

The Catholic Record

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.
 United States and Europe—\$2.50.
 Publisher & Proprietor, Thomas Coffey, L.L.D.,
 Editors—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 RECORD 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 manuscripts. 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 Falconio
 and Sheil, late Apostolic Delegates to
 Canada, the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston,
 Ottawa, and St. Boniface, the Bishops of
 London, Hamilton, Peterborough and Ogdensburg,
 N. Y., and the clergy throughout the
 Dominion.
 In St. John, N. B., single copies may be
 purchased from Mrs. M. A. McGuire, 239 Main
 St., and John J. Dwyer.
 In Montreal single copies may be purchased
 from J. Milloy, 281 St. Catherine St. West.
 In Ottawa, Ont., single copies may be pur-
 chased from J. W. O'Brien, 14 Nicholas St.,
 In Sydney, N. S., single copies may be
 purchased at Murphy's Bookstore.
 The following agents are authorized to
 receive subscriptions and canvass for the
 CATHOLIC RECORD:
 General Agents—M. J. Hagarty, Stephen V.
 James, George J. Quigley, Resident Agents—
 Miss Heide Nassau, 100 St. James St.; H. Chamberlin,
 Hilson Ave., S. 348, W. Ottawa West; Mrs.
 Geo. F. Smith, 228 Manx St., The Heights of
 Anne Hoggan, Hilton, O., St. Vital, Manx,
 John P. O'Farrell, 98 Aberdeen St., Quebec
 City, Miss Margaret E. Mulligan, Canora,
 Sask.

LONDON, SATURDAY, APRIL 28, 1923

AUTHORITY IN RELIGION

Sir Henry Newbolt is an author of some distinction, and an outstanding English educationist. His address before the National Conference on Education and Citizenship a couple of weeks ago was scholarly and thoughtful, as might be expected. But in emphasizing the Bible as a great literature he openly deplored the fact that it is made the basis of religion. This "unfortunate" fact had, in his opinion, practically destroyed the great educational influence the Bible might otherwise exercise; especially on English-speaking people between whom and the Jews there is a remarkable spiritual affinity. This peculiar view of the Bible, coming at a time when the need for the religious element in education was being emphasized, had, we thought, considerable significance and we pointed it out.

Now the writer of the religious editorial in the *Globe*—a commendable feature of that paper—has felt impelled to take up the challenge thrown down by our distinguished visitor. After summarizing Sir Henry's address, which gave the Bible an unique place in literature, he says:

"Now, so far Sir Henry Newbolt's words were truly interesting and informing. But he went on to express an opinion which must have puzzled many of his hearers, especially in St. Paul's Church. Here are his words as reported, and the expression of them on two occasions is substantially the same:

"To the English of Wycliffe's day it was a living thing, literature which spoke to their fibre, inspired in the sense that all great art lives with a spirit which the artist knew was not his alone. Then had come the argument of sectarianism. The Book should be read to show that this is so. It became propaganda—a text-book.

"From that moment the real value of the Bible was ruined in England. Humanity will not have a text-book for that which concerns the things of its innermost life—its religion."

"Why should the use of the Bible as a text-book be 'unfortunate,' and its 'real value ruined' thereby? The reference to 'sectarianism' must not be allowed to hinder inquiry on this point. What is the essential character of the Bible? Is it not the revelation of God for man? And, if so, why may it not, indeed, why must it not, be employed as a text-book? The Bible is the record of a fourfold revelation which man needs for life. It reveals God in all the purity and glory of that monotheism which Sir Henry Newbolt so well depicted. It reveals redemption from sin with its 'sweet, oblivious antidote' of a Saviour's sacrifice. It reveals the standard of that highest morality which Sir Henry so truly praised. And it reveals the power whereby man can realize and express that morality in his life by the offer of Divine grace sufficient for every need."

The writer of the *Globe* editorial here merely re-states the traditional Protestant view; but he does not apparently see that Sir Henry directly challenges the whole Protestant position. And Sir Henry's statement is as good as that of the pious *Globe* writer.

Protestantism places the Bible in Sir Henry Newbolt's hands and tells him that it is the "revelation of God for man," his rule of faith and his guide in morals; and, furthermore, that he and he alone by the exer-

cise of his own private judgment is to be the sole interpreter of the Bible message. Sir Henry decides that this is good literature, great literature, unique in fact; "inspired in the sense that all great art lives with a spirit which the artist knew was not his alone." But to make it a text-book of religion is to spoil it as literature; that is precisely what has "ruined the Bible to England." And who shall say him nay? Is not his private judgment the last court of appeal? He will not have his religion from the Bible; he will make it up for himself from literature. Indeed he is not so modest in his statement. He speaks for and in the name of humanity—"humanity will not have a text-book for that which concerns the things of its innermost life—its religion."

Protestantism cast off all constituted religious authority and vested it in the Bible privately interpreted. So subjectivism was enthroned and the objective reality of truth—including revealed truth—denied. How can Protestantism call Sir Henry to account if he chooses to regard the Bible purely as literature and maintain that as such its real utility is destroyed by sectarianism? To concede him the right of private judgment, indeed to exalt private judgment into an inalienable God-given right, and then to presume to sit in judgment on the conclusions deriving from the exercise of this God-given right is—quite enough to justify Sir Henry's whole contention.

The *Globe* writer continues:

"The fact is that Sir Henry has entirely failed to prove the truth of his contention that we have substituted 'the voice of authority for the voice of desire.' Man needs, as he ever has needed, an authority in religion, as in every other sphere of life, including literature. And where else, except in the Bible, can this authority be found? Humanity needs the knowledge of God, the knowledge of redemption, the knowledge of truth, the knowledge of power, and it is only in the Word of God that these are available."

This is a surprising paragraph. The writer resents the imputation of substituting "the voice of authority for the voice of desire." Sir Henry Newbolt's meaning quite evidently is that to give to the Bible an authoritative voice in the matter of religion is to ruin its value as a literature which, like all literature, influences by exciting emotions and desires rather than by direct teaching. Our journalistic defender of the faith declares Sir Henry has failed to prove his heinous charge of substituting "the voice of authority for the voice of desire" and in the next breath emphatically asserts for the Bible that very authority which Sir Henry—speaking not only for himself but for humanity—invects against and repudiates.

It is indisputably true that "man needs, as he has ever needed, an authority in religion, as in every other sphere of life." But the writer begs the question by asserting the Bible is the only possible authority in religion.

The Divine Founder of Christian religion knew quite well that in religion as in every other sphere of life, there must be authority; and He provided that necessary authority. He chose twelve men, taught them, trained them, commissioned them to go forth and preach the Gospel to every creature, to teach all nations; "All power is given to Me in heaven and on earth. . . . As the Father hath sent Me so I also send you . . . and behold I am with you all days even unto the consummation of the world. . . . Amen, Amen I say to you whatsoever you shall bind upon earth shall be bound also in heaven."

The denial of that divinely constituted living authority created by Christ Himself, and the attempted substitution of the Bible therefor has led to religious anarchy. Pitifully weak as well as inconsistent is the spectacle of private judgment rebuking private judgment. This fundamental Protestant principle justifies Sir Henry Newbolt in denying to the Bible any authority in "that which concerns the things of its innermost life—his religion." And though he may be presumptuous in speaking for "humanity," still experience proves that for humanity the Bible, privately interpreted, has but a tenuous and ever-les-

ing authority; private judgment has destroyed the authority of the Bible.

REPRESENTATION BY POPULATION

In connection with the late lamented Redistribution Bill for Ontario we heard and read some references to "the old Liberal principle" of representation by population. At one time it was the battle-cry of those Liberals led by the Hon. George Brown and came to be commonly known by the abbreviation Rep. by Pop. It was in no sense a principle that Liberals can recall with pride; indeed, were ignorance of the political history of Canada not so general as it is, the Rep. by Pop. would be relegated to oblivion by Liberals if not kept alive by their political opponents.

Rep. by Pop. had, of course, nothing to do with the question of the population unit of representation in the constituencies—rural or urban—that was under consideration in Ontario a week or so ago.

When Upper and Lower Canada were united under one Parliament in 1841 into the Province of Canada the population of Lower Canada (Quebec) was much larger than that of Upper Canada (Ontario). When the text of the Act of Union became public in 1840 a strong protest was issued by some of the leading men of Quebec headed by Morin and Neilson. The chief ground for this protest was that the Act gave equal representation in the Assembly to Upper and Lower Canada, though the population of Lower Canada then stood far in excess of that of Upper Canada.

In 1849, when Lower Canada still had a larger population than Upper Canada, Papineau proposed that the representation should be in proportion to the number of inhabitants. To his infinite credit, La Fontaine, loyal to his conception of the Act of '41, strongly resisted Papineau's proposal. When in 1840 the outburst of feeling in Lower Canada against the apparent injustice of equal representation was ignored by both England and Upper Canada, La Fontaine concluded that it was the intention to form a sort of Federation between Upper and Lower Canada on the basis of equal representation. To this condition, once accepted, La Fontaine was great enough, magnanimous enough to induce his people to be loyal.

It was only when Upper Canada, gaining from immigration much faster than Lower Canada, had an actual majority over the latter in population, that Representation by Population became the slogan of George Brown.

In the circumstances Rep. by Pop. had a sufficiently ignoble origin. But it did not stand alone. To the abomination of divers weights and divers measures for the two sections of the Province George Brown added the "No-Popery" cry in the election campaign of 1857. Writes Sir Joseph Pope in his *Life of Sir John A. Macdonald*: "The *Globe*, which had completely lost its wits on the question of Roman Catholicism, and saw the cloven foot of the Papacy in everything, jeered at the Administration as being wholly the slave of clerical influence. . . . Mr. Brown, who, in the *Globe*, continued with undiminished vigor his crusade against the Roman Catholic Church . . . strongly urged the adoption of such changes in the constitution as would provide for representation in Parliament based upon population as opposed to the system then in vogue, which gave Upper and Lower Canada an equal number of members in the Assembly."

Mr. (afterwards Sir) John A. Macdonald opposed the principle of representation by population, because he felt it was a violation of the agreement under which the union was effected in 1841. That union was a distinct bargain, entered into by the representatives of Upper Canada and the governing power of Lower Canada, and could not be altered without the consent of both sections of the Province having been obtained. . . . To force Mr. Brown's theory of equal representation on Lower Canada would, Mr. Macdonald contended, be a breach of the compact under which they entered the Union.

So Rep. by Pop. tied to the tail of the Protestant horse went down to defeat.

That is the unsavory history of "the old Liberal principle," Representation by Population. s

CATHOLIC SOCIAL ACTION IN CANADA

BY THE OBSERVER

The American Catholic Hierarchy, about three years ago, initiated a programme of Catholic Social Action; and considerable strides have been made in uniting the Catholic laity of the United States in joint action, looking to the assertion and the spread of Catholic views on questions of sociological interest, upon which almost everyone who can write or speak at all, is writing or speaking these days.

Our brethren of the great Republic have had some advantage over the Catholics of Canada as to the situation from which they took their departure for this new venture. Or, perhaps we ought to say that the venture was not wholly new in the United States. At least, the Americans had a greater and more general development of lay activity; and that was a condition that served them as a basis for further progress. Also they had a less acute condition as between the different races which, living together in the same country, call the holy Catholic Church their spiritual mother.

As regards the question of lay activity we in Canada have not yet any such thing as a general federation of Catholic societies; while the Americans had one for a good many years before the bishops laid out the new programme three years ago. The Catholic press of Canada has advocated this form of Catholic social action for a long time; but outside the Province of Quebec not much has come of it. In that Province, however, there is a different situation. Quebec is very well organized along the lines of Catholic social action; but the other provinces are much behindhand in that matter.

When we turn our thoughts to the question of a general Canadian organization similar to that which has become so powerful in the United States, we are face to face with the undesirable condition to which we have just referred; the lack of sympathy and understanding between the French and the other Catholics. The Americans have the different races; more races than we have; yet they have not the acute condition to which we refer. Why not? If the continuation of this disunion and misunderstanding were really inevitable, why should our American brethren find themselves less embarrassed in this respect than we are?

We have in Canada an unfortunate coolness between the Catholics who are French and those who are not. Now, the Catholic Americans have the differences of race, of language, and to some extent of customs and points of view, but yet the new movement instituted by the bishops was launched three years ago, with the participation of all the Catholics of that cosmopolitan country. From which it would appear that our American brethren have made more progress than we in accommodating such differences, and at all events have found it possible to get started in their new organization without leaving out any Catholic race.

It is an unfortunate fact that we of the races who speak English in Canada are disposed to look upon the Province of Quebec as an interesting foreign country with whose Catholic action we are not practically concerned, though of course we are always glad to hear that the Church is doing well there, and though of course we take some sort of detached interest in the Catholic people of that Province, such as we take in the Catholics of the Argentine Republic, for instance. So far as any thought of active co-operation with them is concerned, for Catholic action, they are as vague in our thoughts as though they were five thousand miles away and under another flag.

Now the Americans have all the races that we have and they have large and powerful bodies of Catholics of races that are scarcely represented in Canada at all; yet they have not the same utter lack of unity in Catholic action. Let us pass by the question of where the responsibility lies for the condition in Canada, lest we find ourselves in one of those disputes which have no end. Let us merely emphasize that it is a fact, and respectfully raise the question of what is going to be done about it. My own opinion is that Canadian Catholics who speak English are less broad than our brethren of the great Republic; but that is an opinion

that will be disputed; and therefore I do not insist upon it; but let me voice an opinion which I may confidently hope will not be disputed by any Catholic of any race; and it is this:—The Catholic religion contains the basis for the accommodation of differences much more acute than any that can possibly be found among or between the different races in Canada; and a Catholic who shall say that these differences cannot be accommodated and that all the Catholics of Canada cannot be brought to act together in social work for the general good of religion and of the nation, is something more, and a little worse, than a pessimist; he lacks a full measure of confidence in the essential effectiveness of Catholic Charity.

NOTES AND COMMENTS

THE PERUSAL of several volumes of theatrical memoirs of late has called up a host of memories. A few reflections arising therefrom may be of interest to a section of our readers, and not be entirely out of place in these columns. A purpose is served sometimes in turning from the more serious things of life to those of gentler import.

THE RECENT death of Miss Genevieve Ward, (commented upon at the time in these columns) and the still more recent passing of the great French tragedienne, Mme. Sara Bernhardt, leaves Miss Ellen Terry, and Mrs. Navarro (Mary Anderson) almost the sole survivors of a generation of players which in point of distinction was second to none that had preceded it. Writers of stage history are accustomed to refer to the latter half of the eighteenth century as the golden age of the drama in England, yet it may be doubted if even the generation that produced such artists as Mrs. Siddons, the Keans and the Kembles reached a higher level than that which gave to the world Edwin Booth, Henry Irving, Ellen Terry, Adelaide Neilson, Genevieve Ward, and that peerless daughter of Kentucky, convent-bred Mary Anderson.

OF MARY ANDERSON it may be said that what her stage career lacked in duration it more than made up in artistic achievement. She came upon the scene fresh from a convent education, and under the tuition of that incomparable tragedian, Milnes Levick, to whom she herself has, in her published memoirs, paid glowing tribute, soon forged to the front as the greatest American actress of her generation.

BUT GREAT as she was as an artist, she is remembered perhaps even more as a pattern of maidenly reserve and womanly dignity. The dazzling white light of the stage had no inherent attraction for her, and when on her marriage to Antonio de Navarro she withdrew from the public gaze the attraction of the home circle proved irrevocable. With herit was "all for love and the world well lost." She emerged temporarily, from her retirement during the Great War, dedicating her talent on several memorable occasions to the great cause. For the rest she has been content to turn her back upon the memory of great histrionic triumphs and to devote her life entirely to her husband and children. But to those who can recall those triumphs they remain and ever will remain a precious memory.

ELLEN TERRY on the other hand, who like Mary Anderson is a pattern of womanly dignity, is unlike her American contemporary in this, that she has spent almost an entire life time upon the stage, having retired but a few years ago. It was but the other day that she celebrated her seventy-fifth birthday. "Advanced in years as she is," writes a leading critic, "this great woman would be recognized as an outstanding character anywhere. Think you, that Miss Terry requires dressing up, the services of the paint-stick, appropriate scenery to establish the fact that she is a wonderful actress? Not a bit of it. Despite her years she could act before a barn-yard wall and still enthrall the onlooker."

NOTWITHSTANDING HER great age this flower of the English drama remains, on the testimony of intimate friends, brilliant in repartee, fascinating in conversation, refreshingly kind in her criticism of others, and utterly

unspoiled by that most severe of all tests, world-wide adulation. Miss Terry is spoken of as beloved on all sides, and the possessor still of a youthful spirit to a degree rarely equalled by those who have passed middle life. She is said also to possess the admirable faculty of self-elimination. It is told of her that in once discussing the art of acting with Mme. Bernhardt she remarked: "I have only one desire—to sit at your feet!"—a sentiment which is as rare as it is admirable in this age of self-aggrandisement.

IN CONTEMPLATION then of the careers of these two great artists, not to speak of many others of their generation present to the memory, the question as to whether their combined achievements did not constitute one of the greatest chapters in the history of the drama becomes understandable. And this becomes accentuated in view of the decadent conditions which prevail in this generation that has succeeded it. But perhaps the wheel will come full circle, and playgoers of the future, satiated by the enervating atmosphere which has overtaken the stage of today, may turn once more to these things of good repute which in the art of the actor itself, and the literature which makes it possible, tend to soften the asperities of life and make the average man forget his cares. That is after all the mission of the drama if only the ideal is kept high.

INSPIRING ADDRESS

POPE PIUS TO COUNCIL OF PROPAGATION OF FAITH

THE N. C. W. C. Cable Service from Rome has already reported the important sessions of the Superior Council of the Propagation of the Faith which, under the presidency of His Eminence Cardinal William Van Rossum and attended by representatives from all the countries of Europe, also from North and South America, were recently held in the Eternal City. The Superior General Council spent many days discussing plans for the missions. Of particular importance were the policies which were adopted relative to the distribution of funds collected by Propaganda. As a crown to the meetings held, the members of the Council were received at 1 o'clock on March 20th in private audience by the Holy Father. Those in attendance at the sessions of the Superior Council and also at the private audience with His Holiness were: Cardinal William Van Rossum, Prefect of the Sacred Congregation de Propaganda Fide; Archbishop Francis Marchetti Selvaggiani, Secretary of the same Congregation and President of the Superior Council; Monsignor Boudinon, Vice-President; Monsignor Joseph Negara, General Secretary, and the following members: Senor Mercader, South America; Monsignor de T. Serclaus, Belgium; Father Lajoie, Canada; Monsignors Bechetolle, Descomps, Vanneufville, and Comm. Groffier, France; the Prince Von Lowenstein, Reverend Doctor Louis, and Monsignor David, Germany; Canon Ross, England; Monsignor Roncalli, Italy; Monsignor Vasquez Camarasa and Father Jovani, Spain; Monsignor Freri, United States.

After an expression of fidelity to the Holy See, read in the name of the whole Council by Cardinal Van Rossum, the Holy Father, in presenting a gift of five hundred thousand lire to the Propagation of the Faith, delivered the following beautiful eulogy on the work of Propaganda, and called on Catholics everywhere to rally to the support of the missions.

DEVELOPMENT OF A MARVELLOUS SOCIETY

"Almost hidden in this intimate recess, this gathering is not very large, but, as Your Eminence has said, in such simple, pious and eloquent words, because of this very fact, it is closer to Our Heart. Through it there has come about something for which We may well thank Our Lord and from which We may hope for great benefits to the work, divine among all other works, of the evangelization of the world; the work which from the very first moment of Our Pontificate has occupied and, We may also say, preoccupied Our mind and Our heart, but which has likewise filled it with the greatest consolations and sweetest hopes; the work of apostolate which is, indeed, the very reason for the existence of the Pontificate. The whole Catholic tradition calls the Pope *Dominus Apostolicus*, so true is it that the Apostolate is the truest and most precious substance of the Roman Pontificate."

"And now it has come about that a marvelous society, a society which has already had a century of beneficent experience, the Society for the Propagation of the Faith, had come to place itself closer to the Apostolic See and thus become truly Catholic. The work which first belonged to the sons of the Church has become in a certain sense, the work of the Mother,

the work of the Church itself. Well may We therefore promise Ourselves again all that is greatest and best which We had already hoped for from it at first. Indeed, we do not hesitate an instant to note the happy and promising beginning of this new phase of activity of the Society of the Propagation of the Faith, and to thank all those who have dedicated to it the holy activity of their spirit."

"We do not doubt that this Society is to have the same experience which We have always had Ourselves. Many times in the past of Our already long life, We had experienced the Divine Kindness and aid of Providence in the little, humble things of human life. But when Benedict XV., of Holy Memory entrusted to Us the first charges, committing to Us interests which were no longer Our interests but solely those of the Church and the Holy See, then We began to experience anew the kindness and Providence of God. We saw it under Our eyes. We felt it in a thousand ways. We experienced it on a hundred occasions and sometimes we saw it manifested in ways so divine, with such striking opportuneness that, truly, there could be no hesitation in recognizing the hand of God among us and the things about us. And We remember that when We explained these reflections of Ours to Our August Chief, Benedict XV., We heard him reply: 'Remember that this is the experience which We have every day. And indeed, We too were to see these words applied and verified in the daily experience which awaited Us, in Our turn. All this shows us that when we enter into a sphere worthy of the divine promises of aid and assistance made by the Divine Redeemer, the Redeemer Himself keeps His word, and keeps it magnificently, divinely, with supreme bounty.'

BLESSINGS WILL BE MULTIPLIED

"And We do not doubt but that the Society for the Propagation of the Faith will have this experience. For a whole century it has been blessed with so many divine blessings and has done so much precious good to souls, that we may be certain that the Divine blessings will be multiplied just as the fruits also will be multiplied for the ever greater glory of God, for the ever more splendid honor of the Church. And when We think, beloved sons, that this hope is your greatest consolation and your deepest comfort, We can be sure of interpreting the desire of your hearts by assuring you of the greatest, most perfect and most complete recompense which divine grace reserves for those who devote the best of their efforts to this work which is beneficent and holy among all others."

"We rejoice, therefore, with all Our heart, for all that you represent to Us here. This union of souls come from all parts of the world; this joining of hearts for a unique and lofty end; this concord and tranquillity of your first work; this unity and uniformity of intent, of views and of mind which have been described to us so comforting by His Eminence the Cardinal Prefect, do not surprise Us, for knowing your past We have deduced from it the greatest assurances not only for the present, but still more for the future which awaits your holy plans."

"We thank the Lord with all Our heart and, as always, we thank the men of good will who make you the instruments of His infinite charity; so, also, do we thank you who are the first among these men of good will, that is to say those who are most obviously engaged in making the goodness and benefits of God felt among all peoples."

IN THE TRENCHES OF THE FAITH

"And as Our grateful thought goes to God and to you, so also does it go to those generous ones who are in the trenches of the faith, fighting in the very face of the powers of hell, sacrificing themselves in the battle of God and winning holy victories. Who knows but on this very day, at this very hour, the Divine Spirit is instilling in those hearts the happy presentiment of a future ever more beautiful, ever more blessed by divine graces, ever more fecund in salvation for souls, and that this presentiment is already the comfort and compensation of their heroic trials?"

"It is with the n that We desire to begin Our benedictions; with them who are brought before us by your presence like a great, immense, sublime vision; with them who will reap the first fruits of your holy activity and be made to increase and multiply the fresh fruits of salvation, holiness and divine glory."

"And from them to you, who devote the best part of your activity to this precious work and to so many others which are easy to guess, for all good works go hand in hand and call on each other in the happiest concord of goodness."

"To you Our Benediction, and to all your families and to your friends to whom you perhaps thought of carrying the Blessing of the Pope; to you and to your countries who, through you, manifest their truly Catholic sentiments by contributing to the work of the Propagation of the Faith."

"Returning to your own countries, let each one of you tell of these our sentiments of gratitude