

The Catholic Record

Price of Subscription—\$1.50 per annum.
United States & Europe—\$3.00.
Published for Proprietor, Thomas Coffey, L.L.D.
Editor, Rev. James T. Foley, B.A.
Associate Editor, Rev. D. A. Casey, S.J.
H. F. MacIntosh.

Advertisements for teachers, situations wanted, etc., 50 cents each insertion. Remittance to accompany the order.

Approved and recommended by Archbishops of Canada, the Bishops of Ontario, Kingston, Ottawa and St. Boniface, the Bishops of London, Hamilton, Peterborough, and Ogdensburg. N. Y., and the clergy throughout the Dominion.

Messrs. P. J. Neven, B. J. Broderick, M. J. Hagarty, C. S. Corcoran, D. J. Murray, Mrs. W. E. Smith, Miss Mary Hanley, Miss O. Harrington and Miss. B. B. Saunders are authorized to receive subscriptions and transact all other business for THE CATHOLIC RECORD.

Obituary and marriage notices cannot be inserted except in the usual condensed form. Each insertion 50 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. McGuire, 249 Main Street.

LONDON, SATURDAY, MAY 9, 1914

HURTA

Most of the powers of the civilized world recognized Huerta as defacto president of Mexico. The American ambassador to Mexico was strongly in favor of doing likewise. Ambassador Wilson may have been indiscreet, but he was on the ground and likely well-informed. Madero was a spiritualist who placed so much reliance on his information from the spirit world that he would not listen to mundane advisers. When these counselled him to surrender to Felix Diaz and end the hopeless and bloody battle that was devastating the city of Mexico, this visionary fatalist shot three of them with his own hand. General Huerta ordered his soldiers to seize the madman; later he was assassinated. Foreign residents in Mexico, including Canadians and Americans, believed Huerta entirely guiltless of Madero's death. So did the ambassadors of foreign powers. Huerta was unanimously chosen by the Mexican Congress to assume the presidency and restore order to the distracted city and country.

It is difficult to see on what grounds the President of the United States assumes the right to judge of the fitness or unfitness of Huerta for the position he occupies. It seems incredible that in the present efforts to restore peace between the United States and Mexico that President Wilson will, as has been asserted in the press, insist on the elimination of President Huerta. Premier Asquith might with equal right and justice have declared against the fitness of Professor Woodrow Wilson as chief executive of the United States.

The Ottawa Citizen probably indicates the correct explanation of the influences that shape the policy of great powers with regard to independent nations rich in natural resources but weak in armaments:

"Mexico is the scene of a cut-throat war between certain rival camps in the world of international finance. The American camp is dominated by the Standard Oil trust, backed by an army of United States and Canadian investors in Mexican lands and franchises. The most dangerous rival to Standard Oil interests is Lord Cowdray, leading a powerful group of British and European investors. Between the two the Mexican peasants have been robbed of their lands and reduced to a state of penance or semi-slavery."

Lord Cowdray's concessions of mineral and oil lands are extremely valuable. A fleet of 30 tank steamers each, with a capacity of about 40,000 barrels, is employed by the British Company which has become a powerful and menacing rival of the Standard Oil trusts.

"British monopoly interests are understood to be tied up with General Huerta; he is heavily backed by loans from Britain and France. The American exploiters, on the other hand, while they can have no sympathy with the liberation movement of the peasants, would welcome the defeat of Huerta."

The Citizen points out some interesting facts in the way a free and patriotic press moulds public opinion. In England the press lauds Huerta as a strong man anxious and able to establish stable government in Mexico, while Villa is described as a blood-thirsty bandit and Carranza a dangerous revolutionary. In America Huerta is not only the murderer of Madero but a weakling and a drunkard; a hindrance to peace and progress who must be "eliminated." Villa a natural military genius and a patriot supporting the noble cause of constitutional reform under the enlightened and patriotic Carranza.

There are bandits and brigands in Mexico; but their glory pales before the splendour of the achievements of the Rockefeller and Cowdrays of more highly civilized nations. Whether continuous civil warfare is better or worse than the debauching of public conscience and prostitution of patriotic sentiment to the colossal

private interests of grasping and unscrupulous plutocrats may be left an open question. Certain it is that the Mexicans would settle their own difficulties much more easily and expeditiously if "great powers" were not gambling for such high stakes in their unhappy country.

THE ENTRANCE EXAMINATION

Despite the outcry against it in some quarters the High School Entrance Examination is still a really important event in the school life of a large proportion of the children of this province. The criticism which called for its abolition was superficial, incoherent, based on inadequate grounds though given some color of justification by abuses or defects that had become evident in the course of its development. We should like to have seen it develop into a more comprehensive test of the work done in the schools. We should like to see it replaced by an examination appealing directly not only to the few who desire a secondary education, but one that should be the natural and matter-of-course objective of all who enter our elementary schools—and that is an examination in fact and in name a Leaving examination for the elementary schools. Passing such a test would certify to all whom it may concern that the pupil has made the complete elementary course and is entitled, therefore, to begin his secondary course. This would go far to disabuse the minds of parents and pupils of the present all too prevalent notion that the last and best year of the elementary course is of little use to those who do not intend to enter the High School. The substitution of a Leaving for an Entrance examination is quite a different thing from simply abolishing the latter. We may not be satisfied with the house we live in, but it won't mend matters to tear it down while we have no idea of how we are going to replace it.

We still hope to see a Leaving examination replace the Entrance. Perhaps we are too optimistic in our faith in the ultimate triumph of common sense in such matters. Certainly recent developments do not tend to increase that faith.

Some of the objections worthy of consideration against the Entrance are that the teacher is the best judge of the pupil's work and fitness for promotion; that the written test is unfair to the child who may be nervous, excited or indisposed at the time; that the arbitrary setting of certain questions may not be at all an adequate test of the pupil's attainments.

As to this last it may be said at once that the resources of the Education Department are surely not exhausted if the papers set are not a fair, adequate and common-sense test of elementary school work.

There are children who are nervous or who from other causes fail to do themselves justice at the written examination. These, no matter how numerous, are exceptional cases, demanding some regular provision for exceptional treatment. One might imagine that such cases should be left to the discretion of the Entrance Board, where all interests are represented. The High school principal is usually chairman; Public schools are represented; Separate schools are represented; the Board are on the spot; they could easily inform themselves fully of everything that has a bearing on the case; if the teacher is the best judge of the pupil's work and fitness, the Entrance Board can interview him personally and likewise the candidate in question. One would naturally suppose that to meet such exceptional cases the power and discretion of the Entrance Board would be extended so as to deal with them.

Not so does the official educational mind think on such questions. The case must be referred to the official Supervising Board in Toronto, statements drawn up, declarations made, questions hypothetical and otherwise answered by correspondence, and so forth and so on. Finally the Supervising Board passes sentence. Such was and is the rigidity of the red-tape regulations. Such a case occurred here in London last summer.

Now, to meet the objections of those who were tired of this sort of thing the Education Department says to the Entrance Boards: Take everything into your own hands, abolish the examination entirely if you like, substitute for it the recommendation of the teacher; we are out of it altogether. The official educational mind will not extend the local Entrance Board's jurisdiction a little,

nor trust its discretion in dealing with exceptional cases, but this same Board may, with the Department's blessing cut, loose altogether and set up its own standards based on anything or everything except the written Entrance Examination.

One could understand a relaxation of the rigid regulations surrounding the Entrance written examination: one could approve of a reasonable extension of the discretionary power of the local Entrance Boards: many would heartily endorse any modification that would tend to do away with abuses, especially the abuse of keeping pupils too long in the elementary classes; but we are a little dazed at the somersault from extreme to extreme.

If it is a good thing to abolish the written examination and substitute for it the recommendation of the teacher why not make it general, the rule for the whole province? Perhaps it is safer to go slowly.

Catholics who remember the criticism of years ago so scornfully flung at the Separate schools for failing to show themselves equal to the Public schools on this fair, adequate and common test of efficiency—the Entrance examination—will agree with us that without it we should have largely failed to convince friend and foe alike of the admitted relative standing of Public and Separate schools to-day. Nor do we think that the absence of such common test of efficiency will benefit either Public or Separate schools, or conduce to increased public interest in their work.

CARDINAL BEGIN

In the elevation of Archbishop Begin to the sacred college of Cardinals the Holy See has honored the old historic see of Quebec and given Canada a representative distinguished by his learning as well as by the unassuming dignity of his long life in the single-minded service of God's Church. Gentleness also, that flower of true Christian charity, always pervaded his whole personality and policy, and has left him in his venerable age enjoying the love of many, the respect of all and the enmity of none.

The CATHOLIC RECORD voices the feeling of Catholics all over Canada in expressing its heartfelt congratulations to the illustrious Archbishop of Quebec.

May he long represent Canada in the august senate of the Church.

CLAP-TRAP

"All classes and conditions of people in Toronto belong to Protestant associations."—The Toronto News.

That is probably the reason why the News can not see its way clear to accept the Ottawa Citizen's advice.

Referring to a News editorial The Citizen says:

"Ulster isn't our quarrel or business in any event, but if it must be discussed the introduction of clap-trap should be avoided as much as possible."

Take the clap trap out of the News' articles and there would be nothing left except, perhaps, a sulphurous odor of virtuous indignation at those Protestants who pretend to believe that Catholics—even Catholics in Ireland—have equal civil rights with Protestants.

The News concludes a characteristic piece of frenetic clap-trap in this way:

"And they are using as the instrument of oppression a Parliament which would not allow a Roman Catholic to be sovereign of the United Kingdom."

Not even a little thing like that!

We are progressing, however. We have relieved the sovereign on his accession to the throne from the obligation of taking a blasphemous oath. In time we may concede even the King complete liberty of conscience.

Again the News:

"We wonder what these appealers to class distinction, these sinuous demagogues, would have to say if Toronto and York were to be put under Quebec. We wonder if they would jeer if the workmen drilled in the fields and their women trained for hospital service for the protection of their civil and religious liberties. We wonder if they would gibe at their leaders."

We wondered what it was all about until we realized that the suggestion of Ulster being a pawn in the political game between the frightened British aristocracy and the determined British workingmen was peculiarly offensive, almost a personal insult to the gallant knight who is the editor-in-chief of The News. Sir John's seething indignation at the proletarian lack of respect for and confidence in the pa-

triotism of the aristocracy (quorum pars) may not be simulated.

"He is writing down to his constituents," suggests a friend. But is it necessary for him to get right down under their feet? We wonder.

WHEN ENGLISH SOLDIERS WERE NOT SO SQUEAMISH

Reviewing the Wellesley papers Truth (London, Eng.) has the following:

In "The Wellesley Papers" just published in London by Herbert Jenkins, Ltd., a letter to the Duke of Wellington in 1798 from his brother Wellesley Pole, third Earl of Mornington, throws a lurid light upon the predecessors of the rebellious soldiers of the Curragh Camp. The Earl writes to the Duke:

"In this horrible rebellion the King's troops never gave quarter. Hundreds and thousands of the wretches (the Irish) were butchered while unarmed on their knees begging mercy; and it is difficult to say whether soldiers, yeomen or militia-men took most delight in this bloody work. Numbers of innocent persons were also put to death. In the action I was concerned in the rebels in their flight, took shelter in the houses of the county, and the soldiers followed the wretches and killed every man in the house they went into—frequently the man of the house, who had taken no part in the dispute. Nay, there were some cursed Germans under the command of Count Humbert, who in almost every action during the rebellion killed women also."

It might not be out of place to add here an incident or two from the Tithe War when the gallant English soldiers shot down the Catholics who resisted the collection of tithes to support an alien church imposed on them by the friends of civil and religious liberty.

At Rathkeeran the peasants who were led by a young girl, Catherine Foley, came into collision with the police. The fight was still raging when the 70th Regiment arrived upon the field and fired into the peasants, killing twelve and wounding many. Among the slain was Catherine Foley, shot full in the face.

Other encounters continued to take place, says Barry O'Brien from whose account we quote, until at length came the fight at Rathcormac in 1884. At Rathcormac a widow—a Catholic of course—owed 40s. tithes, and the parson came to collect the money, escorted by the Twentieth Regiment and the Fourth Royal Irish Dragoons. Once more the peasants made a gallant stand. "I never," said one of the English officers present, "saw such determined bravery as was shown by the people on that day." While it was a question of hand to hand fighting, the peasants held their ground; but, being without firearms, they had to yield to powder and ball. The soldiers fired upon them, with the result that there were over fifty casualties, killed or wounded.

That is a little bit of the story—the infamous story—of the Tithe War.

"The moment," says Sydney Smith, "the very name of Ireland is mentioned, the English seem to bid adieu to common feeling, to common prudence, and to common sense, and to act with the barbarity of tyrants and the fatuity of idiots."

The Tithe War was put an end to by "one of the noblest men that ever lived, Thomas Drummond," who said in effect to the parsons: "Yes, the law says you shall have your tithes; take them. The law does not say that I am to collect them for you. Take your tithes; have your pound of flesh. But if you shed one drop of Catholic blood you shall answer to me."

Then the Tithe Commutation Act was passed in 1839, by which, says Joyce in his "Concise History of Ireland," "the tithes were put on the landlord instead of the tenant. But the tenant had to pay still, for the landlord added the tithes to the rent."

It was not until 1869 that the incus of the Protestant Church of Ireland was lifted from the Irish Catholic people; and loyal Orange, justice-loving, bigotry-hating Ulster during the agitation against Disestablishment threatened to kick the Queen's crown into the Boyne if the Bill were enacted into law. History is repeating itself.

Sir John Simon nearly a year ago confessed that he was impressed, tremendously impressed, by the self-control of Nationalist and Catholic Ireland. Cardinal O'Connell recently said what impressed him most in the self-control of the Irish people at present was its dignity.

But it is just as well that the ranting bigots who are now pandering to Orange prejudice should rid their

minds of cant, and consider the danger of pharisaical clap-trap about civil and religious liberty. What liberty the Irish Catholic enjoys he fought for and won against fearful odds. He has rid himself of the Irish Church; he has rid himself of landlordism; he is almost free from Protestant ascendancy; he has conquered the House of Lords; he dominates the House of Commons; he has won the cordial good will and active co-operation of British democracy; he has won over to the cause of justice the most enlightened minds in Great Britain. On the eve of final triumph he will not tamely submit to the dying forces of reaction or be dismayed by the puny obstacle of Ulster's religious intolerance.

However, it must not be forgotten that the time is past when at the mention of Ireland "the English seem to take leave of common feeling, common prudence and common sense, and to act with the barbarity of tyrants and the fatuity of idiots."

There is some of the old leaven not yet purged out, but, thank God, the great majority of our fellow subjects are now eager to make amends.

There is now between the democracy of Britain and the people of Ireland not only a common feeling, a common prudence, and a common sense, but there is a common and indomitable purpose to go forward out of the unwholesome shadows of the dark and dismal past into the full light of the better day that has already dawned over the hills and dales of Ireland.

THE CATHOLIC LAITY

In his address at the Western Catholic Banquet in Winnipeg, which we reproduce from the North West Review, Bishop Fallon indicated an important service which Catholic citizens should render society. There is a very distinct modern tendency to revert to the pagan idea of the omnipotent State; to exalt the claims of the State at the expense not only of those of the individual but at the expense of the natural rights of man. And this tendency has been, perhaps unconsciously, greatly aided by Protestant clergymen who find their influence over individual lives almost at the vanishing point. They would extirpate evil by legislation and make men virtuous by Act of Parliament. This exaltation of the State over the rights of the individual has lowered the ideal of citizenship that at times it painfully suggests the cry of the decadent Roman populace to those who governed—*Panem et Circenses*—bread and circuses; provide us with food and amuse us.

The Catholic Church planted the seed and fostered the growth of Christian civilization. Perhaps British institutions have most faithfully preserved the traditional Catholic ideal of the greatest possible individual liberty consistent with necessary authority. It is, therefore, peculiarly fitting that Catholics of English speech should resist the absorption by the State of the rights of the individual, to deny absolutely and unceasingly the right of the State to assume the responsibilities of Divine Providence. Already we have those who advocate in the name of education and eugenics and humanity, putting the right to marry and beget children at the discretion of State officials. They would have the State not only deny the rights and assume duties of parenthood but turn society into a human stock-farm, state-controlled, so as to breed a better class of human beings some generations hence.

Warwick Chipman, in the University Magazine of last October, has a wonderfully sane and forceful article, "Labels and Liberty," from which we quote this appropriate extract:

"Are not all these points of view really part of the general assumption that man exists in order to carry out the purposes of man? If that assumption were true, there would be very little sense in any protest for liberty. Human freedom is of no value in itself. It is only valuable in so far as it makes men fitter for ends beyond their widest imagination. This is the consideration, and no other, that gives worth to the splendid defence of freedom made by Havelock Ellis in his book, 'The Task of Social Hygiene.' He shows there with a relentless resource of illustration, the folly and futility of substituting prohibition for abstinence, censorship for conscience, laws for character. By such means we get no further forward. Evil becomes no weaker and humanity no stronger. In his view, a generation trained to self-respect and to respect for others has no use for the web of official regulations to protect its feeble and cloistered virtues from possible visions of evil, and an army of police to

conduct it home at 9 p. m. Not regarding legislation as a channel for social reform, Mr. Ellis is out of sympathy with the lavish proposals of some of our labelers. We must welcome his support because it will help, not for their own sakes, but for something far beyond them, our healthy hatred of external interference, of meddling and coddling regulations, of Star Chamber Committees, and of all usurpations of the role of Providence. For our question will be—when the world has been reduced to a universe of prisms—not, will the prisms enjoy themselves, but who will carry out the purposes of God?"

DR. J. K. FORAN'S POSITION

About three years ago the Ottawa Evening Journal, in an article under the heading "In the Public Eye," referring to Dr. J. K. Foran, made use of this language: "It is a loss to the entire country that one possessed of such qualities and attainments, oratorical gifts and independence of spirit, should not be on the floor of the House instead of occupying a place of routine in the service of that House." These words are so true that from end to end of Canada they met with approval by all who read them. We know that when Dr. Foran conducted the True Witness in Montreal he had been offered more than once a candidate's opportunity of entering the larger field of usefulness: but, for reasons highly creditable to himself, he each time withdrew and remained in the quiet sphere of journalism and literary work. Within the last year or so, despite the bonds of the service, he has done more, by public addresses, lectures and orations, than any other person to defend the cause of his own fellow countrymen and co-religionists. He has gone into Protestant circles, has lectured to Catholic associations, has spoken in English and in French, and always with a tact that made his arguments effective and with an eloquence that stamped him as one of the leading platform orators of our day. The times are such that we can ill afford to have such a man silent, or in a situation wherein his ability and talent, his keen desire to serve and his remarkable powers of expression should be left dormant. He is needed, and badly, in the public arena of our day; and we are confident that the Irish Catholic people need only the hint to find the way that will lead to such a much desired and much required result. It would be a good day for us when, with his practical experience of Parliamentary affairs, his extensive knowledge of events past and present and his magnetic gift of expression, Dr. Foran would be enabled to watch over and to battle for our interests, as he certainly would do, on the floor of the Canadian Commons.

THE WEALTH OF ULSTER

We crave our readers' indulgence if we again refer to the amazing collection of falsehoods cabled to the Toronto Telegram by its "special correspondent in Belfast." Many of us have wondered why the Irish nation should object to the exclusion of the bitterly anti-Irish faction that infests the north east corner of the island. We have found the key to the puzzle, says the Telegram. Ulster and Belfast more particularly refuses to enter the Home Rule stall and become the milch cow of the Irish Parliament. * * * Belfast pays one-half of all Irish taxation." So it is delightfully simple, after all. Redmond wanted Ulster's taxes, hence he fought against exclusion. The Telegram's "man on the spot" has certainly made an amazing discovery. But, somehow, we seem to have heard it before. At the time of the first Home Rule bill the same old war horse was trotted out. "Should Ulster be dismembered the Dublin Parliament would not have revenue enough to pay its way, for Ulster—Protestant Ulster, is the milch cow of the whole country." (London Standard, April 14th, 1886.) Sixteen years later we read in the Pall Mall Gazette (September 19th, 1912) "Mr. Redmond and his party are not asking for the right to govern themselves. If that were offered them tomorrow they would promptly throw it in the donor's face. The essence of their demand is the right to govern and tax Ulster. They require the north to be their milch cow." "The real reason," says the Spectator (Aug. 24th, 1912), "is that she is wanted for the purpose of levying taxes on. She is the milch cow of Home Rule." "Mr. Redmond is only concerned with Ulster as a possible milch cow for the rest of Ireland." (Irish Times, Sept. 21st, 1912.) We it really worth the Telegram's while to send a special correspondent to

Ulster to cable to Toronto an old chestnut of this nature? Surely even if the editor is not over particular about the truth he might at least insist on a little originality.

Now, let us see how far statistics bear out the "milch cow" theory so beloved of the Unionists. Here is the Schedule D, (professions, manufactures, and commerce) table of assessments for the four Irish provinces.

Leinster.....	£5,291,461
Ulster.....	2,527,844
Munster.....	1,823,910
Connaught.....	924,088
Per inhabitant this works out	
Leinster.....	£4. 2. 6.
Ulster.....	1. 9. 1.
Munster.....	1. 7. 4.
Connaught.....	0. 6. 1.

Comment is needless. Statistics cannot lie, and these are the government figures. The Leinster cow, it seems, gives more than twice as much milk as the Ulster animal, and so far from the Telegram's statement that "Belfast pays one-half of all Irish taxation" being established the whole province of Ulster, containing one-third of the entire population of Ireland, pays less than one-third of the taxes. If we omit from the provincial summaries the three principal cities in each the evidence against Ulster's pre-eminence is even more damning. Here are the figures:

Ulster (minus Belfast).....	£0. 13. 10 per inhabitant
Leinster (minus Dublin).....	0. 19. 9 per inhabitant
Munster (minus Cork).....	0. 17. 3 per inhabitant

Ulster thus drops from second to third place.

But, we are told, Ulster pays between two-thirds and three-fourths of the Custom revenue of the whole of Ireland. Let us see. In 1909 the values of the commodities which were subject to Customs duties imported into Ireland, and into Belfast, were

All Ireland.....	£5,941,904
Belfast.....	1,819,772

The Customs duties on the foregoing were

All Ireland.....	£4,779,831
Belfast.....	2,512,678

By what manipulation of these figures can it be shown that Ulster pays between two-thirds and three-fourths of the Customs duties of Ireland? But granted that the figures proved the point what follows therefrom? Customs duties are no more paid by the cities in which they are collected than excise duties are paid by the cities containing breweries and distilleries. Everybody knows the duties are paid by the consumers, so that Belfast's Customs duties are paid by all Ireland and only collected in Belfast.

But it is unnecessary for us to demolish the argument of the Telegram's correspondent. He himself trips himself up, as witness the following:

"Unaided by Government patronage, subsidies, or extraneous help of any kind, Belfast has succeeded in building up some of the greatest and most important industries in the world."

"Protected by a beneficent government . . . the city has prospered."

This latter is the one grain of truth in the Telegram's mountain of falsehood. The woollen industries of the South and West were deliberately suppressed by Acts of Parliament. The linen industry in the North received bounties. To-day, as everyone knows, the most prosperous industry in Ulster, the great ship-building works of Harland and Wolff, is the property of a Home Ruler, Lord Pirrie. COLUMBA.

NOTES AND COMMENTS

THE LITTLE group of Catholics in the island of Jamaica maintains a monthly magazine, Catholic Opinion, which, in the quality of its contents is at once a credit to themselves as a people and a reproach to other sections of the English-speaking world where Catholics are more numerous, more influential and, as a body, perhaps more highly endowed with this world's goods. Catholic Opinion is now in its nineteenth volume—a fact bearing eloquent testimony to the zeal and intelligence of our brethren in the West Indies.

WHILE ECONOMISTS of various schools and the theorizing order of sociologists are debating how best to further the welfare of the masses, a Catholic citizen of Louisiana, Mr. William Reilly, President of the Luzianne Coffee Company, has put theory into practice. According to The Josephite, heretofore summoned his father's former slaves and their descendants, to the number of thirty, to meet him on one of his farms. When they were gathered together Mr. Reilly said to them: "I am going to try to put you in the way of living independently and prosperously. I