

The Catholic Record

Price of Subscription—\$1.50 per annum. United States & Europe—\$2.00

Publisher and Proprietor, Thomas Coffey, L.L.D. Editors: Rev. James T. Foley, B.A., Thomas Coffey, L.L.D.

Associate Editors: Rev. F. J. O'Sullivan, H. F. Mackintosh.

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

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

The following agents are authorized to receive subscriptions and orders for the CATHOLIC RECORD:

General agents: M. J. Haggerty, Vincent St. George, and Miss Helen O'Connor, Resident agents: George B. Hewitson, Minneapolis, Minn.; Mrs. W. E. Smith, Halifax; Miss Bride Saunders, Sydney; Miss L. Heringer, Winnipeg; E. R. Costello, 2266-24th ave. West, Vancouver, B. C.; Miss Johnson, 211 Rochester st., Ottawa; Miss Rose McKeaney, 148 D'Alouin street, Quebec; Montreal, M. J. Mervin, Montreal, B. F. O'Toole, 1947 Montague St., Regina, Sask., and E. J. Murphy, Box 125, Saskatoon.

Obituary and marriage notices cannot be inserted except in the usual condensed form. Each insertion 25 cents.

Subscribers changing residence will please give old as well as new address. Single copies may be purchased from Mrs. M. A. McGuire, 249 Main Street, John J. Devlin and The O'Neill Co., Pharmacy, 169 Brussels street, in Montreal single copies may be purchased from J. Milroy, 241 St. Catherine street, west.

LONDON, SATURDAY, MARCH 17, 1917

HOPE DEFERRED

Once again Irishmen at home and throughout the world will celebrate the feast of Ireland's apostle and patron saint with good reason to remember the long black record of English misgovernment. That great Irishman, Sir Horace Plunkett, gave the sound and statesmanlike advice that "Anglo-Irish history is for Englishmen to remember, for Irishmen to forget." A section of Englishmen, still of great influence in the Government, do not remember—indeed have never learned—and seem fawnously determined not to allow Irishmen to forget.

"Each generation of Englishmen," John Redmond wrote in 1911, "have comforted themselves with the reflection that they were righteous men, though their ancestors governed Ireland infamously. No Englishman justifies the government of Ireland in the sixteenth, seventeenth, or eighteenth century, and even the Englishman of the latter part of the nineteenth century condemns the government of the men of the earlier part. But the truth is that no generation of Englishmen can plume themselves on their administration of Irish affairs. Ignorance and ineptitude are the characteristics of the English rulers of Ireland of every generation; yet Englishmen talk of Irish ingratitude and sneer at Irish grievances. What does Ireland now want? Pitt asked Grattan in 1794, and 'What does Ireland now want?' is the stock question of English statesmen of the twentieth century. Englishmen constantly forget that they are the original wrong-doers, and that they have never acted so as to obliterate the memory of their misdeeds. Englishmen love national independence, but cannot conceive how other people should have this feeling too."

But England was in the relentless grip of a comparatively small privileged class who practically monopolized the functions of government and ruled the people of England as well as the people of Ireland always with an eye, first of all, to their own interests and privileges. The English people have been slowly but steadily emerging from this modern phase of serfdom and with the powerful, generous and sustained aid of Ireland's representatives in Parliament have put themselves in the way of achieving democratic self-government. The aid generously given by the Irish was essential to the success attained. Lecky says: "A majority of the Irish members turned the balance in favor of the great democratic Reform Bill of 1832, and from that day there has been scarcely a democratic measure which they have not powerfully assisted. When, indeed, we consider the votes they have given, the principles they have been the means of introducing into English legislation, and the influence they have exercised upon the tone and character of the House of Commons, it is probably not too much to say that their presence in the British Parliament has proved the most powerful of all agents in accelerating the democratic transformation of English politics."

Since Lecky wrote, that influence has been intensified and multiplied. And to crown their work in this respect their help was decisive in passing the Parliament Act by which a Bill passed in three successive sessions by the House of Commons becomes law in spite of its rejection by the House of Lords. Up to this time the House of Lords was the

impregnable fortress of English class privilege, the insuperable barrier to democratic progress and social reform. By virtue of Parliament Act this oligarchical institution will no longer thwart the public will and make representative government a sham.

And all this time what was the part played by North East Ulster? Ever since the foundation of the Orange society the passions and prejudices of these unfortunate people have been pandered to and played upon by the Ascendancy class, that ugly, parasitic growth on the national life of Ireland. And they, in turn, served their political masters faithfully, yes fanatically. As the Globe aptly remarks:

"From the first Reform Bill down to the controversy over the veto of the Lords this Ulster minority has been the tool of the feudal classes and the persistent foe of democratic progress."

In the face of all this, in the midst of the struggle of democracy and liberty against junkerdom and despotism, while the greatest of Wars is being waged for the rights of small nationalities against brutal imperialism, England's radical Prime Minister and central figure of the War tells the House of Commons, tells Ireland and the world, that the Irish Self-Government Act, which has been approved over and over again by a majority of the people of Great Britain as well as of Ireland, which has received the royal assent and bears the King's signature is only "a scrap of paper," until the petted Irish tools and dupes of the feudal classes consent to its adoption! Thank God there are men in England and throughout the Empire who feel keenly the shame and dishonor thus forced upon them.

Here we shall quote The Globe not only because it puts the case tersely, clearly, fearlessly, but especially because we believe it reflects the sentiment and convictions of the great majority of the self-respecting people of this self-governing Dominion:

"As the London Liberal newspapers point out, in offering a truncated Ireland the Premier was offering something the Nationalists could not possibly accept. Equally unanswerable is the contention of The London News that the responsibility for a settlement of the Irish problem rests on the Government and not on the Irish people. The question of Ireland is not a problem of Empire only. In these days of War the fate of the smaller nationalities of Europe has become a world issue. Britain cannot, even if she would, avoid the judgment of other nations and other peoples on the results of her rule in Ireland. So long as Ireland is governed from Westminster so long must Britain bear the responsibility for the condition of Ireland."

"Britain must go into the coming Peace Conference with clean hands and a clear conscience. The Irish question must be settled before the Allied powers discuss with Germany and Austria-Hungary the future status of the small Slav nationalities now under Teuton rule."

"What stands in the way of a just settlement of the Irish question? It is idle to talk of the partition of Ireland when neither party will accept this solution. On this question Sir Edward Carson is hopelessly at variance with his own consistency, Dublin University. It is irritating to suggest that Ireland must wait for the fulfillment of British promises until the Ulster minority gives its assent, unless the same principle applies to British legislation. Did the Unionists consider the Nonconformist minority in England and Wales when they forced upon it the iniquitous (?) Education Act of 1902 and filled the jails with passive resisters? Did Mr. Lloyd George listen to the objections of minorities when forcing through his social reform legislation? What is the complaint of Nationalist Ireland? It is one that affects the honor of British statesmen. The complaint is that by the aid of Irish votes the Liberal party carried through its monumental schemes of social reform; that by the aid of Irish votes it invaded Wales and disestablished the State Church; that by the aid of Irish votes it destroyed the veto of the Lords and removed what Mr. Asquith declared to be the last obstacle to the granting of Irish self-government; that, having made use of the Irish vote in British domestic politics to effect a social and political revolution, Mr. Lloyd George now tells Irish Nationalists they can get no help from him or from his Government in fulfillment of British pledges."

"The situation in Ireland has not been improved by Mr. Lloyd George's speech. He has laid down the principle that no minority must be forced to submit to a form of government of which it does not approve. He asks Ireland to accept principles of government which he himself has denounced when applied to British affairs. To the veto powers of the hereditary and unrepresentative Peers Mr. Lloyd George opposed the inalienable right of a free people to govern themselves. Shall less be done for Ireland than

has been claimed and successfully asserted on behalf of the British democracy? "The solution of this question of Ireland must not be subject to the reactionary doctrine of minority rule or the veto of a governing class. Britain must set her house in order. The settlement of the Irish problem is too closely bound up with fundamental issues in this War to be side-tracked or ignored."

Some time after the formation of the late Coalition Government a Canadian, prominent in public life, shrewdly wondered whether Lloyd George was robust enough a radical to withstand the atmosphere and influences of the social classes who were beginning to lionize him, and who would with equal readiness adopt or destroy him; or whether, like Chamberlain, he would succumb to their blandishments. Perhaps it is too soon yet to answer; but if the radical Premier feels his present thick coat of pharisaism at all comfortable or supportable, even as a "war measure," he is ripe for adoption.

Had Lloyd George, dictator by the will of the people, had the courage and the statesmanship to use his exceptional powers boldly, to set right an age-long wrong, he would have achieved the master-stroke of the War and enlisted unreservedly on the side of the Entente Allies the unconquerable moral force of the civilized world. As it is, the hope deferred that maketh the heart sick is the portion of Ireland; but it is infinitely more desirable than that apparently chosen by the man who spurns the ladder by which he climbed to the premiership of England.

Ireland will recover, Ireland will win; that unconquerable spirit which has sustained her for centuries leaves no room for doubt as to her final triumph. But instead of the glorious page of history that Lloyd George could have been largely instrumental in writing there is left for posterity to explain away an ignoble page stained with ingratitude, treachery, and that shameful and cynical inconsistency which we try to convince the world is exclusively Prussian.

THE CAPITAL LIFE

The Banks, the Insurance companies and the Trust and Loan companies control practically all the accumulations of capital in the country. In round numbers, but well under the actual figures, the Banks have at their disposal a billion dollars, the Insurance and Trust companies two billions. To this vast reservoir of capital countless Catholic streams contribute their quota; but Catholics have an infinitesimally small voice in its control.

Mature consideration of this condition of things suggested the obvious remedy. Catholics of high standing, great influence and wide experience in the business and financial world felt impelled, in order that a reasonable proportion of the country's capital should be under Catholic control, to establish the Capital Life Assurance Company and the Capital Trust Company. In this there was nothing to which non-Catholics could reasonably object; and as a matter of fact no such objection, reasonable or unreasonable, has ever been made by them. As well might they object to Catholics entering into competition with others in any line of business, great or small.

We are not, however, far enough removed from the time of the odious penal laws against Catholics not to feel some lingering remnants of their degrading effects. So—however incredible it may appear to self-respecting Catholics—we occasionally find that such commendable enterprises as the Capital Life and the Capital Trust represent are regarded with a certain amount of disfavor by timorous co-religionists whose forefathers must have had more than the ordinary unhappy experience in penal days. The children of even such as these must be taught that they are free men in a free country. The success of the Capital Life, besides the attainment of the objects in view as its foundation, may have no small influence in this direction.

From Canadian Insurance, a journal devoted exclusively to insurance matters, and one, therefore, whose expert opinion carries weight, we clip the following editorial comment: "That excellently managed company—the Capital Life—had a good year in 1916. It increased its net premiums by \$16,261; it reduced its expenses by \$6,969; it increased its new business by \$81,378 over the 1915 figure. The actual new business was \$810,596 in sums assured, and the increase in business in force was \$389,756, which is better than the

average experience. The total assets were \$388,428 at the end of the year invested to produce 6.22% interest. It would be difficult to find a company which has had such an excellent record as the Capital in the same stage of its career, and we cannot but think that its management is extraordinarily capable."

THE SUPERANNUATION OF TEACHERS

We have at different times very strongly supported the proposal to form a superannuation fund for the teachers of this province. Now that the Bill is before the Legislature it may be useful to say that mature consideration, and fuller discussion but deepens our conviction that the proposed action is wise, useful, necessary. Any such measure at this date in the history of insurance can not fail to be placed on a sound actuarial basis both as its provisions and its administration. It will therefore provide safe insurance against old age or incapacity to a body of men and women whose services it is almost insulting to praise. In grateful recognition of those services the Government, by the proposed act, will pay half the premium necessary to establish the superannuation fund. The measure should receive the unanimous support and assent of the Legislature.

THE CATHOLIC HIGHLANDS OF SCOTLAND: THE WESTERN HIGHLANDS AND ISLANDS

The author of this very interesting book has already two valuable works relating to the history of Catholic Scotland to his credit; and by the publication of this third volume he has put Scottish Catholics and their descendants under a further great obligation. The author is a monk of the order of St. Benedict, and before the outbreak of the War was stationed at Fort Augustus in the Highlands. He is now a chaplain with the Fleet, and the prefatory notice is dated on H. M. S. Agincourt.

Two impressions to be gathered from a perusal of the little book are: first, the part which the Irish missionaries took in spreading and keeping alive the faith in Scotland, for to them is due in large measure the success of missionary effort in this rugged out of the way country; and secondly, the steadfast way in which the people kept the faith in the face of fierce persecution. The book is compiled largely from original letters and reports in the Archives of the Propaganda, and at Blair's College, Aberdeen. The districts dealt with are: Barra, South Uist, Knoydart, Morar, Arisaig, Moydart, Glengarry, and the Lesser Isles. The adoption of these names for so many places in the New World shows that there was a large emigration from the districts named to America; and the descendants of the early emigrants will find in this book a history of their fathers of which they may well feel proud.

The first Vicar Apostolic for Scotland was Bishop Nicholson, whose episcopate began in 1695 and continued for many years with much success. Bishop Nicholson said of the Catholic Highlanders that they "were of very lively spirits and were wonderfully successful when they had a little education." The Bishop made a visitation to Strathglass in 1700. Father Blundell says of that visit:

"On 27th May the Bishop and his party arrived in Strathglass, which is described as twelve miles from Lovat. He greatly admired the valley of the Glass river, one of the most beautiful in all Scotland, with its fine arable land along the river side and the wooded hills rising on either bank. Timber was then in such abundance that all the houses were built of it. They are called Creil houses, because the large timbers are interlaced with wicker-work in the same way that baskets are made. They are covered outside with sods, or divots. All the houses on the mainland, wherever we went, are built after this fashion, except those of the lairds and principal gentry. Strathglass is partly inhabited by Frasers, whose chief is Lord Lovat, and partly by Christolms under the Laird of Strathglass. These latter are all Catholics."

It will be of interest to learn that as early as 1661, St. Vincent de Paul sent missionaries to the Hebrides, and that the great saint took a very deep interest in the spiritual welfare of the Catholics of the far-away islands on the west of Scotland. Among the most notable of the missionaries was Father Robert Munro, who reconciled the Chief of Strathglass to the Church. Father Blundell speaks of him as a man "whom no adversity could conquer. He was three times imprisoned and

sentenced to death if he again returned from his banishment; but on each occasion he at once came back to his field of labour. In 1704, whilst lying prostrate with fever in a miserable hut in Glengarry, he was discovered by some English soldiers, who carried him off to the Castle, where he was thrown into a dungeon, and where, after receiving the vilest treatment, he was allowed to perish. He had been thirty-four years on the Highland Mission, and during the greater part of that time his principal residence was Glengarry and its neighbourhood."

As to Arisaig, Father Blundell says: "Justly have the priests in more recent times loved to be buried at Arisaig; there is probably no church in Great Britain which has such Catholic associations."

One cannot leave this most interesting work without a reference to the charming but altogether too brief sketch of Father Allan Macdonald, the apostle of Eriskay, as his people loved to call him. His parish was the little island of Eriskay, whose population was in his time about four hundred. Father Blundell truly remarks: "There is indeed a great attraction about the island and its people. It has no road at all, all traffic such as carrying peats, etc., being done by creels on the backs of ponies. Fishing is the chief means of livelihood, and this, in addition to the crofts, gives the people all they require. They are indeed remarkably happy and contented. There is no licensed house on the island, and woe betide the fisherman who in Father Allan's time brought spirits to his beloved island home."

This gifted and lovable man was cut off at the early age of forty-six. No man of his day was so well versed in the folk-lore of the Scottish Celts; and scholars frequently sought him in his almost inaccessible retreat. Neil Munro, the famous novelist, has written a beautiful account of his visit to Father Allan, and has paid a deserving tribute to his rare gifts. One can well regret with Father Blundell that an extended biography has not been written of the apostle of Eriskay, who, scholar as he was, might have moved, had he wished, among the most cultivated circles, but preferred to live his life among his fisher-folk in a lonely wind-swept island in the Atlantic ocean."

There are many other portions of "Catholic Highlands of Scotland," on which we would like to dwell; but it is better that the reader should go to the book direct. It can be procured by applying to The Procurator, The Abbey, Fort Augustus, Scotland. Price, five shillings and four pence. —"The Catholic Highlands of Scotland," by Dom. Odó Blundell, O.S.B., F. S. A. (Scot.) Edinburgh, Sands & Co.

PERPETUATING NATIONAL SENTIMENT

Saturday will be St. Patrick's Day. The shamrock will, of course, be in evidence; for the wearing of the green is becoming quite popular now. There will be plays and concerts, some Irish and some a poor imitation. There will be an interchange of picture post cards whose technique is scarcely suggestive of the artistic temperament of a nation that produced the Book of Kells. "All Praise to St. Patrick" will be sung as usual and there will be eloquent orations; but we fear that the one word-perfunctory will, in many places, properly qualify the outward celebration of Ireland's national feast day.

We cannot, it is true, expect the present generation to be as interested in matters pertaining to Ireland, or to be as profoundly stirred by emotion on her Saint's day as were their grandfathers and grandmothers to whom the sight of the little shamrock or the sweet notes of Irish melody recalled memories of the past, brought back the lights and the shades of other days. There are those who contend that it is better for Irish Canadians to disassociate themselves from the traditions of the past and to devote all their affections and energies to the land of their birth. Canada is our native land in the sense that we were born here; but it does not conform in all respects with the definition of Lacordaire. "Our native land," says he, "is not its government. It is the soil that saw us born, the blood and the homes of our fathers, the love of our parents, the souvenirs of our childhood, our traditions, our morals, our liberty, our history and our religion." In the case of the French Canadians, Canada supplies all these motives of devotion; for they have a glorious history of over three hundred years,

replete with traditions of valor and self-sacrifice, missionary zeal and martyrdom. But we are but of yesterday. Our traditions, our morals, our history and our religion are more closely associated with the native land of our forebears than with the land of their adoption. As Canadians and Catholics, our loyalty and our piety will be all the more unwavering and ardent in proportion as we treasure an abiding and grateful remembrance of that land that gave us our love of liberty and our faith.

As we write, a picture comes back to us of a representative Catholic home of a quarter of a century ago. On the mantel stood a crucifix around which was twined the rosary. On the walls hung pictures of our Lord, His Blessed Mother, St. Patrick, Daniel O'Connell and Robert Emmet. There was no mistaking the faith or the nationality of that home. They stood four-square to all the winds that blew. What a contrast to this is presented by some of our Irish Canadian homes of to-day! In the latter there is no evidence of the nationality of the family, and evidences of their faith are relegated to the bedroom; for the pictures of the Madonna that appear in the parlor are not so much objects of devotion as copies of paintings to which Protestants have been pleased to give their sanction.

There would not be as great reason for regretting the passing of Irish sentiment if the faith of our people suffered nothing by it. We must admit that there was a class of Irish emigrants, in whom ignorance of the teachings of their faith and neglect of their religious duties, coupled with anything but an edifying life did not inspire in their children sentiments of attachment to Irish traditions. Some of their offspring have been lost to the Church, and others, whose lives are a striking contrast to those of their parents, are among its most zealous members. But when we find the sons and daughters of honorable and faithful Irish parents not over anxious to proclaim their nationality and seeking associations with its historic enemies, it would not be safe to bank too much upon their allegiance to their faith. "Catholicity," says Dr. Cahill, "is almost natural to an Irishman. He is, as it were, a Christian before he is baptized; you can efface every feeling from his heart but Catholicity; you can crush out every sentiment from his mind but the love of his altar; you may break him into pieces and crush him into the dust, but, like the diamond in fragments, the faith shines in him to the last." Had that distinguished writer and eloquent advocate of Ireland's cause lived in our day he would have seen the sad divorce of religious and national sentiment, the forgetfulness of the centuries throughout which our sires in the land beyond the sea fought and suffered for the substance of things to be hoped for, for that reward that God will give to those who change not their faith from Him.

The original purpose of the Sinn Féin society was to revive the Irish language, traditions and customs, to build up the industries and the self-respect of the nation, so that when she should have a university and a parliament of her own, she would have a population to use them and a spirit to guide them. Its leaders feared nothing so much as that Ireland should become a well-to-do province or shire of England, and that her national aspirations and her religious fervor would be stifled by worldly prosperity and the materialistic influence of the dominant nation. It were well for the Irish race in Canada if we had a movement along the same lines, an effort to keep the younger generation informed of the events of Irish history and the traditions of the past; at least until such time as we will have created local history and traditions that will afford noble ideals of loyal citizenship and devotion to our holy faith.

THE GLEANER.

IT IS difficult at this day to realize the turmoil and the bitterness that was called forth by the restoration of the English Hierarchy in 1850. The generality of Englishmen of the present day look back upon that period with some degree of shame and confusion. The country was practically called to arms against the handful of Catholics then in the country; the Pope and Cardinal Wiseman were burnt in effigy up and down the country; Catholic churches and presbyteries were wrecked or burned, and many poor priests had to escape by back door or roof to save their lives. Let any of our readers who wish to have an idea of the lengths to which public feeling was excited consult Newman's "Present Position of Catholics in England," first published in 1851.

DURING ALL this excitement the most virulent and inflammatory leading articles against the Pope and Popery appeared in Dickens' Household Narrative. Readers of that periodical were told of the "most insolent claims of the Roman Catholic Church"; of "Popish domination," of the "serpentine cunning of the school of Loyola"; of "Pio Nono's old childish treble about miracles and mothers of mercies," and about the "two renegade priests—Aehili and Newman." Certainly, if Charles Dickens were to be judged by his ephemeral writings of that period his most ardent champion would have to seek safety in silence.

THEN THERE are the "Child's History of England," and "Pictures from Italy," compilations which are one with any pretensions to historical knowledge nowadays can for one moment take seriously. The Catholic Church therein is the "fruitful mother of ignorance and tyranny"; there is an abundance about "lazy monks," and "drivelling superstitions" and the like. And yet, a Catholic writer of name, the Rev. W. H. Kent, whose contributions to the Tablet have an international reputation, acquires Dickens of bigotry nevertheless. For, as he holds, Dickens' prejudice was born in ignorance, not of malice. He hated what was mean and tyrannical, and with his limited historical knowledge, thinking he discerned these things in the Catholic Church, he was not sparing in his denunciations.

OVER AGAINST the indictment that has not unfairly been levelled at Dickens, stands his unequivocal and undoubted friendship for many Catholics. We cited the instance two weeks ago of Adelaide Procter, and we may now add Charles Kent, the poet and essayist (father of the Rev. W. H. Kent already mentioned,) of Charles Stanfield, the artist, and of Percy Fitzgerald, the man of letters. The latter in his "Fifty Years of Catholic Life," speaks of the many acts of kindness shown to himself and to other Cath-

Dickens' novel." We must own at the outset that while we cannot go the full length with the one advocate we certainly cannot join hands with the other.

THAT DICKENS was a thorough-going Protestant no reader of his novels will care to deny, and that at times, in his writings, he gave color to the charge of narrowness and bigotry, must be admitted by even his most loyal defender. Let us take a glance at this aspect of the man first, and then see if we can find lying about in his books or in his life any evidence that will tend to mitigate the charge.

THE ONE phase of Dickens' character is that, perhaps, in spite of the "Child's History of England," with which his latter-day readers and admirers are least familiar. His animus against the Catholic Church if such it may be called, came out most strongly in the monthly supplement of Household Words, i. e., the Household Narrative, in the years 1850 and 1851, which together formed one of the most critical periods to Catholics in England in modern times. They were the years of the "Gorham Judgment," the re-establishment of the Hierarchy, with the "Durham Letter" and the "Ecclesiastical Titles Bill." The latter was also the year of the famous Achilli v. Newman trial, in which every dreg of anti-Catholic and anti-Roman bitterness that had existed in England for three centuries was stirred up from the bottom, and men's judgment clouded like the waters of a muddy pool.

IT IS difficult at this day to realize the turmoil and the bitterness that was called forth by the restoration of the English Hierarchy in 1850. The generality of Englishmen of the present day look back upon that period with some degree of shame and confusion. The country was practically called to arms against the handful of Catholics then in the country; the Pope and Cardinal Wiseman were burnt in effigy up and down the country; Catholic churches and presbyteries were wrecked or burned, and many poor priests had to escape by back door or roof to save their lives. Let any of our readers who wish to have an idea of the lengths to which public feeling was excited consult Newman's "Present Position of Catholics in England," first published in 1851.

DURING ALL this excitement the most virulent and inflammatory leading articles against the Pope and Popery appeared in Dickens' Household Narrative. Readers of that periodical were told of the "most insolent claims of the Roman Catholic Church"; of "Popish domination," of the "serpentine cunning of the school of Loyola"; of "Pio Nono's old childish treble about miracles and mothers of mercies," and about the "two renegade priests—Aehili and Newman." Certainly, if Charles Dickens were to be judged by his ephemeral writings of that period his most ardent champion would have to seek safety in silence.

THEN THERE are the "Child's History of England," and "Pictures from Italy," compilations which are one with any pretensions to historical knowledge nowadays can for one moment take seriously. The Catholic Church therein is the "fruitful mother of ignorance and tyranny"; there is an abundance about "lazy monks," and "drivelling superstitions" and the like. And yet, a Catholic writer of name, the Rev. W. H. Kent, whose contributions to the Tablet have an international reputation, acquires Dickens of bigotry nevertheless. For, as he holds, Dickens' prejudice was born in ignorance, not of malice. He hated what was mean and tyrannical, and with his limited historical knowledge, thinking he discerned these things in the Catholic Church, he was not sparing in his denunciations.

OVER AGAINST the indictment that has not unfairly been levelled at Dickens, stands his unequivocal and undoubted friendship for many Catholics. We cited the instance two weeks ago of Adelaide Procter, and we may now add Charles Kent, the poet and essayist (father of the Rev. W. H. Kent already mentioned,) of Charles Stanfield, the artist, and of Percy Fitzgerald, the man of letters. The latter in his "Fifty Years of Catholic Life," speaks of the many acts of kindness shown to himself and to other Cath-

NOTES AND COMMENTS

THE QUESTION: Was Dickens a bigot? will receive a variety of answers according to the point of view of the spokesman or his conception of the meaning of the word. We have ourselves heard the novelist very strenuously and very eloquently defended against the imputation, and on the other hand, we know of at least one individual, of very wide acquaintance in literature too, who will not, to use his own phrase, "soil either his hands or his mind with a