

**The Catholic Record**

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

Address business letters to the Manager. Classified Advertising 15 cents per line. Resolutions must accompany the order. Where Catholic Record Box address is required send 10 cents to prepay expense of postage upon replies.

Obituary and marriage notices cannot be inserted except in the usual condensed form. Each insertion 6 cents. The Editor cannot be held responsible for unclassified manuscripts. Every endeavor will be made to return rejected contributions when stamped addressed envelopes are enclosed.

The Catholic Record has been approved and recommended by Archbishops Falconio and Sbarretti, 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, 240 Main St. and John J. Dwyer.

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

The following agents are authorized to receive subscriptions for the Catholic Record: General Agents—M. J. Hagarty, Stephen V. James, George J. Gentry, Montreal Agents—Miss Berde S. Sanders, Sydney; E. R. Costello, 15 Pender St., St. John's; Chamberlain, Ottawa West; Mrs. Geo. E. Smith, 225 Manoe St., Montreal; Mrs. Edward McPhee, 224 Martin Ave., Kinross; Whelan, Man., J. P. O'Farrell, St. Andrews St., Quebec City; Miss Margaret E. Mulligan, Canora, Sask.

LONDON, SATURDAY, SEPT. 16, 1922

**THE MASS**

At the Last Supper our Lord said: "With desire I have desired to eat this pasch with you before I suffer." Cardinal Manning interprets this desire to mean His desire to make the Supper His offering of the Sacrifice that takes away the sin of the world, and to begin His new and intimate way of union with us forever. The death on the Cross was the immolation; but there is no sacrifice unless there is an offering as well as an immolation; and at the Supper, in the words of Manning, "He began the act of oblation, finished on Calvary, which redeemed the world." In a discourse delivered at the Council of Trent the Archbishop of Cologne expressed it thus: "To the Father, with His own hands, He offered Himself, while the wicked men to whom He was given over ceased not from their buffeting . . . till they consummated on the Cross the sacrifice which was offered in bread and wine."

Today theologians are casting aside many different explanations of the Mass, devised by their predecessors during the Protestant controversies, and are going back to pre-Reformation tradition. M. J. Paquet of Quebec, Father Lepicier, formerly in the Propaganda, and now Father de la Taille in Gregorian University of Rome, concur in explaining the Mass substantially as follows:

On Thursday evening, about twenty hours before the death of our Lord, He and His Apostles assembled in the room where the paschal meal had been prepared for them according to the Law of Moses. This was the great festival of the Jews in memory of their deliverance from the land of Egypt. At that supper our Lord began the sacrifice which redeemed the world. He there made the offering of all that followed during the Passion and on the Cross. This offering together with the passion and death is all one sacrifice. The suffering and death resulted from that offering. There He inaugurated the New Law, saying: "This is the cup of My blood of the new and everlasting testament," and St. Paul adds: "Where there is a testament the death of the testator must necessarily come in." St. Thomas Aquinas says that by His offering at the Last Supper our Lord "voluntarily accepted the passion."

There He formally took upon Himself the sins of the world, and the effect is seen immediately in the garden of Gethsemane where He cried in prayer: "My Father, if it be possible, let this chalice pass from Me." As priest according to the order of Melchizedek our Lord placed Himself in the state of Victim at the Supper. There He manifested His will to suffer and die for the salvation of many by taking bread and wine as the symbols of His separated Body and Blood, and by changing their substance into that of His Body and Blood. Then He gave to His Apostles the power and the command to continue the same sacrificial rite for all time, saying: "Do this for a Commemoration of Me." His celebration of this sacrificial rite at the Last Supper was much more than the institution of the Blessed Eucharist. First of

all, it was the offering of His Body to be broken and of His Blood to be shed in the Passion and on the Cross. This offering was as much a part of the Sacrifice of the Cross as the death itself. "Sacrifice consists especially in the offering," says the Council of Trent, and the offering involves the death. The continuation of this offering of the Victim of Calvary really present on the altar in the form of bread and wine is not another sacrifice. It is the sacrifice of the Cross continued in Christian worship, and this what we call the Mass.

**AN INTERESTING APPEAL AND A VIGOROUS COMMENT**

We have always regarded with sympathy the aspirations after unity of the disjecta membra of Protestantism. Recognition of the manifold evils of division must lead thinking men and women to seek the cause of the endless splitting up of those Christian sects that are at one only in the common acceptance of the negative designation of Protestant. And this search must end in the recognition of the patent fact that the fundamental principle of Protestantism—Private Judgment—is the inevitable and prolific source of division. Earnest souls amongst them know that Christ prayed for unity and they repeat that prayer "that they all may be one, as Thou Father in Me and I in Thee." Those who believe in the Divinity of Christ must perforce acknowledge His omniscience and His wisdom. And despite the extraordinary bias of tradition, education and environment many—eventually all who preserve the faith—must be led to seek Christ's own Divine plan and safeguard of unity and to find it in the Catholic Church. In God's way and in God's time all that is permanent of the efforts toward union or reunion will find its realization in that unity which Christ gave to His Church and against which the gates of Hell shall not prevail. Nor do we lose sympathy or hope because of the ignoble and un-Christian light in which some of the protagonists of Church Union reveal themselves.

An open Letter addressed to the Rev. S. D. Chown, Superintendent of the Methodist Church in Canada, has just been given the press by Rev. Dr. E. Scott, Editor of the Presbyterian Record, Montreal.

It appears that Dr. Chown "made statements re the Presbyterians and Church Union at the different Methodist conferences during the present summer, and in a pastoral letter to the Methodist people in The Christian Guardian of June 25th ult. that have been carried by the public press far beyond the Churches concerned."

To these public statements made by Dr. Chown both in sorrow and in anger—not anger perhaps, but with such righteous indignation as a Methodist Superintendent may allow himself in a pastoral letter—Dr. Scott makes direct, lucid and forceful reply. One or two points are especially interesting, though the whole letter is that and more—it is illuminating even where it runs counter to the Catholic position.

Dr. Chown with a modest yet confident sense of the infallibility attaching to his office thus interprets Presbyterian rights: "We are well aware that there is opposition within the Presbyterian Church. In our judgment, however, there are limits of propriety that should be observed in the activities of the opposition. From our point of view, it seems that they have a right to withdraw from any arrangement made to carry out the will of the General Assembly, but not to block the consummation of its declared purpose."

To which Methodist interpretation of Presbyterian rights and to the gracious permission thereto appended, Dr. Scott replies: "The mistake here is in judging the 'rights' of Presbyterians in their own Church from what you call 'our point of view.' The 'rights' of the Methodist and the Presbyterian people in their own Churches are widely different. The Methodist Church is incorporated. It is a legal entity. Its General Conference, within certain limits, has power to transfer the Church and its civil rights and possessions whither it will, and the only alternative for the Methodist people who do not wish to be transferred is to 'withdraw.' The Presbyterian Church is not incorporated. It is not a legal entity; it is simply a Christian organization with a General Assembly chosen to legislate within and for that organization and pledged to 'maintain and defend the same,' but with no power to disband it, or to transfer the

Church and its civil rights to another control.

Presbyterians who do not wish to be transferred have no need to 'withdraw.' They simply continue their own Church and allow those to 'withdraw' who may so desire. And Presbyterians in Canada do not wish to 'withdraw' from their Church home to admit of its being handed over to a new organization by the one-third of its membership that voted for the O. B. U."

Though one might think that this information should have been known to the zealous promoters of Church Union, apparently it is only at this latest stage that Dr. Chown has learned these facts of such vital interest and moment to the cause he is advocating.

But it is in the following paragraph that Dr. Chown reveals the hope that is in him to be realized by Church Union:

"I would say with all conviction that, if the major Churches of Protestantism cannot unite the battle which is going on for the religious control of our country will be lost in the next few years. I refer not to the school question only, but to the whole movement within Canada in the religio-political realm."

This solemn Methodist warning leaves the sturdy Presbyterian cold, contemptuous.

Here is his vigorous comment: "Thank you very much for this frank forecast of the proposed merger; not a Church, but a religio-political machine incorporated, as provided in the Basis of Union, to 'battle' . . . in the religio-political realm for 'religio-political' ends at the bidding of its central authority."

"You have here given Presbyterians an added imperative to continue their own beloved Church with Christ her 'only King and Head,' a Church whose mission and work is not 'religio-political' but to win men and women to Him, and then, as Christian citizens, will they do their duty in the State."

Any one conversant with the political history of Canada knows that amongst all the classes making up the Canadian electorate there is none more intelligently independent than that which is sometimes called "the Catholic vote." We all know the bogey of "The Roman Hierarchy" so often and so successfully used at election times to frighten timid Protestants out of voting for political measures on their political merits.

Dr. Chown quite evidently believes in that dreadful bogey and his simple faith is quite touching when he tells his obstinate Presbyterian brethren whom he would gather into his religio-political fold, that "the gobelins will get them if they don't watch out."

One can sympathize with the shocked Methodist Superintendent when he reads the Presbyterian shameless denial of fundamental principles, the first and greatest of which appears to be: "The fear of Popery is the beginning of Church Union."

**WAS THERE DERELICTION OF DUTY?**

Our readers are aware of the tragic death of the estimable young priest, Father Thomas J. Clohecy, of Dundalk, Ontario, at the hands of John Cosgrove, a Catholic deaf mute of his parish. Our sympathy goes out to the bereaved parish and to the friends and relatives of the priest thus cut off in the prime of his sacerdotal zeal and activity. Nor can we withhold our sympathy from the friends of the unfortunate man who is now charged with the crime of murder. Evidently subnormal, no one not intimately acquainted with him can form any judgment as to the measure of his responsibility for the crime. That is a matter on which judge and jury will decide after fair trial in a court of justice.

But this is precisely the point to which we desire to call attention. In the account of the tragedy as given in The Globe, August 21st, we read:

"Cosgrove is about thirty years of age. Some time ago an attempt was made to place him in an institution, but when officers called at his home to take him he ran away into the bush and evaded capture. After he returned home no further action was taken to put him under restraint."

And the London Free Press adds an important and significant detail in this paragraph of its report:

"The warrant on which Cosgrove was arrested was an old one, issued this spring, charging him with assault to do bodily harm on his father. This warrant was being executed when Cosgrove escaped, and so no action has been taken since. He was arrested on this warrant."

It appears, therefore, that, some months before the murder of Father Clohecy, there was grave reason to think that Cosgrove was more or less irresponsible and a dangerous person to be at large.

On what must have seemed reliable information a warrant was issued for his arrest. This of course did not decide the question. Had Cosgrove been arrested at that time, only after fair and full investigation by competent authority would the question be decided as to whether it were safe to allow him to be at large or whether he should be put under restraint in a suitable institution.

That is probably what will have to be done now if he be adjudged irresponsible; dangerous, he has proved himself to be. Why was that warrant for his arrest never executed? It is true he evaded the officers who went to arrest him; but he returned home in a few hours and remained openly in the neighborhood ever since. And it was on this old warrant issued last spring and evidently never cancelled or withdrawn, that he was arrested after he had shot the priest.

We make no charge for we know only what the newspapers have told us of the case. But, on information now proved to be only too well founded, a warrant was issued some months ago for the arrest of a man alleged to be dangerous if allowed to be at large, and this warrant, though never withdrawn, was not executed until the man shot and killed another. There may be some satisfactory explanation of this fact; but, though the press has given the fact to the public, no explanation satisfactory or otherwise has been offered.

Was there dereliction of duty by somebody?

That is something that should be cleared up. We saw no reference to it in the reports of the preliminary trial; it may concern neither prosecution or defense. But, we submit, it does concern the public and, perhaps, the department of the Attorney-General of Ontario.

**DO THEY KNOW OR DO THEY NOT?**

BY THE OBSERVER

One of the popular attitudes of the day is, "We do not know." There are a great many to be met with who imagine they are taking a very superior attitude when they say, "Don't be so emphatic about the things a man should believe, or about the rules of conduct a man should observe; for nothing is known for certain about those things; and nothing can be known with certainty about them. Yet, those very men do hold as certain and settled, many truths and many rules of conduct. Why do they do so? Because there is not really any such thing in the world as an Agnostic. There is not really one Agnostic in the world; not one man in the world who calls himself an Agnostic whose actions are in logical accordance with his professed views.

And that is a mighty good thing, too; for if men should proceed for even one day on the theory that they had no moral knowledge that was certain and sure, the world would be plunged into chaos in that one day; and no longer time would be needed. The Agnostic, if he could be, or dared to be, logical, would have to take the stand that whatever any other man might choose to do, no matter how horrible it might seem to him, might be all right; and the thief, the prostitute, the murderer, and the traitor, were not to be reproached by him; however he might differ from their views. There are, in the prisons of every country, many men who do not think it is any harm to steal, and how can the Agnostic, if he be a real Agnostic, condemn them for that attitude? "Oh, but," one may say, "we condemn them for their having broken a rule of conduct that is necessary and good for human society; and for that we punish them." Well, then, you will not visit them with any other punishment? You will not despise them in your mind; nor shrink from them as from an object that is despicable or dreadful. Needless to say, there is no such limit placed to our detestation of murder and other grave offences; we do condemn them on grounds other than their mere disobedience to a law of the land, and we condemn men and women for offences that are not punishable by society.

But, the Agnostic, if he wants to be consistent, can take no higher or

other stand than on the mere rules of human law; and if the offender can find a flaw, or a quirk, in the human law, the Agnostic is, by his own professions, bound to acquit him of all guilt, in his own mind, to the same extent to which the law of the land acquits him in the court room. Of course, no such acquittal takes place. The man who does a deed that our inner monitor says is a rotten thing to do stands condemned in our eyes; no matter though the law may excuse or let him go. But, how can we justify this if there are not really any laws of conduct that we can know, and dogmatically hold as settled and unquestionable?

There are, then, such laws; our whole course of conduct confesses our belief that there are such laws; no matter what we may say with our lips. There are, then, laws whose existence and binding force we admit; quite apart from the statute books of the State. If an Agnostic goes that far, and he does so that far, his first principle is gone, for there is not only a law to be known, but the Agnostic himself knows it, in part at least, and cannot deny his knowledge, since he acts on that knowledge every day he lives.

The Agnostic is then driven to deny that there is a source of knowledge somewhere, not that there is a certain portion of that knowledge in his own possession, for his daily life confesses these things, but he is driven to dispute, piece by piece, the knowledge which others profess to have. But this is not really Agnosticism at all; though it is what passes for it; and it is in this sense that I wish to discuss it today. The people who call themselves Agnostics are generally more accurately described as skeptics. And there is not much pure skepticism, any more than there is much pure Agnosticism, in the world. My experience with those who call themselves Agnostics or Skeptics and who are hardly ever either the one or the other, is that they choose to suit themselves the things to be doubtful about, or profess ignorance of, and they are as credulous as children in matters in which they want to believe.

The man who says he does not know is rarely content to say just that and let it go at that; he has very decided opinions, which he has, on his own professions, no right to have at all. Ask him these questions—Will you say that I may be right; that the Catholic Church may be right; that there may be a hell; and that you may go there; that every word in the Bible may be true? Ask him these questions and you will at once find out how much of an Agnostic he is. For, he will not admit that all these things may be true; he is dogmatic in his denial of dogma; and yet, if his Agnosticism were real, he could not refuse to admit the possibility of every one of these things being true; because it is the first principle of Agnosticism that we can know no ultimate truth with certainty and if we have no such knowledge and can have no such knowledge, then anything may be true so far as we are concerned. As for pure Skepticism, those who call themselves skeptics are usually more credulous than the believers they affect to despise. Ask any man who calls himself a skeptic, how he explains the piles of crutches, leg irons, bandages, and other appliances in the Church of Sainte Anne De Beaupre, and he will begin at once to explain; and it is to be noted that so-called Agnostics and skeptics are usually eager to try their hands at explaining things. He will at once begin to tell you that these people were not ill at all in the way in which they thought they were, or that they were wrongly advised by their medical attendants; or that as soon as they became convinced that they were going to be cured, the cure came; by an act of the mind or the will; or something; the power of mind over matter, and all that.

How credulous they are; these men who imagine they doubt everything. Their explanation is the hardest one to believe that they could possibly imagine. It is far easier, and far more rational, to believe that there is a Supreme Ruler who has power to cure our ills, and who sometimes does, than to believe that the thousands of pilgrims who went to Sainte Anne de Beaupre sick, and left it well, were deceived by themselves, or were healed by a mere act of their own mind.

In my experience the people who call themselves Agnostics or skeptics, are never satisfied to take merely a negative attitude; they take the attitude;—I don't know; and therefore you don't know. If they were content to say,—I don't know; but You may; so go ahead and show me if you can, then they might claim to be Agnostics or skeptics.

But, the skeptic gives us an affirmative explanation of a miracle; and jeers if we do not swallow it right out of his hand. The Agnostic lays down dogmas; the principal one of which is that in ultimate and essential things there is no certain knowledge to be had. Having accepted this dogma, a dogma which if true destroys all other dogmas, and precludes the possibility that there can be any others, the Agnostic coolly, and without the least idea of being absurd, tells us that he does not know anything and does not pretend to. Well, the proposition that we can not know anything with certainty, is knowledge, if it is true. To find out that we do not know anything is to learn a very important fact. What could be more important to know than to know that we know nothing. If a man knows that he knows nothing, he has valuable knowledge; for what can be more important to a man than to be aware of his own ignorance. But suppose a man says to the Agnostic who has just handed him this important bit of information, "See here, though, You say I know nothing; but to know that is to know something; so, then, I ask you, can a man know something and nothing at the same time?" "You say I know nothing; but how can that be, for 'I believe you, I know that what you say is true and then I know something. I then know something; namely, that I know nothing. But, if I can know this something, why can I not hope to know another something; and if I may hope to know something else, where will then be your great truth, that I can know nothing? Is your great truth, then, which you have revealed to me, which is that I can know nothing, the only truth that exists? If so, where did you get it? If you got it from a person, from whom; if it came into your mind, by what means did it come? And from where did it come? Is there a source of truth somewhere, where you got this great truth that man can know nothing? If so then you have misinformed me again; for the existence of a source of truth, from whence you got this great truth of yours, is, in itself, a truth, so there is another truth; though you said just now there was but one."

All men are believers; all men believe dogmatically; and there are no pure skeptics; and no pure Agnostics; much as some people like to so imagine themselves to be such.

the same time as his great exemplar John Henry Newman, and from that time until his death in the later seventies, waged war relentlessly and unceasingly upon those "heralds of revolt" whose highest mission seemed to be to deprive the present age of that priceless heritage of belief which bygone centuries had bequeathed to it.

It was in the pages of the Dublin Review and as editor of that valuable periodical, that Ward gave to the world that series of essays on religious philosophy, history and polemics that commanded the respect of even the most uncompromising exponents of "free thought." And it is noteworthy, that his son, Wilfrid Ward, was, after the interval of a generation, to become editor of the same periodical, and to carry on his father's work.

THE CALLING up of William Ward's fame as a cricketer recalls also the noticeable fact that three of the most eminent of the Oxford converts were sons of London bankers. John Henry Newman's father, John Newman, was a member of the banking firm of Ramsbottom, Newman & Co., and, as Thomas Mozley tells us, at the time of the future Cardinal's birth, resided but a few yards from the Bank of England. Cardinal Manning's father was in his day Governor of the Bank, of which, as we have seen, the father of William George Ward, and grandfather of Wilfrid, was a Director. Manning and Ward were about the same age, and may have been known to one another, although no biography of either, so far as we recall, mentions the fact.

CARDINAL NEWMAN, who was born in 1801, was therefore considerably older than the other two, and as the Newmans had, while John Henry was a child, moved to another district of London, he is not likely to have then known his future collaborators. There is, however, an interesting possible association in another direction. Benjamin D'Israeli, who both under that name and later as Lord Beaconsfield, became Prime Minister, was born in or near Theobald's Road, and that fact is recorded on a commemorative tablet placed some years ago by the London County Council on the house where his birth took place.

THE NEWMAN family lived in Theobald's Road about the same period, and at the time of the placing of the Beaconsfield tablet it was suggested that the probability of the future Premier and the future Cardinal having been playmates in the neighborhood might fittingly be recorded on the tablet. There is a wealth of interesting suggestion in the association of men of eminence, and in London alone, not to speak of other historic towns, a whole literature has grown around it.

**BOY LIFE**

"Talks to Boys." By Rev. J. P. Conroy, S.J. Published by permission of the Queen's Work Press.

BLUFFER & Co.—CONTINUED Exhibit A is most educational. We have named it the Bluffer.

Exhibit B. The Tesser. A trifle more delicate in texture, but quite an interesting display. The Tesser, in the open, is an artless, tender, manly, cheerful-spirited young fellow; takes whatever comes along; never asks for anything; most easily satisfied. "My old thing is good enough for me" is his motto. In captivity—in other words, at home—the work-side of the beautiful tapestry jumps into sudden view.

"Ma, can't I get a new suit of clothes? Can't I? Hey? All the other boys have new suits. Can't I get one? Hey, ma? Say ma?" (it reads like poetry.) "Can't I get a suit like Tom Gary's?" Told to go to the store: "Oh, why can't Jack go? I'm tired. Gee, my foot hurts something terrible!" (Business of a hideous limp.) "Aw, let Jack go!"

"Pa, will you give me a quarter? I want to go to the nickel show.— Yes, I do too need a quarter, because I want to get an ice-cream soda after it. Say, pa, will you give me a quarter? Huh?" And thus the Tesser keeps up his whine, his begging, his reiterations, often following a long period of whining with the snuffles and the pouts and that tears-in-the-voice effect which would be worth a for-

STUDENTS of the Oxford movement will not need to be reminded of the conspicuous part William George, or "Ideal" Ward, as he came to be known, took in that memorable movement of religious thought back to the early days of Christianity. Conspicuous as was his work at Oxford, however, it was as a Catholic later in life that he won for himself a place among the foremost philosophers of the century. He became a Catholic in 1845, about