

The Catholic Record

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

Publisher and Proprietor, Thomas Coffey, L.L.D. (Rev. James T. Foley, B.A. Thomas Coffey, L.L.D.)

Associate Editor—H. F. MacIntosh.

Manager—Robert M. Burns.

Advertisements for teachers, situations wanted, etc., 50 cents each insertion. Remittance to accompany the order. Where Catholic Record Box address is required send 10 cents to cover expense of postage upon replies.

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

Approved and recommended by Archbishops Falouto and Staretti, late Apostolic Delegates to Canada, the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa, and St. Boniface, the Bishops of London, Hamilton, Peterborough and Oshesburg, N. Y., and the clergy throughout the Dominion.

In St. John, N. B., single copies may be purchased from Mrs. M. A. McGuire, 249 Main Street, and John J. Dwyer.

In Sydney, N. S., single copies may be purchased at Murphy's Bookstore.

In Montreal, single copies may be purchased from J. Milloy, 241 St. Catherine St., West.

The following agents are authorized to receive subscriptions and canvass for the Catholic Record:

General agents: M. J. Hagarty, Vincent S. Co., and Miss Jessie Doyle; resident agents: Mrs. W. E. Smith, 101 St. James St., St. Paul, Minn.; E. R. Costello, 2256 8th Ave., West, Vancouver, B. C.; S. J. Johnson, 210 Rochester St., Ottawa; Mrs. J. S. Sney, 228 St. Urbain St., Montreal; M. J. Mervin, Montreal; B. F. O'Toole, Lebrun, Sask.; Miss Anne Hogan, 307 Lanegate Street, Winnipeg, Man.

LONDON, SATURDAY, DEC. 6, 1919

THE COAL SCANDAL

There is an observation or two to make on the soft coal situation.

The working miners struck because their wages did not meet living expenses; an allegation easily believed when we consider that they worked only half or less than half the time. We are now told that the shortage of cars was responsible largely for this condition; but we all know that it suits the coal barons, as it suits all capitalistic employers, to have the supply of labor greater than the demand.

The United States Government promptly interferred in the strike and, while not claiming the right to force laborers to work, it made any direction on the part of the leaders, any cooperation between two or more miners, any use of the union funds to support the striking miners, illegal, almost treasonable. The Government action was acclaimed by the press as asserting the liberty of 110,000,000 citizens over the dictatorship of the half million miners.

Then the United States Secretary of Labor, W. B. Wilson, very naturally and properly took the matter up, and, after due investigation, decided that a fair settlement would involve a 31.6% increase of wages to the miners. The miners agreed. The operators balked, refused point blank to accept.

What should have been done next is plain: the right of Eminent Domain should have been exercised by the Government.

What was done was quite another story. The Government reconsidered the matter, for several days the Cabinet in secret session was deadlocked on the solution. Finally Big Business emerged triumphant. It was discovered that the coal strike was not a Labor question but a Fuel question. Fuel Administrator Garfield superseded Secretary of Labor Wilson, and the poor miners can have 14% increase; they cannot, of course, be compelled by brute force to accept and go to work; but they can be starved into work; for it remains a criminal offence, a "conspiracy" against Government to use their own funds to sustain life while fighting the coal barons for a fair wage.

In the meantime ex-Secretary of the Treasury, William G. McAdoo, showed that the operators made 200, 300, 400 and 800% profit on capital invested—net profit after paying war taxes—in the single year of 1917 alone!

The press, which sent up a howl of indignant protest against the miners, roared like a sucking dove against the operators; suggested that McAdoo must be aiming at the presidency next year, and reprimanded him for allowing his ambition to lead him into anything so unscrupulous, indeed into such a betrayal of official trust, as to make public official and confidential information without the authorization of the President.

Thereupon Mr. McAdoo issued this further statement:

"The coal operators assert that I gave out confidential information when I stated that profits of the mine owners in 1917 ranged from 15 to 2,000 per cent. on capital stock before deduction of taxes. This was not confidential information. The Treasury Department may publish statistical matter of this character at any time. In fact, information concerning this very subject was furnished by me to the United States Senate in response to a resolution introduced by Senator Borah concerning profiteering, and was published July 5, 1918. (See Senate Document 259, 65th Congress, 2nd session.)"

The right of Eminent Domain is not a Bolshevistic device; is not indeed a discovery of this era of progress. It comes down to us through the centuries from the middle ages. Altum Dominium or Eminent Domain is exercised every time a right of way for a railroad is expropriated in spite of private ownership in land. It is based on the long accepted principle that private ownership can not be permitted to work injury to the general good of the community.

If in all history there ever was a case calling for prompt and decisive exercise of this undoubted and long established right of Eminent Domain it was when the operators refused Secretary Wilson's terms of settlement in the pending dispute with the miners.

The Republican party is supposed to be the party of Big Business in the States; but the over-riding of Secretary Wilson's action in the coal dispute has proved to the hilt that Big Business has powerful friends in the Democratic Cabinet.

Those who profess such fear of "class" government should ponder the situation; and we might all ask ourselves if we are not looking in the wrong direction for the fomenters of Bolshevism.

The great free press of a free country, so loud in its denunciation of the dictatorship of the miners union, is silent on the dictatorship of the coal operators; so eloquent in its praise of the fearless action of the Government in vindicating public rights against the striking miners, is mute on the subservency of the Government to the arrogant coal barons.

What is the answer?

A SINISTER SUGGESTION ACTED UPON

In the London Letter of the Statesman of November 8th occurs the following:

Lord Beaverbrook in an article in his paper The Sunday Express, of September 28th, states:

"Great, potent, though silent forces in the public life of the United States are the Presbyterian and Methodist Churches. The Methodist Church stretching out its influence over millions in every corner of the vast continent is perhaps the most powerful political body the New World has ever seen. It was its tremendous pressure which made America dry—and a body that can do that can do anything. In fact on this very issue, the Irish municipal bosses, who were the owners of the liquor traffic, locked horns with the Methodist Church, and were utterly overthrown."

"The Methodist Church, in any easy case regards a politico-religious crusade preached by the Irish with small favor, but it might take no practical action on the other side unless its interest was suddenly aroused. Then it would act and it would crush the American Sinn Feiners as a cartwheel crushes a tadpole. The Ulstermen have so far made no real effort to stir this slumbering giant, unless perhaps Sir Edward Carson's much criticised July speech in Belfast was intended as the first move in this campaign. But if they make the appeal in loud enough accents the feelings of those Presbyterian and Methodist Churches will move to meet them. A single shot fired in Ulster under the domination of an Irish Dominion Government would set the real American opinion in flame. It is idle to ignore these facts, or to pretend that this big stick of American opinion is not a weapon which may yet be turned against Sinn Fein itself. I am stating the political dilemma which confronts this country—not taking sides in a religious dispute. We suffer from the hostility of Catholic Irish America. But give dominion over Ulster to the population of the South and West, and our reputation in America would wither under the devastating hostility of the Presbyterian and Methodist Churches tomorrow. I would welcome a change of venue for this age-long controversy. Great Britain has had more than its share. Let it be agitated and fought out for a time on the other side of the Atlantic. One thing is certain, it would be a rare education for the States, both in English and Irish politics, and at the end of it Americans would understand the difficulties, of temperament, race and religion with which successive British Governments have had to deal in trying to solve the riddle set by the Irish Sphinx."

On this "sinister suggestion" the Statesman's London Correspondent thus comments: "This base appeal to religious prejudice, will, it is felt on this side, work serious injury to the movement for an Anglo-Saxon rapprochement. . . . It at any rate evidences a deep-seated determination on the part of the Tory remnant in England to forego none of the weapons that proved so successful in the past in retarding a just settlement of the Irish question."

Lord Beaverbrook's "sinister suggestion" merits careful perusal. It

illustrates the ethics of Big Business applied to politics. The cement merger has, "within the law," plundered Canadians of untold millions and will extort untold millions more; Max Aitkin's share of the swag was \$7,000,000. Thus in his twenties began Lord Beaverbrook's career. A knight hood was the cheap and easy first step to the peerage. His huge monopoly in war pictures brought him millions a month. It is said on his behalf that out of this he eventually financed the whole of the British propaganda during the War. In the unsettled state of British politics he wields through his wealth, through his control of several newspapers, and his intimacy with Lloyd George, a great if somewhat precarious power.

Such is the man whose "sinister suggestion" of a few weeks ago turns out to be the deliberate plan of today. He doubtless finances the scheme to transfer to America the factious religious bitterness injected for political purposes into the Irish question.

"Let it be agitated and fought out for a time on the other side of the Atlantic."

Hence it is highly interesting to read the following despatch which in many papers, was condensed and given an inconspicuous place. Like Lord Beaverbrook's outline of the plan, this despatch is too important to condense or cut down.

Belfast, Nov. 22.—William Coote, M. P. for South Tyrone, accompanied by a deputation of prominent clergymen representing various churches in Ireland, is sailing for America today from Liverpool for the purpose of "putting before their Churches in America the true position and the dangers which threaten their churches in Ireland by the adoption of the Sinn Fein program."

The party comprises: Presbyterian, Rev. Wylie Blunt and Rev. William Corkey; Methodist, Rev. S. E. Harte, Edward Hazelton and C. W. Maguire; Episcopalian, Rev. Louis Crooks. All these clergymen officially represent their respective denominations which number approximately 1,000,000 Irish Protestants.

The Methodists of Ireland comprise some home rulers, but all are agreed on opposing the plan for an independent republic. The Presbyterians have been more active than the Methodists in Irish politics and in opposing Home Rule. Mr. Coote and Rev. Mr. Corkey are ardent Carsonites.

The delegation will not confine their attention to the Ulster, but will present the case of the Protestant minority throughout Ireland, which includes a great number of professions and industries. The belief among Protestants that America might be influenced in favor of Prof. Eamon De Valera, created by the reports of his receptions, has caused great apprehension among the Irish Unionists who therefore decided to present the other side of the cause.

Only when read in conjunction with Lord Beaverbrook's article in his own paper can its full significance be grasped. Anything so unscrupulously unfriendly to America at a time when good relations are so eagerly desired by England can best be explained by the last sentence in the above despatch.

"The belief among Protestants that America might be influenced in favor of Professor Eamon de Valera, created by reports of his receptions, has caused great apprehension among Irish Unionists."

Of course Ulster Protestants like American Methodists are mere pawns in the game.

The triumphal progress of de Valera from coast to coast, from the Canadian border to Mexico, his cordial and enthusiastic reception by all classes and creeds, by men in every rank and condition of life, is just what should have been expected from freedom-loving Americans, the basic doctrine of whose political creed is that governments derive all their just rights from the consent of the governed. But it "has caused great apprehension among the Irish Unionists" who have consented to be Lord Beaverbrook's tools in presenting "the other side of the cause."

Is it their intention to follow Professor de Valera's example and openly present to all classes and creeds their political cause on its political merits? By no means. They have sailed for the purpose of putting before their Churches in America the true position and the dangers which threaten their Churches in Ireland by the adoption of the Sinn Fein program." (Note the quotation marks in the despatch itself.) From this carefully worked and apparently authoritative extract from their commission the appeal of these Irish Protestant clergymen is to be primarily if not exclusively religious. Unlike Eamon de Valera they will appeal not to American love of liberty, but to Protestant fear of "Rome;" not on behalf of a people

nobly struggling to be free, but on behalf of a parasitic faction struggling to maintain an outworn and undemocratic ascendancy.

As in the plan of campaign itself, so in the choice of instruments to carry it out is seen the fine Italian hand of the newly ennobled ex-Canadian. "The Methodist Church," he writes, "is perhaps the most powerful political body the New World has ever seen." "But it might take no practical action unless its interest was suddenly aroused." "The Ulstermen have so far made no real effort to stir this slumbering giant."

Of the Episcopalians, in spite of their kinship with the Established Church of England, Lord Beaverbrook says nothing, (a compliment that will be appreciated; of the Presbyterians, as such, he is not so hopeless, yet not at all confident; his faith and hope are, in the main, pinned to the political power of the Methodists, if only they can be egged on to do his dirty work. Will Methodist Americans enjoy the bad eminence to which the wily nobleman raises them?

In any case, of the six clerical delegates on this unsavory mission three are Methodists. The entire Methodist body in Ireland is scarcely 50,000, a little over one per cent. of the total, and hardly five per cent. of the Protestant population of Ireland; yet they constitute fifty per cent. of the Irish clerical mission to America.

The field of anti-Catholic prejudice has been pretty thoroughly exploited in the United States; and its exploiters very thoroughly discredited. There is not much doubt that a great many Methodist Americans will warmly resent being used as pawns in the game Lord Beaverbrook would play in the interest of an English political faction; a faction moreover with whom real Americans can have but scant sympathy. And there must be many more who as Methodists rather than as Americans will recognize the infinite harm to their Church which would come of this prostitution of religion to base political intrigue. On no ground can intelligent, patriotic or spiritual-minded Methodists congratulate themselves on the distinction which the astute and unscrupulous Lord Beaverbrook has conferred on their Church, nor on the catspaw mission he would thrust upon it.

No one better than the self-expatriated Canadian millionaire knows that the cause of Irish freedom is not religious, nor politico-religious. What religious prejudice there is in it has been injected not by Irish Catholics at home or abroad, but by the political faction opposed to it. The first Irish Republicans were the Presbyterians of the North; it was they who conceived and organized the United Irishmen. Lord Edward Fitzgerald, Robert Emmet, Smith O'Brien, Isaac Butt, Parnell, were all Protestants.

The very names of these leaders in the cause of Ireland's freedom are a sufficient refutation of the parrot talk of the Irish question being a religious question. The suggestion that de Valera's appeal to American sentiment is "a politico religious crusade" will carry weight only with those who have neither heard nor read that Irish Leader's appeal. Accompanying him throughout his tour, from the same platforms eloquently pleading the same cause, is the Protestant Episcopalian Minister, the Rev. Dr. Mythen. Invariably, wherever he goes, prominent American citizens of all creeds and of no creed, give Professor de Valera, countenance, sympathy and co-operation.

This it is that accounts for the undertone of bitter disappointment and exasperation in the article of the financier of British propaganda, and for the desperate and dastardly expedient therein proposed, which is now being put to the test.

That the plan of campaign of Lord Beaverbrook's devising will arouse the outworn resentment of patriotic American Protestants is evidenced by the subjoined paragraph published before any public intimation was given on this side of the Atlantic of the anti Irish and anti Catholic mission of the "prominent Irish clergymen."

The Inter-Church League for Irish Independence, which has headquarters at 2126 Woolworth Building, New York City, apparently has been organized to defend the loyal Americans and loyal Protestants in this country against the slurs cast upon them by English propagandists who have practically proclaimed to the world that the Protestant religion is desirous of keeping Ireland in bondage in order to maintain supremacy. In a statement signed by a large number of Protestant ministers and prominent laymen it is said: "This is a slander against our religion that

Protestants the world over resent. Protestants have never fought to enslave any people, no matter what their creed might be. Protestants gladly fought for the freedom of Catholic Cuba, Catholic France, Catholic Belgium and Catholic Poland. Protestantism is more hurt by the charge that it is selfishly opposed to the freedom of the Irish nation than is the cause of Irish freedom."

CANADA'S NATIONAL STATUS

At a recent meeting of the Canadian Press Association Mr. J. W. Dufoe, who represented the newspapers of Canada at Paris during the Peace Conference, discussed the question of Canada's national status. He is reported in the Globes as saying:

"Mr. Dufoe said the question of the national status of Canada was one that could no longer be side stepped. We must determine what our status is to be, so that it may be decided at the Constitutional Conference of the Britannic nations, to be held in England in the not distant future. He observed that if the question should become a political issue it will be the dominant and controlling issue of Canada, and may very easily bring about a new alignment of parties, which is bound to succeed the present state of chaos."

This is a question we have repeatedly urged on our readers as the great political question confronting Canadians and one which imperatively demands intelligent study. There are those who think that because the Round Table groups are no longer active that the Imperialistic movement has collapsed. They are living in a fool's paradise. The Round Table groups were study clubs directed along Imperialistic lines, but openly and above-board, with the frank acknowledgment that the people of Canada were the final court of appeal. Along these lines the movement has come to an end of its activity. But we can have no better evidence that Imperialism is still active than Mr. Dufoe's announcement quoted above. His associations in Paris during the long period of the Peace Conference give weight and significance to his statement that the national status of Canada is to be decided at the Constitutional Conference to be held shortly in England. What's in a name? We recall the fact that Sir Wilfrid Laurier strenuously and effectively opposed the suggestion to change the name of the Imperial Conference to that of Imperial Council. But who has metamorphosed the coming Imperial Conference into a Constitutional Conference with power to decide for the future the national status of Canada? It will be recalled that Mr. Doherty, during the special session of Parliament just ended, while acting leader, intimated that Mr. Lapointe would probably be invited to attend the next Imperial Conference. Is it conceivable that our representatives at the Imperial Conference, even should they comprise the leaders of both political parties, without consulting the Canadian people, without discussion, even, of the matter either in Parliament or the press, should think of arrogating to themselves the powers of a constitutional assembly?

NOTES AND COMMENTS

AT THE opening meeting of the great Canadian "Forward Movement" which, like other emanations of emotional enthusiasm of the present decade, is to regenerate and "uplift" humanity for the very last time, the assembled representatives of the five leading Protestant denominations sang with one voice the following lines:

"We are all united
All one body we
One in Faith and Doctrine
One in Charity."

In reference to which incident some profane individual asks one of the daily papers if it can any longer be claimed that words mean things?

These are further extracts from Mr. Dufoe's address:

"Sir Robert Borden had affirmed the principle that the Empire of the future must be made up of autonomous self-governing countries in some form of alliance. The War Cabinet had been created as a result of action taken at that conference. It was an association of representatives of the nations at war, who, under the special pressure of war, acted practically in unison with the certainty that behind each Premier stood his own people. . . . A significant thing was a Westminster cable which was published in Canada in March, 1918, stating that Lloyd George had summoned the overseas democracies to support him in the democratization of the war effort. If the War had gone on its conduct would have devolved on a group in which representatives of each British nation would have met on terms of equality."

And again:

"The Winnipeg Editor spoke of a recommendation made by the First Lord of the Admiralty concerning the reorganization of the British navy and the establishment of a common navy administered by a single naval authority, upon which each of the Dominions would be represented, with local Naval Boards in each of the Dominions. The Premiers of Canada, Australia, South Africa and New Zealand conferred upon that recommendation, and submitted a counter memorandum to the Imperial War Conference in which they declared definitely against a common navy, in favor of Dominion navies and objected to a statement in the original memorandum that an efficient navy could only be secured under common control. The discussion went on for a month, and ended in the acceptance of the Dominion's

point of view. The overseas Dominions said they would take advice upon the matter from a high naval official, and that was why Lord Jellicoe was in Canada at the present time."

This, to Canadian autonomists, may sound reassuring; but there is such suspicious over-emphasis placed on such airy nothings as allowing Dominion Ministers to be present at a meeting of the War Cabinet, on the new national and international status acquired by Canada, that it may be only camouflage for committing us to a policy that will merge in a common Empire the national identity and individuality of Canada.

There are but three possible futures for Canada. She must to some extent retrace the steps of her historic development and become so merged in the Empire as to lose in great measure the national status already acquired; this is the tendency of Imperialism whatever form it may assume. Or she must continue her development in self-government until complete independence is attained. The third alternative is entering as a group of free states into the United States of America, forming one great, powerful North American Union which would hold a dominant position in the world with no imperialistic interests or ambitions.

There is no intelligent study of Canada's future possible which does not include all three; it is only by the comparative study of all that the merits and defects of any one can be adequately understood. The Round Table groups squarely faced the issue; they were the only Canadians who gave serious study to this one fundamental and vital question of Canadian politics. Others frowned at them, or spat at them; but no study worthy of the name was carried on amongst their opponents. That assertion detracts nothing from the able and exhaustive work of Mr. J. S. Ewart published in the Kingdom Papers and The Republic of Canada. His was the work of an individual.

VATICAN CHOIRS RETURN HOME

THE limited American tour of the Vatican Choirs under the direction of Rt. Rev. Monsignor Raffaele Casimiri comes to an end with a popular farewell concert at the Metropolitan Opera House, New York City on Tuesday night, Dec. 2nd.

The following day the sixty singers from the greater Roman basilicas will sail for their homes in Rome on the S. S. Touraine, via way of Havre.

This history making tour which began on September 18th, in New York City has fulfilled every promise made for it.

Monsignor Casimiri has been recognized as the greatest director of polyphonic music ever heard in this country and his selection of programs sustained the finest and highest traditions of the old masters.

The tour at the outset was announced as possessing a single great purpose and that was to instill in the minds of music lovers in this country a greater appreciation and better understanding of the higher sacred music which has been fostered in the basilicas of the Catholic Church at Rome for the past sixteen centuries.

That this result was accomplished far beyond the dream of the men who promoted the tour of the Vatican Choirs is now a matter of history. Everywhere they were received with signal honors and distinction due their wonderful art and their devo-

But his difficulties do not end there. He had approached the police authorities for a record of the Church of England women and girls who had passed through their hands during the month, with this result:

I was told: "It will be impossible to tell you this as we only keep record of whether a prisoner is a 'Catholic' or a 'Protestant,' all Church of England prisoners are entered as 'Protestants.'" At the Industrial Farms connected with the city of Toronto, the Government has placed the conduct of the Sunday services in the hands of the Roman Church and of the Salvation Army. The Salvation Army services to serve all who are not Roman Catholic, or 'Catholic,' as the government calls them; in other words, the Salvation Army is to serve all "Protestants," among whom the government places the members of the Church of England.

"I go into hospitals and find on the registers names of persons belonging to the Church of England entered as Protestants, no indication that they are members of the English Church. I am not surprised at this difficulty in which we find ourselves, no one is to blame except ourselves. We are gradually allowing the Church to be reckoned as one of the Protestant denominations in this country."

The poor man, like Rip Van Winkle, has evidently just awakened from a long sleep, and has not yet quite grasped the truth that the matter of his protest was settled over three hundred years ago.

In a biographical sketch of the "First Protestant Missionary in Canada," the Canadian Churchman quotes the Rev. Thomas Wood, the missionary in question, as saying:

"I am convinced that if I had been sent two years ago among them and no Pophish Priests allowed, the greater part, if not all, had become Protestants."

This was in the eighteenth century, and had reference to the Indians of Nova Scotia. It reveals the Anglican and Protestant notion of tolerance at that time. Fortunately "Pophish Priests" were sent and the tribes were Christianized. The Toronto rector above referred to will scarcely find the missionary's classification of his co-religionists to his liking.

"THE DEVIL is by no means extinct," said Rev. Dr. Herridge of Ottawa in a "Forward Movement" sermon, "but he has fallen from his high estate and is supreme no more." In elucidation of which pious observation, the Reverend Doctor proceeded to say that "while the spirit of selfishness, greed and brute force is still abroad, there is in our day a quickened consciousness and less indifference to evil."

IS THERE? "Culture" and "refinement," or what passes for those admirable qualities, are unquestionably more widely diffused in this age of comfort, and evil perhaps shuns the light more than in the past, but that there is as much real virtue as in the ages called "dark" or that the boasted refinement of our time is less on the surface is fairly open to question. Men in the mass were rougher in the "Dark Ages," and sinned more boldly, but they produced types of sanctity, culture and laborer civility which the modern world cannot pretend to rival. Their sins were the inheritance of a still ruder age, while their virtues were the very flower of their faith.

ON THE other hand, in spite of the vane of respectability which passes for virtue, and of a mania for prohibitory enactments which has within it the seeds of soulless tyranny, was evil really ever so widespread or so insidious in its methods as it is today? Was there ever so overmastering a passion for mere pleasure, or less of the spirit of renunciation? Was there ever greater greed for gain or less scrupulousness in the means of attaining it? Was there ever less fidelity to conscience, or a lesser sense of responsibility to an Unseen Monitor? Was there ever less faith? Those who, like Dr. Herridge, seem disposed to contrast the present with the past to the disadvantage of the latter should look deeper. The devil was never "supreme," but no age has smiled more upon his prospects than our own.

THE Hon. N. Wesley Rowell told the Y. M. C. A. convention at Detroit that "social justice is not yet achieved." No! nor never will be in Canada if his own actions in Parliament are to be the criterion. The honorable gentleman further hinted that there will be some funerals in both countries (U. S. and Canada) before the desired end is attained. Is he quite sure that his own political obsequies will not be included in the number?