

The Catholic Record

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.
United States and Europe—\$2.50.
Publisher and Proprietor, Thomas Coffey, Ltd., D.
Editors: Rev. James T. Foley, B.A.,
Thomas Coffey, Ltd., D.
Associate Editor—H. F. Mackintosh.
Manager—Robert M. Burns.

Advertisements for teachers, situations wanted, etc., 50 cents each insertion. Remittance to accompany the order. Where Catholic Record line address is required send 10 cents to cover postage of postage upon reply.
Obituary and marriage notices cannot be inserted except in the usual condensed form. Each insertion 50 cents.
Approved and recommended by Archbishops Palumbo and Shear, late Apostolic Delegates to Canada, the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa, and St. Boniface, the Bishops of London, Hamilton, Peterborough and Oshawa, N. Y., and the clergy throughout the Dominion.
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.
In Ottawa, Ont., single copies may be purchased from J. W. O'Brien, 141 Nicholas St.
The following agents are authorized to receive subscriptions and orders for the Record:
General Agents: M. J. Hagarty, Stephen V. Jones, Clement G. Flood, Vincent S. Cox, Miss Jessie Doyle; resident agents: Miss Bride Saunders, 16 Sherriff Ave., Sydney; E. R. Costello, 2255 8th Ave., West, Vancouver, B. C.; Silas Johnson, 210 Rochester St., Ottawa; Mrs. Geo. E. Smith, 2223 Manor St., Montreal; B. P. O'Hole, 2223 Manor St., Montreal; Miss Anne Hogan, 367 Langside Street, Winnipeg, Man.

LONDON, SATURDAY, JUNE 19, 1930

CANADIAN NATIONAL SENTIMENT

Recently there has been much discussion of the legal and constitutional status of Canada. It is an important question, and the discussion has been worth while. Yet there is truth in the saying "Let me make the songs of a nation and I care not who makes its laws." It involves some exaggeration, for the importance of law is not to be denied. But nationality is largely a matter of sentiment. How do Canadians stand in that respect? The Fourth of July in the United States is celebrated as the National holiday. The First of July in Canada is not celebrated at all. There is ten times more display in Canada over the Battle of the Boyne than over the federation of the Provinces of Canada. In 1917 came the fiftieth anniversary of Canada and a great celebration was planned, but the event was overshadowed by the Great War. That was natural and unavoidable. Yet it is a matter of regret that year after year the anniversary of the Union of Canada is allowed to pass with hardly any effort to emphasize the historical importance of the event.

Most of the races of which the Canadian nation is composed have their own National Societies, such as the Sons of England, the St. George's Societies, the St. Andrew's Societies and various societies representing Ireland and Wales. Not long ago the Fellowship of Englishmen was organized in Toronto. "The fellowship," it is said, "is open to anyone of English birth, and there is a great scope for the fellowship among the many thousands of English folk in Canada who have long felt the want of a central meeting place." The Club will aim at publicity in the English newspapers, so that newcomers in Canada will know that there is a place where they will be welcome.

This kind of local patriotism is natural and laudable. It need not conflict with a broader sentiment. Nobody would deny the broad British sentiment of Sir Walter Scott. Yet when Scott composed his classic poem of patriotism "Breathes there a man with soul so dead," he spoke of Scotland alone, "Land of brown heath and shaggy wood, land of the mountain and the flood." When he said "This is my own, my native land," he meant Scotland. When a Canadian says it, he should mean Canada. Patriotism for a Canadian means love of Canada, his own, his native land. What is needed is the cultivation of that sentiment about Canada. There should be a distinctive Canadian National Society, for the study of Canadian questions and the stimulation of Canadian sentiment. It should emphasize Canadian unity and harmony and good-will among Canadians of all races and creeds, Canadians of the East and Canadians of the West.

The organization of the Daughters of Canada is hopeful in this respect. Some members of the Daughters of the Empire have shown distrust of the new movement. They might as well antagonize the Sons of England. There is room and work for an Imperial Organization and room and work also for a distinctively Canadian Organization.

The need for a distinctively Canadian Organization is all the greater because in this country the foundations of nationality are being laid. There is a striking contrast between our small population, less than nine millions, and our huge territory, nearly as large as Europe, and easily

able to afford homes to a population as large as that of France and Italy combined. Those whose hearts and minds are centred upon Canada are sometimes described as "Little Canadians." The use of this phrase is an evidence of lack of appreciation of the immense opportunities and responsibilities of Canadian citizenship. It is an evidence of exaggerated deference and of a humility which can be compared only with that of Uriah Heep.

The real little Canadian is not the man or woman who puts "Canada First," but the one who thinks of Canada as a little place, and is always looking backward to Europe instead of forward to the great future of Canada.

This excessive modesty must be overcome. It is well to study the history of older nations, to avoid their errors and to be inspired by their achievements. But we cannot work out our destiny by mere unthinking admiration and imitation. It is right for a young man to be proud of his ancestors, but he cannot make his way in the world by pondering over their achievements. He must assert himself, and not for himself. He must use the opportunities that lie before him, rise to the occasion and do the duty of the hour. If he has inherited a vast estate he must develop it. Canada's estate is so vast as to require the undivided attention of Canadians. We may and ought to take an intelligent interest in the affairs of other nations, but after all, we can influence their destinies but slightly, except by our own growth and development. As we desire to govern ourselves, we must allow the same liberty to others. Mere dabbling or meddling in the affairs of others is of little value and may even be mischievous. Our work lies here, in Canada. It is a vast work, and requires intense concentration upon Canada. Concentration does not mean narrowness. No man can succeed in his profession or calling except by concentration, which is quite compatible with a broad outlook. We cannot be useful citizens of the world without being ardent and devoted sons of Canada.

The most loyal of British subjects realize that in this way only, can we, as Canadians, render the greatest service to the British Commonwealth of self-governing nations.

"PAGAN AMERICA"

A few weeks ago we quoted the Protestant Episcopal Bishop of Philadelphia to the effect that the United States of America as a nation had turned definitely away from Christ. And we indicated the marvellous agreement between Pope Leo XIII. and Bishop Rhinelander. The great Pontiff, with the unfailing instinct of Christ's Vicar, pointed out the inevitable consequences of the underlying principles of modern secular education; Bishop Rhinelander simply bore witness to these consequences which thrust themselves upon his observation in his own country.

And he concludes his arraignment of American secular education with these words:

"I know of no great university in this country where even among the elective courses the student can find any definite instruction in the historic Christian faith, as though it were today a living reality with a claim on modern intelligence and thought. It is probably a fact that at any of our leading colleges the student can get more definite instruction in Mohammedanism or Buddhism or almost any other of the ethnic religions than he can in Christianity."

So much for the Bishop's first test: Education in its ideals and results.

His next gauge of the nature and trend of American civilization is one that, all will agree, is obvious and adequate: Literature, as popularly current.

In this connection he says:

"In literature the highest place is, for the first time in history, freely given to the novelists. Writers of fiction are hailed as prophets of the truth and the best guides of conscience. In the pages of these 'best sellers' and high priests of public morals you will find the most sacred Christian institutions treated with scorn and ridicule. And in particular the ideals of purity and continence and holy marriage are frankly thrown in the dust heap."

He admits that in current literature, however salacious and subversive of Christian standards it may be, "there is a certain refinement of taste which shrinks from the brutal frankness characterized

by earlier ages." But, of those earlier ages he remarks with great justice, "along with that frankness there was present and was recognized a very definite idealism and an influencing recognition of Christian standards as being of unquestioned validity and requiring the homage of all right-minded men and women." While in modern literature, "most of the popular writers frankly lay the axe at the root of all Christian standards and advocate the right of each man to be a law unto himself and to be governed by his own unbridled passions."

What Bishop Rhinelander apparently does not see is that this condition in the domain of morals is the logical and inevitable consequence of the Protestant principle of private judgment which in religion emphatically asserts "the right of each man to be a law unto himself." Leo XIII. pointed out that the rejection of all divine authority in religion "must necessarily cause, as in point of fact it does, a profound disorder in the domain of morals," and he notes that morality must "descend inevitably till it reaches the ultimate conclusion of making a man a law unto himself."

Again, the Protestant Episcopal Bishop in bearing witness to actual results is in remarkable agreement with the Pope who is pointing out the inevitable consequences of false principles.

Of the final test, the favorite amusements of the people, Bishop Rhinelander sums up the situation so tersely that there is no room left for comment:

"As for amusements, immorality in dress, looseness in sexual relations, bestiality and crime as chief attractions in theatrical shows and photoplays, unbridled license and extravagance in all things, are so much the established order of the day that the most respectable among us have ceased even to shrug our shoulders."

The moral of all this for our readers is that with regard to education, literature and amusements what is true of the United States is true of Canada. At best there is but a difference of degree.

"IRELAND SINCE THE LARNE GUN-RUNNING"

When, the week following last St. Patrick's Day, we published the Rev. Dr. O'Gorman's summary of Irish history for the past eight years, we believed that we were giving our readers the best possible coherent statement of the momentous events which have brought about quite logically and inevitably the present Irish situation.

With charity toward all, with malice toward none Dr. O'Gorman accurately sets forth these events in their proper sequence and setting and throws a flood of light on a question obscured by deliberate anti-Irish propaganda camouflaged as legitimate items of news. This campaign of propaganda is as cowardly and indefensible as the ruthless terrorism of Irish government by tanks and machine guns—the consecration in practice of the erstwhile exorcised and execrable principle that Might is Right.

To the millions of the Irish race which leave the whole English-speaking world no question in the whole range of world politics is of such gripping interest as that of Ireland's heroic struggle for freedom. But the interest in the Irish question does not end with the Irish people at home or abroad. British statesmen after British statesmen has declared that in the matter of urgency and importance it is the foremost of imperial questions. And General Smuts has emphatically stated that it is vital: "Unless it is settled on the great principles which form the basis of the Empire, this Empire must cease to exist."

At the time of its publication many expressed the desire to have Dr. O'Gorman's lecture in convenient pamphlet form, for reference or for handing to those friends and neighbors who, misled or bewildered by malicious misrepresentation, desired or needed a plain statement of fact. Amongst those who so expressed themselves was one known and loved by every Irishman, the venerable and patriotic Bishop of Raphoe, whose whole life has been given to the service of the national cause, though, we believe, he has never approved of the policy of Sinn Féin. The Most Rev. Patrick O'Donnell wrote:

"The article is a fine sketch of recent Irish history. You will no doubt issue it as a pamphlet."

Our readers will welcome the announcement that the masterly summing up of this chapter of contemporary history is now available in pamphlet form. In another column (page 8) an advertisement gives the necessary particulars.

The Right Reverend M. F. Fallon, D.D., Bishop of London, contributes a vigorous Foreword. His Lordship's wide knowledge of affairs and deep interest in the larger aspects and relations of world politics give to his introduction a weight that merits and will receive much careful consideration.

We quote the concluding paragraph:

"In the pamphlet to which these few lines are a Foreword, the Reverend Dr. O'Gorman gives a dispassionate review of the last eight years of Ireland's history which is a complete refutation of charges based on suppressed truths, suggested falsehoods, and plain, malicious lies. It is a concise, accurate, yet comprehensive statement of facts. It ought to be welcome to every man who loves truth, cherishes liberty, and longs to see broadened out the boundaries of freedom."

ALL'S FAIR AGAINST THE CHURCH

By THE OBSERVER

A story is told by a prominent resident of Belfast that one day he met a man in the street who cried out "To hell with the Pope." The gentleman remonstrated with him: "Don't talk like that; the Pope is a respectable old gentleman."

"A respectable old gentleman!" cried the astonished Pope hater; "well—all I can say is—he has a d—n bad name in Belfast."

Some years ago, a friend of mine called at the office of a daily paper to speak to the editor about some very unfair statements that had been published concerning the Church. He told me afterwards: "The man didn't seem to understand; he did not insist on the truth of the statements at all; but he seemed to think it was of no importance; and I began to think that most of the statements made against the Church, are made, not so much in malice or in wantonness, as in recklessness; just as political papers assail each other and each other's candidates at the time of an election, so long as they go to the opponent's discredit."

For my part, I think there is a good deal of truth in this. The Church is regarded as "fair game"; she has a bad character anyhow; what matter a few more aspersions or accusations, true or false?

This, I suppose, explains, in part, at least, why it is, that even when Catholics answer such accusations in the plainest and most convincing manner; even when they give ocular, visible, demonstration, as in the case where persons, places, or objects are concerned, the lie is seldom or never retracted; and in most cases is even calmly and persistently repeated.

There is such an entire absence of any manifestation of conscience in the controversial methods of Protestant pulpits and the Protestant press, and of Protestants controlling the secular press, where the Church and the Catholic religion are concerned, that one is almost driven to account for it in this way, so as not to be forced to account 90% of all Protestants having the ear of the public as shameless and incorrigible liars.

In politics, or rather, in the strife of political parties, a partisan takes, once and for all, a broad general position; the other party deserves to be beaten; the great aim and end is to beat them; they are so dangerous and so ruinous and all the rest of it, that the end of beating them justifies the means—any means—that may be employed in doing so. All that the political journalist cares about is this general attitude: all other things are secondary and of comparatively little importance. The truth is preferred, if it is handy; not so much because it is truth as because it is more damaging; less answerable and disputable. But, if the truth is not at his service, the partisan is ready to use lies. Here also, he has a preference: he professes not to make the lies himself; but if someone else makes them and hands them to him, he is ready and eager to use them.

Credit to an opponent is, in the easy-going ethics of political life, not to be thought of. Here there is not even a pretence of being honest. The virtues or the abilities of an opponent; or the record of an

opposing party; may be very obviously admirable; but it is thought necessary to deny them, or at the least, to belittle them.

The opponent's motives must always be made out to be the worst that can be suggested with any hope of being believed. Christian Charity is considered a childish weakness.

And, when we turn to the four hundred year old assault of Protestantism on the Church of God, we see the same phenomena on all sides. There are the manufacturers of lies; comparatively few in number; and most of them, I think, long since dead. But their lies are not dead. There is probably a slow improvement in respect of the credit given to the lies; but oh, how many millions of Protestants, yet, in the world, practice against us the use of all means and any means to accomplish the end; which is now just what it was in the days of Luther: the destruction of the power of the Church of God.

The average Protestant has no sensitiveness of conscience where the Church is concerned. He may not think much of an Horatio Hooker as a man and a journalist; but he regards him as a champion of Protestantism because he attacks the Church. Prove to him that a Hooker is a liar; and he laughs, good naturedly and says, "Oh, of course;" but if you attack a Hooker, he takes sides against you.

The Pope has a bad name, not only in Belfast, and in Toronto, but everywhere where there are Protestants; and thousands of Protestants who would not wilfully and deliberately lie about us, think it of no importance whether a statement be true or false, if it is against the Pope or the Church.

If you remonstrate, they laugh lightly—when you get them at their best. "What difference?" they seem to say. "We're fighting you; all's fair in war."

But all is not fair, neither in war nor at any other time. Politicians have long claimed exemption from the binding obligation of truth; but they are not exempt. And there is even less possibility of exempting those who conduct a campaign of falsehood in the name of religion.

One of the many signs that Protestantism, as a religion—or as several hundred religions—is wrong, is that it has always propagated itself and maintained itself by means of this unscrupulous system of blackening the Church without regard to the truth or falsehood of the assertions made.

Protestantism is stamped with many marks of the material and the worldly; but none is plainer than this identity of its methods with the methods of the partisan politician.

NOTES AND COMMENTS

THE THOROUGH and far-reaching vandalism of the English Reformers is perhaps in no way more effectively illustrated than by the destruction of the once splendid library of Syon House, that solitary foundation in England of the Brightline Order. The monastery was founded in 1415, and in the comparatively short period of its existence had built up a library which was second to none in the Kingdom, and the English monastic libraries rivalled any others in Christendom.

BUT IN the mad zeal for destruction, and for rendering the break with the past complete (a circumstance which present-day exponents of the Anglican "continuity" theory would gladly forget) which characterized the Reformation, Syon's splendid possession was not spared. So thorough, indeed, was the vandal's work, that, as a careful census has revealed, but six books from that source have been identified as still existing in English libraries. Modern Anglicans, or at least a considerable section of them, would persuade themselves that there was really no break with the past in the sixteenth century, but as Cardinal Newman said many years ago, antiquarian arguments tending to bolster up that venous theory are altogether unequal to the urgency of visible facts. And the destruction of Syon House, as of numerous other like fabrics in England and elsewhere, is a fact which no ingenuity of argument or deduction can expunge from the record.

A GOLDEN jubilee in the priesthood is an event sufficiently rare to be memorable under any circumstances, and when it is attained in the person of so outstanding a figure as the Venerable Dean Harris it calls for more than passing remark. His

work as historian, as archaeologist, as traveller, as editor, and above all, as Christian priest has made his name known not only throughout the length and breadth of Canada, but in the neighboring republic and beyond seas. The celebration in Toronto last week, therefore, of his golden jubilee was one of the most interesting events of the year.

ESPECIALLY noteworthy was the tribute offered to this good priest by the laity of Ontario and by his innumerable non-Catholic friends, in the banquet held in the King Edward hotel. The gathering at which the Dean was himself the only priest present was of an unusually representative character. We say laity of Ontario, for while Toronto's representation necessarily predominated, many had come from distant points to do honor to the evening's guest, and the letters and telegrams read during the evening and which came from all over Canada and the United States, were not the usual mere formal expressions of regret, but spontaneous tributes of love and respect for the man. It is given to but few to attach to themselves friends so numerous and diverse as greeted Dean Harris on the eventful occasion. Men instinctively recognize the spirit of friendship in others, and the possession of that quality to an eminent degree, accompanied by unswerving loyalty, and a fund of sympathy as large as humanity, are the pre-eminent possessions which have attached to this venerable servant of God, the respect and admiration of "troops of friends."

In his case friendship becomes that "transmitted influence which cannot die."

AN AMUSING story is told of a Kenitite enthusiast—one of that type "deeming himself charged with a mission to denounce the emanations of Ritualism in the Church of England. He was orating on the subject on a street corner in one of the larger English towns when a sympathizer passed him a note suggesting that he say something about celibacy, one of the more recent accessions to the Ritualistic propaganda. The response was immediate. "And my brethren," cried out the preacher with an extra ebullience of perverted eloquence, "strange and dreadful to relate these abandoned men go so far as to practice celibacy, and what is more, they practice it in the open streets!"

THE MEXICAN PEOPLE

USUALLY JUDGED BY ONE PER CENT. OF THE WHOLE

THIS editorial appreciation of Mexico will be interesting to many readers. The Protestant missionary's fling at the Mexican people's "spiritual advisers" only enhances the value of his remarkable tribute to the "unmistakable culture, breadth of information, and sane judgment" of the educated classes, and to the spirit of reverence, true Christian charity, constancy and faithfulness of the aborigines. Too often we compare the Mexican—eighty per cent. of whom are Indian or half breed—with the whites of North America. The proper comparison is between the Mexican peon and those remnants of the North American aborigines whom Anglo-Saxon civilization has all but exterminated.—E. C. R.

ALTHOUGH the Rio Grand and a surveyor's line run across the desert divide Mexico from the United States, the American people who do not live near the border, that is to say, about 107,000,000 of them, know very little about their Southern neighbors. To the average American the Mexican of today is an insurgent or a bandit or, at any rate, a conspirator against his own Government. As a matter of fact, Mexicans of this type form, it has been estimated, about 1% of the whole. Nor are the character, the temperament, the manners and the modes of life of the Mexicans understood in this country. In reputation they suffer from the defects and inequities of the ruling class, formerly the white or Spanish element, well educated and exclusive, and now the Generals, often part Indian, whose origin is more or less obscure. It must be admitted that it has been the fashion in the United States to give the Mexican a bad name and to deny him virtue, courage, manhood and humanity.

The judgment pronounced in 1848 by George Frederick Ruxton, an adventurous British army officer, is often accepted as final to this day. After several months spent in Mexico, in cities and on the trail, Ruxton, one of the most hardy, daring and self-dependent of men, wrote that he could not "remember to have observed one single commendable trait in the character of the Mexican, always excepting from this sweeping clause the women of the country,

who, for kindness of heart and many sterling qualities, are an ornament to their sex and to any nation." He ascribed the courage of the Mexicans, their honesty, their humanity—they were a bad lot and past redemption. But Ruxton had much to do with things, brave and the sons of the people in his wanderings. He never remained long enough in one place to study the Mexicans, and he was never a part of their life in town or on hacienda. There is different testimony from others. Mexicans are very human after all, and they have qualities that make them kindly friends and good neighbors.

An American contractor confided to Charles Macomb Flindrau, whose little book "Viva Mexico!" is one of the most intimate studies of the Mexicans we have: "I hate 'em all. But after my work is over for the day, I like to sit on a bench in the plaza and look at 'em. I sit there a couple of hours every evening. Even when the rains ain't doing anything in particular, you always sort of feel as if there was something doing."

Flindrau found the Mexicans of all classes, down to the humblest laborer, the poorest people he had met, either at work or play. "Give your permission," says a poor bent double under a sack of coffee as he trades in front of a bricklayer mending a wall. A rider passing thirty or forty horsemen greets each one pleasantly, and "May God go with you!" he concludes. Flindrau sagely says that while Americans often cry out at the thievish propensities of the Mexican they invariably speak of some individual whom they have trusted and not found wanting in honesty and good faith. On his own ranch the American writer was well served and his confidence was not abused.

Pallip Terry thinks that Americans are to blame if they do not like the Mexicans—those of course who are not professional insurgents and road agents. Courtesy and hospitality are the rule, with rarely an exception, and "the most rigid Northerner generally thaws beneath the genial beams of Mexican good humor and volubility." He adds: "Never measure Mexican institutions by American standards, nor seek for motives in bright eyes."

A witness with an experience of thirty years in Mexico, Alden Bull Case, an American missionary, knew the Mexicans only to esteem them for their kindness of heart and amiability, and to excuse their faults, which were racial or the result of misgovernment, oppression and a social system for which their spiritual advisers were often responsible. For many years Case lived in El Valle, Chihuahua, the headquarters of Francisco Villa today. But the missionary traveled wide, visiting many cities, including the capital. He speaks of "the excellent bankers, merchants, doctors and lawyers" whom he met, and of the editors and "brilliant literary men" who "surprise one ignorant of Mexico by their unmistakable culture, breadth of information and sane judgment." For the people of El Valle, an agrarian community, he had a warm place in his heart. To him it was a Mexican "Sweet Auburn." He testifies that politeness is not merely a form. In cases of sickness, bereavement or misfortune, sympathy is generous and sincere, and shown not only in words but kind deeds. Orphans never lack homes, and "especially are the aged cared for with kindness." Reverence is a characteristic of the Mexican people. "My years of experience," he says, "have impressed me more with their [the Mexicans'] constancy and faithfulness than with the opposite characteristics." He predicts that there will certainly be a new Mexico. "That country will some day take her place among the stable, the powerful, the highly esteemed nations of the world, contributing her full share to the progress of civilization." With the help of the Neighbor of the North, he adds.—N. Y. Times.

A SERMON AGAINST DIVORCE

THE ETHICAL ARGUMENT PART II.

Preached in the Blessed Sacrament Church, Ottawa, by Rev. John J. O'Gorman, D. C. L.

THE Senate of Canada has passed two private bills legalizing divorce for adultery in eight of the nine Canadian provinces, and establishing divorce courts in two provinces which lack them. A review of the seven paragraphs of the New Testament which teach the indissolubility, except by death, of Christian marriage, forces one to the conclusion that the Canadian Parliament should rather pass an Act abolishing divorce throughout the Dominion. That sounds radical, but it is radical in the true sense of the word: it gets at the root of the evil. You cannot abolish sin by Act of Parliament; but you can avoid legalizing sin.

ATTITUDE OF MODERN LEGISLATORS

WE are face to face with the fact, however, that many Canadians, both in and out of Parliament, do not recognize the blinding force of supernatural authority. They consider that Parliament is as free to legislate on marriage and divorce as it is to legislate on any other contract, provided natural equity be observed. The more advanced wish to revert to the Pagan Roman idea that marriage may be broken by mutual consent, or even at the desire of one party, under certain conditions laid down by the State. Yet according to the Encyclopaedia Britannica, "Christianity has had no greater practical effect on the life of mankind than in its belief that