

The Catholic Record

Price of Subscription—\$1.50 per annum. United States & Europe—\$2.00. THOS. COFFEY, L. D., Editor and Publisher

Advertisements for teachers, situations wanted, etc. are inserted at the rate of 10 cents per line per week. Remittance to accompany the order.

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

Messrs. Luke King, P. J. Nevea, E. J. Broderick, M. J. Haggarty, Mrs. W. E. Smith and Miss Sara Hanley are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transmit all other business for the CATHOLIC RECORD.

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

When subscribers ask for their mail at the post office it would be well for them to tell the clerk to give them their CATHOLIC RECORD. We have information of carelessness in a few places on the part of delivery clerks who will sometimes look for letters only.

Subscribers changing residence will please give old as well as new address.

LETTERS OF RECOMMENDATION

Apostolic Delegation. Ottawa, June 13th, 1905.

Mr. Thomas Coffey. My Dear Sir:—Since coming to Canada I have been a reader of your paper. I have noted with satisfaction that it is directed with intelligence and ability, and above all, that it is imbued with a strong Catholic spirit.

University of Ottawa. Ottawa, Canada, March 7th, 1900.

Mr. Thomas Coffey. Dear Sir: For some time past I have read your estimable paper, the CATHOLIC RECORD, and congratulate you upon the manner in which it is published.

Yours faithfully in Jesus Christ. D. Falco, Arch. of Larissa, Ados, Delos.

LONDON, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 1912

LENTEN REGULATIONS FOR 1912

THE FOLLOWING ARE THE LENTEN REGULATIONS FOR THE DIOCESE OF LONDON

1st. All days in Lent, Sundays excepted, are fast days.

2nd. By special permission of the Holy See, meat is allowed at all meals on Sundays, and at the principal meal on Mondays, Tuesdays, Thursdays, and Saturdays, except the Saturday of Ember Week and Holy Saturday.

3rd. The use of fish and flesh at the same meal is not permitted during Lent.

Children under seven years of age are exempted from the law of fasting.

Persons under twenty-one years of age or over sixty years of age, and all persons in ill health, or engaged in hard labor, or who have any other legitimate excuse, may be exempted both from the law of fast and of abstinence.

In order, however, to safeguard conscience, the faithful should have the judgment of their pastor or confessor in all cases where they seek exemption from the law of fast or abstinence.

Whatever may be the obligation in the matter of fast or abstinence, Lent is for everybody a season of mortification and of penance.

From this law no one can escape, and in it no one has the right of dispensation. Pastors are earnestly requested to preach during the holy season of Lent the necessity of penance, and the obligation of Christian mortification. They will also provide special means whereby their people may advance in devotion and piety.

As in the past, two appropriate week day services will be held in each Church and the necessary permission for Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament on these occasions is hereby accorded.

A special effort ought also to be made to have the sacred practice of family prayer in common, and especially the recitation of the Rosary, a duty of honor and religion during this penitential time.

MICHAEL FRANCIS FALLON BISHOP OF LONDON

THE MEMORANDUM OF THE ANGLICAN SYNOD

The general synod of the Church of England in Canada appointed a committee, of which Hon. S. H. Blake was chairman, and W. D. Gwynne, secretary, to deal with the Ne Temere decree.

They compiled a memorandum which has been scattered broadcast throughout Canada. This pamphlet contains some amusing things, the most entertaining of which is S. H. Blake's interpretation of canon law by which he arrives at the conclusion that "by the express language" of the Ne Temere decree it is not in force in Canada!

Imagine the consternation of the Vatican!

However, the general effect of the memorandum is not likely to be so harmless as Mr. Blake's travellers' tales after his trip abroad into the realms of canon law.

The feeling that the Catholic Church in Quebec overrides or displaces the civil power is assiduously fostered. Indeed it is openly asserted, but the appeal of the memorandum is rather to the emotional prejudices than to calm reason.

"In Quebec it (the Catholic Church) exercises virtually the right of divorce." This is not true. Even in the recent Hebert case it was the civil courts that declared the marriage null and void in so far as its civil effects were concerned.

If a higher court reverses that decision, then, in so far as the civil effects of the marriage are concerned, the Hebert marriage stands valid before the civil law, notwithstanding the decision of the ecclesiastical court that it is not a valid marriage in the eyes of the Church.

The Civil Code of the Province of Quebec enumerates certain legal impediments to marriage and then section 127 reads:

"Other impediments recognized according to the different religious persuasions as resulting from relationship or affinity or from other causes, remain subject to the rules hitherto followed by the different churches and religious communities."

There is here no special privilege granted to the Catholic Church; no mention even of the Catholic Church. The Westminster Confession of Faith expressly declares that no legislation and no consent can make lawful the "incestuous marriages" of those who are within the forbidden degrees of consanguinity or affinity.

Suppose two Presbyterians in the Province of Quebec within the degrees of kindred forbidden by the Westminster Confession were to marry, and later one or both of them come before the civil courts to have the marriage declared null and void as to its civil effects.

The court would refer the question as to whether or not these were invalidating impediments to the General Assembly or to whatever ecclesiastical tribunal it might appoint to deal with the matter. If that ecclesiastical tribunal should decide that according to the laws of the Presbyterian Church the marriage was incestuous and unlawful, invalid and impossible from the beginning, then the Quebec courts, under section 127, would give precisely the same decision as in the Hebert case.

The book of Common Prayer still declares that a man may not marry his deceased wife's sister. Suppose an Anglican married his deceased wife's sister (also an Anglican) and later should seek separation before the civil courts, the court would refer the matter as to the canonical impediments to the Anglican bishop, and if his decision should be to the effect that the affinity in question was an invalidating impediment, the court would declare the marriage null and void as to its civil effects.

It may be urged that Protestants do not take advantage of the civil law in this question; but it is not the fault of the civil law of the Province of Quebec that Protestant creeds, confessions and canons are so little regarded by the Protestant laity. Indeed so far has the disintegration gone that it is unlikely that Bishop General Assembly, Synod or Conference could authoritatively decide what are the "rules hitherto followed by the different Churches and religious communities."

The civil law, nevertheless, gives them the same rights and the same privileges as it gives to Catholics. Mr. Mills, K. C., has well said:

"It is not applicable to any individual Church. It does not single out the Church of Rome, but it says to all religious persuasions of the Christian community that the law-makers of this province have assumed that you have a sincere regard for your religious affiliation and that you are not a hypocrite but are sincere in the faith which you profess to adopt in preference to all others. It says to Methodists, Congregationalists, Baptists, Presbyterians, and Anglicans and all others of the various Christian denominations: if there are any impediments which exist according to the rites of your Church the law of this Province respects them, for Christianity is recognized as part of the common law of the land. The law of this Province not only tolerates your faith but it so far respects it as to require that its conditions shall be observed before the validity of the marriage can be asserted."

Then the delving into history to find out the status of the Church under the French regime, the provisions of the Treaty of 1763, and all similar historical researches are wholly irrelevant. The British North America Act gives to the provinces the jurisdiction over the matter of solemnization of marriage, and it is under this act that the Province of Quebec legislates on the subject. Its right is precisely the same as that of Ontario or any other province in the Dominion.

It is, then, as untrue as it is mischievous to represent the Church in Quebec as ignoring or overriding the civil courts. Is it honest to make the attack on the civil law and constitutional rights of the Province of Quebec under the specious plea for equal rights for all churches?

The memorandum puts the matter thus: "The question may well be asked, where does Rome find authority for her audacious claim that when the statute law of the land validates a marriage, she, placed in the same position as other religious bodies in the Dominion, has the right by her decree to override such legislative declaration and nullify what it enacts?"

The answer is easy; she does not make any such claim.

But the question might well be asked, Where does Ontario, placed in the same position as other provinces in the Dominion, find authority for her audacious claim to interfere with internal affairs wholly within the jurisdiction of the Province of Quebec?

John S. Ewart, a Protestant, a great lawyer and a great Canadian, has published a series of essays entitled the Kingdom Papers; number five of this series deals with the Ne Temere decree. His thorough knowledge of the subject, his calm yet forcible and absolutely

bold treatment of all the questions involved, make his paper refreshing reading after the blinding effect of the Anglican hodge-podge memorandum. We commend this paper and indeed the whole series to the perusal of our readers.

CLERICS AND SECULAR COURTS

A recent decree, *Quantavis diligenter* of our Holy Father Pius X. forbids Catholics to bring clerics before the civil or criminal courts without any ecclesiastical permission. Considerable excited discussion took place in Germany, chiefly for election purposes, until it was authoritatively declared that the decree did not apply to Germany. Archbishop Walsh of Dublin holds that it does not apply to English speaking countries either. In fact the decree has force only in those countries where the privilege of being tried before ecclesiastical instead of civil courts is conceded to clerics.

In the United States the Council of Baltimore had already prohibited the citation of priests before the civil courts without the written permission of the bishop. Without any express prohibition, good order and common sense would impel any Catholic, before taking action in the civil courts against a priest, to lay the matter before the bishop. Thus a settlement might be effected without further trouble or expense. If a settlement is not thus reached in no case will the bishop refuse the permission to have recourse to the civil courts.

This matter concerns Catholics in their private capacity exclusively, as is expressly stated in the decree. In their public or official capacity Catholics would of course do their duty, even if that involved citing a priest before the civil tribunal. "We enact and ordain that all private persons whether of the laity or of the sacred order"—so runs the decree. It refers, then, exclusively to private persons and to Catholics.

That being the case, it is difficult to imagine how it could cause a ripple of excitement or even interest amongst Protestants. But J. H. Burnham, M. P., writes to the press as follows:

"This decree has been well named 'the thunderbolt from Rome.' The Ne Temere is really child's play in comparison. The *Quantavis* seeks to establish the old immunity of priests, in a word, to restore their ancient power and to enable the Church to override or ignore the state altogether."

We suspect, however, that Mr. Burnham is not quite so stupid nor quite so much alarmed as he pretends to be. He stated in the House that the Ne Temere was an issue in his election. The feelings aroused in this reckless agitation cannot be so easily allayed. Some excuse must be made for shelving Lancaster's marriage bill, and Mr. Burnham can count on the impenetrable ignorance and easy credulity of his fanatical supporters.

"Herein, therefore," says this valiant champion of Protestant rights and wily partisan, "lies the great wisdom of the general reference, proposed in the case of Ne Temere. A specific reference, such as attaches to a particular bill dealing with one phase (the marriage phase) might very easily be confined to that phase, and thus it would leave the *Quantavis* unprovoked for. It will define 'the state' once more, and in defining it and its powers, by so doing will demonstrate once more for the benefit of our lawgivers their powers and privileges."

And again: "Hence the value, the priceless value, of a general rather than a specific reference." That should convince the good fanatics of Peterborough that they have exactly the type of warrior needed now that "the old battle for liberty is on again." If not, they have a little more common sense, and a little less purblind bigotry than Mr. Burnham, M. P., gives them credit for.

THE LITTLE THINGS

The little things make life beautiful. We can all do the big things in our own way, but the touch here and there that can make life's pattern more beautiful is oftentimes ignored. The tones of the voice, a smile, the kind word, the thoughtful act, the putting oneself in another's place, the gentle manner—all these make not only for beauty but for help and inspiration. There is music in every nature, latent, mayhap, still by sorrow or disappointment, but the deft touch of the loving heart can awaken it. And the music makers are the world's benefactors, for it is not "art but heart that wins the wide world over."

NO DEAD LINE

We have no sympathy with those who say that a man who has reached a certain period is done with usefulness. So long as a man lives he can render service. To sit down and await the falling of the shadows—to quit the firing line and to go afar from the noise of conflict may please some people, but not the man who wants to die tired, with his harness on. There will be time to rest, but now, whether the hairs be grey or black, we must work with every energy, spare-

ing cowardice as a thing unclean, trusting and unafraid, not troubled about results. Men, who while yet in vigor, are smitten with apathy but encounter the earth; others, burdened with years, are resolute and hopeful, keeping step with the myriads who are putting their blood and brain into their work and who know that time is the greatest of all graces. So long as there is music in the heart, every day is a marvel of beauty, every sunset a miracle, every opportunity a heavenly messenger, every service a source of benediction. Let the sky be blue or gray the marching orders are always the same. To march to the flying of pennons and the acclaim of the multitude is not difficult; to plod along, weary and suffering; to be buffeted by the rain and the storm and to persevere, always in line, because it is right and the only many thing to do, demands patience and the grit that grows under the touch of God, and to keep on the firing line until the command comes for "lights out" is the best guarantee of earthly happiness.

ALWAYS VITAL

A correspondent writes us in what he calls the "cramping hand of the Church." He says much about the Church retarding the progress of mankind and about the men and women who retire into religious houses from the strife and turmoil of life.

We think that Artemus Ward would have said to our friend that it is a good thing not to know so many things that to know so many things that ain't so. A very superficial glance at the pages of history might serve as a deterrent to his flippant ignorance. Macaulay, in his *Essay on Macchiavelli*, says:

"The graces from which the inhabitants of other countries gained nothing but relics and wounds brought to the rising commonwealths of the Adriatic and Tyrrhene Seas as a large increase of wealth, dominion and knowledge. Italian ships covered every sea, Italian cities rose on every shore."

Let our friend find out the number of Catholics who have been prominent in every department of human activity. Artists and sculptors, statesmen and churchmen, explorers and inventors owed allegiance to the Church. The history of France and Spain can give him much needed information. The theory that prosperity is a sign of God's approval is as stupid as it is un-Christian. A millionaire is not necessarily a very holy individual. Nor is the wealth of a nation a proof of the prosperity of its people. Christ did not exhort His disciples to be Captains of Industry. He had no praise for the rich. But He told His followers that misery and persecution and contempt would be their portion in this world. It is strange and inconsistent to hear those who boast of their love of the gospel advocating a theory which is condemned by the gospel.

While the Church, however, is antagonistic to nothing that can redound to the good of humanity, her primary concern is with the souls of men. She teaches the world that all things are in themselves of no real value unless directed by a right intention to our spiritual good. Anything produced by human activity can be made a part of our service to God. This is true of the conquests of genius as well as of the homely little things which are acclaimed by the angels. No one, for instance, says a writer, can accuse St. Ignatius Loyola of any want of energy or enthusiasm in his cause, and his labours were known were crowned with eminent success. Yet he declared that if the whole of his life's work were destroyed by the suppression of the religious order which he had founded, one quarter of a hour's prayer would suffice to restore him to his ordinary tranquillity of mind. Yet his holy and unselfish zeal was intensified and more far-reaching than the restless ambition of Napoleon, while his fiery energy was under the control of a calmer and even more resolute spirit. The career of Napoleon was a pageant of chartered egotism: that of St. Ignatius was a suppression of self in the perfect performance of God's will.

THE JUDICIAL VACANCY IN NOVA SCOTIA

The death of Mr. Justice Lawrence creates a vacancy on the Supreme Court bench in Nova Scotia. Judge Lawrence was for a time member of Parliament for Colchester and he was appointed to the bench only a few years ago. As a judge he gave great satisfaction and his too early death was heard with regret by his many friends.

The Supreme Court of Nova Scotia is composed of a Chief Justice and six associate judges. The first Catholic to be raised to the bench was the Hon. Hugh McDonald, who was for a time Minister of Militia in Sir John Macdonald's government. His judicial career was a long and useful one. Later the late Sir John Thompson was raised to the bench and two Catholics sat upon it, until Sir John joined the Federal Cabinet. His place was filled by a Protestant, and ever since only one of the seven judges has been a Catholic. An opportunity now offers to rectify this. There are Catholics at the bar who can fill the position with quite as much ability and dignity as the other aspirants, and it remains for the new Prime Minister to show that he is willing to see fair play meted out to an important section of his countrymen.

In New Brunswick there are two Catholics on the Supreme Court Bench, and they fill the position with great distinction. Are the Catholics of New Brunswick more alert than their Nova Scotian brethren? We imagine that

EVER THE SAME

These Orangemen in Ulster are the world's comedians. The superheated language, such as an angry, obstinate child would use, and the perfervid resolutions passed so solemnly by the preachers, would seem to indicate that they learn nothing and forget everything. At this stage of the world's history it is amusing to see them getting red in the face because other Irishmen do not see eye to eye with them. Lord Rossmore, who repudiated Orangemen in 1804, calls it the worst kind of mental slavery. He said in a letter, which appeared in the *Dublin Freeman*, that individual, moderate Orangemen appear to be following blindly the lead of some few professional politicians and office

holders whose advice seems invariably to be the result of a contemplation of their personal interests and hardly ever the outcome of a desire for peace and prosperity of an Irishman. Why, then, may we not at least confer and strive for a common ground of brotherhood and of wise and Christian toleration. Why insane and endless suspicion. It would seem, however, that Lord Rossmore's temperate appeal has had no effect. The politicians and placemen and bigoted divines are goading poor, ignorant mobs of stone-throwing Orangemen to resort to brutal violence.

DEVELOP IT

Our readers have read the story of the Christian who died rather than surrender the sacred vessels to the blasphemous touch of the pagan. But a boy he chose death rather than recency to duty. Tempted with pleasure and position, threatened with death in direct form, he rejected the former and smiled at the latter.

It seems to us that many of us might profit by thinking of this incident. For we carry not the sacred vessels but the gift of faith. And yet we expose it to danger by our reading, by morbid curiosity and playing with things that border on the immoral. Our prayers should be for vision. When we see the objects of our faith and realize their significance we are in the way to obtain a knowledge of true values. Vision means the unfolding of the beauty and glory of our belief.

TOO VAGUE

It seems to us that some of the preachments on the brotherhood of man are vague and meaningless. To say that as enlightenment advances man will become more merciful, may please the altruist, but this theory is in harmony neither with facts nor with reason. In the full tide of intellectual grandeur Greece had no idea of the brotherhood of man. Its best and wisest advocated contempt for the slave and the wretched. Rome, even when dominated by its poets and artists, knew not the meaning of charity. In our day pitiless and brutal competition takes no heed of mercy. And some time ago an individual of more or less prominence in a great city scoffed at brotherhood as an invention of the harebrained. The picture drawn by those who know not Christ, of a world inhabited by people who love one another, bear one another's burdens, in which every rose is thornless, and science ministers to the poor and sorrowful exists in the imagination. We do not impugn the motives of those who indulge in this kind of rhapsody, but they certainly do not condition themselves by the facts of human nature. For why should we, if we deny Christ, love man. We can be grateful for benefits received; we can love our children and parents. But why should we love strangers? Why care for the poor and wretched, the unlovely and the degraded? How can we have sympathy with the myriads who blunder on without hope or ambition. These writers may give us pages on the dignity and beauty of brotherhood, but we look in vain for proof. Paganism will not help them and the philosophers whom they quote speak with seething contempt of the coarse and the ignorant crowd. Nature has no respect for the weak. Why, then, should the scribes continue to dote out sentimental trash as a remedy for human ills. Charity, indeed, goes its ceaseless rounds of ministering, not because of the religion of humanity but because of Christ. It sees Christ in the needy and sorrowful. Love of the neighbour is the mark by which Christ's disciples are recognized. Men, by the coming of Christ, are all one body with the same spirit and identical interests. When Christ came with his message to those who are poor, who mourn, "Love took up the harp of Life and smote on all the chords with might. Smote the chord of Self that trembling passed in music out of sight."

the matter lies very largely with the Catholics of Nova Scotia themselves. If they are united in claiming their just rights, these rights will be recognized.

A PECULIAR ARGUMENT

We are surprised to find our contemporary, the Ottawa Citizen, opposed to Home Rule. True, the editor treats the matter in a seemingly judicious spirit, but a close study of his argument reveals the fountain pen filled with the prejudiced view of the Orange fraternity. "It may be," says our confrere, "that the rest of the United Kingdom is not clamoring for so-called Home Rule. That is very true. Then is Ireland to be granted special right as compared with the other component parts of the United Kingdom, simply in answer to a clamor?" So far as Irishmen are concerned, they would hold up both hands for Home Rule for England, Scotland and Wales. We believe such a departure would be of inestimable value to the Empire. And there is some prospect of such an agitation arising. Opponents of Irish Home Rule are for the most part men who are guided either by selfishness or are primed with old-time prejudices fanned into a flame by such men as Sir Edward Carson and Lord Londonderry, both of whom recently threatened to lead the Orange hosts to battle, but when the day of action came betook themselves to a well appointed room in a hotel and drank to the glorious, pious and immortal memory, while their dupes were kept in order outside by the Peelers' batons and the soldiers bayonets. But there is another view of the situation which our Ottawa confrere has overlooked. Ireland once upon a time had a Parliament of its own, and the manner in which it was deprived of it will be an eternal stain on the characters of the English statesmen of that period. A million pound sterling and the bestowal of high sounding titles were used to bribe members of the Irish Parliament to sell their country. Sad to say, a sufficient number of hirelings were found to accept the bribe and take rank with Ireland's traitors. The country merely wants a restoration of what she had been robbed of a century ago. The introduction of the sectarian cry into the discussion is dishonest. Those who say that Home Rule would mean oppression of the Protestants are dishonest. They do not themselves believe that such will be the outcome, but use the cry to cajole and deceive the ignorant. There is a class of Ulsterites who take civil and religious liberty to mean the privilege of lordship it over the "Papists," and appropriating the good things in the gift of Dublin castle.

WE ARE SURPRISED

It has come to pass that when some editors—few, we are glad to note—enter upon a discussion of matters Catholic, they seem to lose their grip of common sense. The publisher of Saturday Night once in a while hits out valiantly at abuses of one kind or another, and, in doing so, it would not be according to the fitness of things were any one to suggest that he was actuated by other than the loftiest motives—or, as the speaker in the Commons sometimes says, "It would be out of order." But when he undertakes to discuss matters having to do with the Catholic Church, we have still another illustration of the "Innocent Abroad." In all seriousness we would ask our Toronto contemporary to seek an introduction to the Catholic Encyclopedia in the Public Library. Last week's Saturday Night contained a letter from "a Catholic," who protested against the editor's use of the word "Romanist." Here is the explanation:

"A Romanist," according to Webster's International Dictionary, a recognized authority wherever the English language is spoken, is "one who adheres to Romanism," and Romanism in turn is defined as "the tenets of the Church of Rome; the Roman Catholic religion." This is Saturday Night's authority for using the abbreviated term Romanist upon occasions in place of Roman Catholic. Saturday Night utilizes the term as a short cut and to prevent unnecessary repetitions, all on the authority of Webster's.

The excuse that "Romanist" is used because it is an abbreviated term is a very poor one. The word "Catholic" is surely quite as handy a term to employ. It is not necessary to write "Roman Catholic." "Catholic" will do, if saving of space is considered. The editor fortifies himself in his position because he has found the word in Webster, but we beg to remind him that definitions are therein given of hundreds of other words which are not current amongst gentlemen.

ALL FOR JESUS

A clergyman in a London Church a few days ago took for his Sunday sermon, "The Duty of Giving One's Life for Others." "The hardest thing you will ever be called upon to do will be to live day by day a life for other people," said the reverend gentleman, and he added: "The Christian Church is the only place on God's earth where rich and poor can come together on terms of absolute equality." In the first statement the preacher, perhaps unconsciously, paid a high tribute to the Catholic Church. In the every day work of the sects may be found much striving to promote better conditions amongst the people. The ladies, especially, have their associations for objects of benevolence, etc. Their good works are many and admirable, and in proportion as they do the will of the Master in succoring His needy ones will they receive their reward. But few, very few will be found amongst them who have resolved to devote their whole lives to the glory of God, relinquishing everything that the world prizes. If the reverend gentleman desires to see the text of his sermon carried out in all its completeness he will have to make a study of the lives of the priests and the nuns of the Catholic Church.

Let us first consider the priest. He relinquishes all that is most cherished by the world—family, friends, worldly wealth, worldly ambition—for what? To enter the army of Christ. To do battle against the kingdom of darkness and lead the way to heaven. Late and early, in all seasons of the year, he will be found at the bedside of the dying, administering comfort, material and spiritual, to the sorrow stricken, the poor and the lowly, inculcating the spirit of the Master in the souls confided to his care, ever preaching the Word and teaching, especially the tender souls of his flock, the precepts of the Divine. For him there is no earthly reward, for him the only recompense is a knowledge that his duty is well done and that he has given of his best to serve the One to Whom he pledged fealty on his ordination day.

Now we turn to the holy virgins who have gladly become the spouses of our Divine Redeemer.

Not for a day, or a year, or any number of years, have they made profession of poverty, chastity and obedience to the service of God, but until they are placed away with their sisters in the modest grave in the cemetery. In

their early years, when the world and its belongings are most alluring, they made pledge of their fealty during life, be it long or be it short, to the Crucified. They beg for bread for the poor, they keep vigil night and day caring for the orphan, they visit and comfort the sick, they provide homes for the poor whose steps are approaching life's winter time, they take from the street the outcasts upon whom society looks with scorn and impart to them a new hope and a new life. Taking the work of the noble army of both sexes into account, how barren, in comparison, appears the results of the labors of those who have out themselves off from the one true fold.

The second statement of Rev. Mr. Whiting is to us most surprising, unless he had in mind the temples raised by Catholics. The Churches of the sects, as every one knows, are essentially the resorts of the well-to-do. Some poor persons—the very poor—may sometimes be found in non-Catholic places of worship, but, as a rule, especially in centres of population, the cushioned pews and the luxurious appointments of the Churches of the sects know not the lowly and the poverty-stricken. For them is not the glorious up-to-date music and operatic singing and the learned discourse of the preacher on some topic which only too often has little or nothing to do with the love of God or our eternal destiny. The Methodist preacher's ideals are to be found only in the old Church that has come down to us through all the centuries from Peter to Pius X.

It has come to pass that when some editors—few, we are glad to note—enter upon a discussion of matters Catholic, they seem to lose their grip of common sense. The publisher of Saturday Night once in a while hits out valiantly at abuses of one kind or another, and, in doing so, it would not be according to the fitness of things were any one to suggest that he was actuated by other than the loftiest motives—or, as the speaker in the Commons sometimes says, "It would be out of order." But when he undertakes to discuss matters having to do with the Catholic Church, we have still another illustration of the "Innocent Abroad." In all seriousness we would ask our Toronto contemporary to seek an introduction to the Catholic Encyclopedia in the Public Library. Last week's Saturday Night contained a letter from "a Catholic," who protested against the editor's use of the word "Romanist." Here is the explanation:

"A Romanist," according to Webster's International Dictionary, a recognized authority wherever the English language is spoken, is "one who adheres to Romanism," and Romanism in turn is defined as "the tenets of the Church of Rome; the Roman Catholic religion." This is Saturday Night's authority for using the abbreviated term Romanist upon occasions in place of Roman Catholic. Saturday Night utilizes the term as a short cut and to prevent unnecessary repetitions, all on the authority of Webster's.

The excuse that "Romanist" is used because it is an abbreviated term is a very poor one. The word "Catholic" is surely quite as handy a term to employ. It is not necessary to write "Roman Catholic." "Catholic" will do, if saving of space is considered. The editor fortifies himself in his position because he has found the word in Webster, but we beg to remind him that definitions are therein given of hundreds of other words which are not current amongst gentlemen.

DEBATING SOCIETIES

From Toronto comes to us good news in regard to Debating Societies in that city. We rejoice in the fact that splendid work is being done to develop the latent talent of our young men, and trust the example set by the Catholics of the Queen City will be taken up with earnestness and perseverance by our people in other centres in the Dominion. We ask all our young men to take thought and consider what their future will be if they be but feather heads in the golden glow of youth. If they are adepts in dealing out and playing pieces of paste board—if they devote nearly all their spare hours to sport, and seek but the sporting page of the daily paper—if they follow the races and are prominent figures at the bulletin boards—if they become habitués of the gambling dens—if their faces are familiar to the wine clerk—if they can grow eloquent in describing points of a game, and have given grave study to the career of Jack Johnson and the other butchers of the prize ring—they will have a bleared future, and in the life of the community will be dubbed undesirable citizens and noodles. We are pleased to print the following reference to the last debate of the Toronto Union:

"Resolved, that the granting of bonuses to corporations by municipalities is detrimental to the public welfare." was the subject discussed on the occasion of the twelfth debate of the season under the auspices of the Toronto Catholic Debating Union. The affirmative, which carried the day, was upheld by Messrs. D. J. Coffey and M. Mulligan, representing Lourdes' Literary and Athletic Association, while Messrs. C.