gives me the opportunity of placing
before what I can reach of the

English-speaking public my views
on this grave issue of Church Union,
not as presented in your letter, but
as expressed by myself, and as they
are in fact. They evidently have
not reached you in the original, but
in some fragmentary and distorted
reproduction. Otherwise, your pro-
test would be more to the point.

With the general purpose of the
Church Unionists, in quest of unity
of creed and discipline, I am in full
sympathy, and expressed it unequiv-
ocally.

If the promoters of the United
Church were content with request-
ing from the Federal Parliament
legal incorporation of the new
Church, and, for that body, power
to acquire property and dispose of
it (in conformity with provincial
laws), and to rule itself according
to its creed and regulations, nobody,
in our opinion, would be inclined to
oppose their object; provided, of
course, that each and every indi-
vidual member of any of the consti-
tuent Churches should remain free
to adhere or not to the new Church,
and that the rights of the recusants
—moral and material rights—should
be fully safeguarded; provided also
that provincial jurisdiction in all
matters of religious worship, educa-
tion, registers of civil status,
property rights, etc., remain
untouched.

This is an exact transla-
tion of the words used as a pre-
face to my criticism of the Bill.
The whole of that criticism, and its
conclusion, should be read in the
light of this declaration of principle,
which you seem to have totally
ignored.

Likewise, there is not to be found
in your letter the slightest trace
of the arguments brought forward in
my study of the bill. Please let me
repeat them here, in a very com-
pact condensed form.

The Bill ought not, in my opinion,
be enacted in its present form, for
three main reasons:

(1) By the proposed legislation,
Parliament does precisely what you
object to: "it interferes in
matters peculiarly concerning the
Church." As I wrote, on the 15th
of May, "the Federal Parliament—
and, for that, any Provincial
legislature—has no right to legis-
late upon the dogmas or discipline
of any Church."

(2) The Bill violates or disre-
gards vested rights, moral and
material, individual, and corporate,
which ought to be held sacred and
inviolable by all legislative bodies in
Canada, and be respected by all
Canadians, whether French or Eng-
lish-speaking, Catholic or Protestant,
Christian, Jew or Gentile.

(3) The bill, in many of its
provisions, invades the jurisdiction
of the Provinces, does away with
rights and privileges acquired under
Provincial legislation, and thereby
violates the spirit and letter of the
Canadian Constitution.

It is upon these grounds, and
these alone, that I appealed, not
especially but among others, to the
representatives from Quebec, not to
defeat this or any other form of
Church Union, but "to invite its
promoters to withdraw the Bill and
present it in some other form."

This was my conclusion, to be read,
I repeat, in conjunction with the
general principle laid down at the
opening, and above quoted. Why
not say so in your letter? What
reasonable objection have you
against it?

If the Church Union Bill had been
framed by Catholics, and imposed
upon the parties concerned, with
or without my advice, by the Catho-
lic members of the Committee,—or
again, if Mr. Duff's amendment had
been prepared by those same Catho-
lic members, in order to serve their
own ends,—there might have been
some justification for a burst of
indignation. But, as the matter of
fact, the course of events has been
running in the very opposite direc-
tion.

The "interference" of Parlia