

The Catholic Record.

"Christianus mihi nomen est Catholicus vero Cognomen."—(Christian is my Name, but Catholic my Surname)—St. Paclan, 4th Century

VOLUME XXXIII.

LONDON, ONTARIO, SATURDAY, MARCH 18, 1911

1891

The Catholic Record

LONDON, SATURDAY, MARCH 18, 1911

JUST AN OPINION

A correspondent complains that we are giving an Anglican clergyman too much attention. We have, we confess, no hope of inducing this cleric to read history as it is written by the non-Catholic Gairdner. It seems to us that he is too much in love with notoriety and is too intent on getting the applause of the ignorant to consider his duties to his profession and to truth. His performance may please a few Anglicans, but the many who know that his main contention is untenable and discredited must view it with wonder. We have no quarrel with any divine who backs up statements with proof—who reinforces his arguments with recognized authorities; but we can have no controversy with a man who rambles on, taking no heed of the dictates of common sense and forgetting now and then the canons of social amenities. We have placed before our readers facts, and to spare, to show that, in continuity, theory is but a figment, unknown some years ago, and existing to-day only in the imaginations, somewhat overcharged, of men of the type of the Halifax cleric. To men who read it is as dead as Henry VIII, who drove England out of the house of Peter. It is the veriest twaddle to say that the Reformation in England was caused by those who longed for a purer form of religion. Some years ago writers who crowded their gentry with chapters of rhetoric were in honor, but to-day they are exhibited just as they were—courtiers who crooked the knee because of pelf and preferment—perjured clerics and a royal despot animated by base personal motives. "Whatever," says Dr. Gairdner, "may be said of the ardent heretics who contributed to that revolution (the Reformation) it is a great mistake to look upon them as the emancipators of human thought. Those who so regard them, it seems to me, altogether mistake their character, and from this cause, besides other errors, they do injustice to the very noblest men of the day." Hear Gairdner again refuting those who aver that Papal jurisdiction in England was resisted long before the days of Henry VIII. "There were two separate jurisdictions exercised in England as in every other country—there a civil jurisdiction, of which the king was the head; the other spiritual and ecclesiastical, of which the Pope was the head. As there was one faith in all Christendom so there was, theoretically at least, one chief ruler in spiritual matters; and though the Greek Church refused to acknowledge him his authority in the West was absolutely undisputed till the days of Luther in Germany and Henry VIII. in England." The Anglican divine may write for many moons, but history cannot be forged with words, and any attempt to erase a connecting link between the pre-Reformation Church and the Anglican Church of to-day—between a Church united in faith and worship and government and the Church that flouts doctrinal unity and is the theatre for warring clerics championing mutually irreconcilable views—we say that the attempt to claim kinship with the saints and sages who made "Morrie England" and safeguarded its liberties for generations, is as foolish as it is vain.

OUR OWN FAULT

Once before we told our subscribers, who write us querulous letters, that we cordially detest communications with a whine in them. It is ebullient, ineffective and unworthy of freedom. If they have grievances why talk about them. These pompous resolutions and whereas may comfort the "spouter" and other nuisances who take up time and test patience; but the only way to deal with grievances is to act. Now, with regard to this question of public libraries, referred to by a correspondent, we ask him to turn the energy wasted in writing us into protest. Librarians who do not cater to the legitimate wants of the reading public can be always made to see the error of their ways by a personal interview or by bringing into play the remonstrances of gentlemen who have no desire to discriminate against Catholics. For our part we have but the kindest memory of the courtesy of the public custodians of books. They have, indeed, Catholic authors on their shelves, but there is never any feverish anxiety on the part of Catholics to read these books. In this connection we may say that a few weeks ago we learned that the Catholic patrons of one public library never touched anything but fiction, and these patrons, as a rule, were young women with a distaste for housework—old women, whose brains were doubtless added through an overdose of love story, and a few young men who were

waiting for a nice clean job to knock at their doors and claim them for its own. So, dear subscriber, come out of the cloud-land of vacuous utterance, and, with the level ground of common-sense under your feet, you may discover that grievances are due to our own fault, and exist because we indulge in talk with no business end to it.

WHY THEY LANGUISH?

Some organizations grow apace and then languish and cumber the ground. In many instances the society is talked to the verge of extinction. Wherever the "orator" abounds there is a source of decay. Words, of course, must be said; but these interminable speeches, destitute of ideas—these exhibitions of wind by the gentleman who is always "on his feet"—will lessen the vitality of any organization. And we have noticed that these worthy individuals are, when work is to be done, never on the firing line.

A MYSTERY

One of the mysteries that baffle the most of us is the Catholic who is uncharitable. We do not refer to occasional sins against charity, but to the habit—the daily round of fault-finding, misinterpretation of motives, the cruel attack, the unkind word. How these people can go on, complacently to all seeming, is beyond our ken. For such a life is not of the religion given us by the Lord. His religion makes the love of the neighbor indispensable. It means sympathy and kindness—the bearing of one another's burdens—the doing of the acts of love and mercy that will make intercession for us at our day of trial. Why do some of us make life a sorry, scalding thing? Why weave it out of the base of an evil, bitter mind, when we have the light and color of heaven to adorn it. And yet, despite the Church, the knowledge that this is our seed time, many of us are but receptacles for gossip and slander. We can live in the sunlight and we prefer to live in darkness. We can add to the world's store of kindness, and we choose to add to the devil's store of hate. We can play a manly part and we are content to be retailers of gossip, of stories, of insinuations—to have evil tongues which cause dissensions and sunder friendships and make life wearisome to many. Surely a mystery—that men and women who claim to be followers of Him Who gave love in bounteous measure to all, should travel the unlovely highway of uncharitableness. And they without the fold look on us with scorn and have a suspicion that we are hypocrites.

VANISHED INTO DARKNESS

Cramer and Ridley and Latimer, erstwhile to many the heroes of the English Reformation, are to-day without their nimbus of glory. Anglican clergymen have referred to them in scornful language and have placed them in a category in which there are neither saints nor heroes. One of these, the anti-Catholic Dr. Littledale, said: "I gravely assert it to be absolutely impossible for any just, educated, religious man, who have read the history of the time in genuine sources, to hold two opinions about the reformers. They were such utterly unredeemed villains for the most part that the only parallel I know of for the way in which half-educated people speak of them amongst us, is the appearance of Pontius Pilate among the saints in the Abyssinian Kalender."

USING A PAPAL DECREE AS A PRETEXT

A case of Mixed Marriage in Belfast and its results has for some time been the occasion of much Ultra-Protestant excitement in Ireland and Great Britain. The matter was raised recently in the House of Commons by the Orange party, in reference to which Mr. T. P. O'Connor in his cable letter to The Chicago Tribune says: "The triumph of both sections [of the Liberals] was crushing in the first debate initiated by the Tories over the alleged scandalous interferences by an Irish priest with a husband and wife in Belfast, one a Catholic and the other a Presbyterian. For weeks all of the English and Irish Tory press and platforms have been ringing with the story of a happy couple separated and their children kidnapped by an intolerant Irish priest in obedience to the Papal edict against mixed marriages. The campaign was intended to rouse the alarms of the Irish Protestants against Home Rule, and by an appeal to the English 'no Popery' prejudice to supply the strongest proof that Home Rule meant home rule."

FATHER COLEMAN'S STATEMENT

The facts and the whole truth as to this now famous case are given in a letter to The Dublin Freeman's Journal by Rev. Ambrose Coleman, O.P., from which the real motive and purpose of the outcry against "Rome" will be readily understood. Father Coleman says: "The facts and the whole truth as to this now famous case are given in a letter to The Dublin Freeman's Journal by Rev. Ambrose Coleman, O.P., from which the real motive and purpose of the outcry against 'Rome' will be readily understood. Father Coleman says: 'It is easy to see why the Ulster Orange and Unionist have been giving such extraordinary prominence to what is known as the McCann marriage case. The incident, deplorable as it was, would have been left unnoticed at any other time, but it happened to synchronize very opportunely for the Northern fanatics with the late General Election and was seized on as a flagrant instance of the persecution Protestants would have to suffer from Catholics if the latter got their rightful position in Irish affairs: The shibboleth 'Home Rule means Rome Rule' would receive unanswerable confirmation. And so every possible effort was made to inflame public opinion in the North on the case. Violent no-Popery speeches were made and violent resolutions passed in Orange Lodges; inflammatory tracts were preached in several of the Protestant churches; numbers of letters appeared day by day in the papers, and a distorted version of the story was published in England and Scotland in many of the organs of the press and on thousands of posters. The loss of an election by the Liberals, in a town expressly placarded with the story, was directly attributed to the tactics adopted. The whole plan of campaign had been carried out with a blind fury and an astuteness that is so palpably dishonest as to have evoked strong condemnation both from a leading Anglican ecclesiastical organ and from an important Non-conformist weekly. As a meeting is announced to take place in the Metropolitan Hall to protest against recent Papal Decrees on Marriage and this story will in all probability be enlarged upon, it seems opportune to give our people through the length and breadth of the land, the facts and their bearing on the Papal Decree for, although the Catholics of the North are sated with them by this time, stray notices have reached other parts of the country. I must premise to the account of the case that an air of rage and indignation surrounds it at the present. It appears, then, from the woman's story, as set out by her ecclesiastical adviser, that in May, 1908, shortly after the Papal Decree took effect, she, a Presbyter, was married to a Catholic named McCann, in a Presbyterian church. Now, I will grant at once that no defence can be made for the conduct of this woman, who, as she herself avers, deceived the girl and going through a form of marriage which he knew in his conscience was not valid, and if the law of the land can punish him by imprisonment, it is just to the support of the woman he has injured. I have no fault to find with the two children. It is alleged, were born. The first was brought to a Presbyterian church by the woman and there baptized. The second was brought by the father to a Catholic church and baptized by the priest. According to the woman's story, the priest (name not given) called a few times at the house told the woman that she and the man were living in sin, and that the children were illegitimate, and that she should induce the man to return to the Catholic church to renew the ceremony of marriage, in order to validate their union. The man also pressed her to do so, but the woman refused. The next stage of the matter was that, owing to the woman's refusal, the man took the two children from the house and disappeared with them, and neither he nor they have been heard of since."

Let it be kept in mind, too, that we have not yet heard the other side of the question. We naturally wish to know what the man has to say for himself. Granted that the man acted as a sinner in the first instance, and lived with a woman to whom he believed he was not validly married, what was he to do if he repented of his sin and wished to settle matters with his conscience by getting properly married according to the way his conscience directed? The woman acknowledges that he tried to do this in one obvious way, and that she refused to consent to it.

Amongst those who delivered violent speeches on the question in Belfast was the Rev. Samuel Prenter, D. D. of Dublin, brought there specially to reply to Father Hubert, C. I. who has so ably and so bravely vindicated the position of the Catholic Church with regard to marriage, dwelling at length on the features of the unfortunate case before the public. Father Hubert appealed to Scripture and History, to human and divine law, in defence of the recent legislation of the Church, including the "Temenore" Decree. Dr. Prenter, not daring to take up the preacher's arguments, threw aside Scripture and history and law, and delivered a furious onslaught on the Pope, and the priests on the grounds of cruelty alone, calling the latter "demonized cellmates," and accused them of corrupting the home by means of the Confessional, of which he professed to have most abominable evidence. Of course, that is just what we should expect from a no-Popery orator of the calibre of Dr. Prenter, but it is disconcerting to find in the announcement of a meeting of protest against the "Temenore" Decree to be presided over by the Protestant Archbishop of Dublin, that this no-Popery orator is to hold forth again amongst others on the same question. As I said at the beginning, the language used in Ireland by reverend and very reverend orators has fast called forth very adverse criticism from respectable Anglican organs. The Church Times (Protestant) says, amongst other things about Dr. Crozier's diatribe in the North against the Papal Decree: "We are filled with shame hearing such rubbish poured from the lips of a Bishop of our Communion into the greedy ears of Belfast groundlings." And our Non-conformist friends in Dublin might hear the conduct of this Bishop Weekly, an important English Non-conformist paper, says on the subject of marriage: "If we are asked to say that the Church, or any particular church, is invariably wrong, we must be faithful to the marriage whatever may be legal marriage, according to the decrees of a State, we must clearly answer in the negative. The case of the man who has a Catholic wife, who constitutes a Christian marriage. They have the law of Christ to follow, and they must follow it at all hazards. They may interpret it wrongly, but they must be faithful to the interpretation which they adopt." And it adds that "when the Catholic Church says to a man legally married to a woman that he is not truly married and that he should induce her to return to the Catholic church, that Church may be acting within its rights." It is very unlikely, however, that the principles here enunciated will find any expositors at the meeting in Dublin. Rather will it be said for an obvious purpose that the State has all power in the matter of the Sacrament of Matrimony, and the Church has no power in granting a new measure of self-government.

Lot it be kept in mind, too, that we have not yet heard the other side of the question. We naturally wish to know what the man has to say for himself. Granted that the man acted as a sinner in the first instance, and lived with a woman to whom he believed he was not validly married, what was he to do if he repented of his sin and wished to settle matters with his conscience by getting properly married according to the way his conscience directed? The woman acknowledges that he tried to do this in one obvious way, and that she refused to consent to it.

Amongst those who delivered violent speeches on the question in Belfast was the Rev. Samuel Prenter, D. D. of Dublin, brought there specially to reply to Father Hubert, C. I. who has so ably and so bravely vindicated the position of the Catholic Church with regard to marriage, dwelling at length on the features of the unfortunate case before the public. Father Hubert appealed to Scripture and History, to human and divine law, in defence of the recent legislation of the Church, including the "Temenore" Decree. Dr. Prenter, not daring to take up the preacher's arguments, threw aside Scripture and history and law, and delivered a furious onslaught on the Pope, and the priests on the grounds of cruelty alone, calling the latter "demonized cellmates," and accused them of corrupting the home by means of the Confessional, of which he professed to have most abominable evidence. Of course, that is just what we should expect from a no-Popery orator of the calibre of Dr. Prenter, but it is disconcerting to find in the announcement of a meeting of protest against the "Temenore" Decree to be presided over by the Protestant Archbishop of Dublin, that this no-Popery orator is to hold forth again amongst others on the same question. As I said at the beginning, the language used in Ireland by reverend and very reverend orators has fast called forth very adverse criticism from respectable Anglican organs. The Church Times (Protestant) says, amongst other things about Dr. Crozier's diatribe in the North against the Papal Decree: "We are filled with shame hearing such rubbish poured from the lips of a Bishop of our Communion into the greedy ears of Belfast groundlings." And our Non-conformist friends in Dublin might hear the conduct of this Bishop Weekly, an important English Non-conformist paper, says on the subject of marriage: "If we are asked to say that the Church, or any particular church, is invariably wrong, we must be faithful to the marriage whatever may be legal marriage, according to the decrees of a State, we must clearly answer in the negative. The case of the man who has a Catholic wife, who constitutes a Christian marriage. They have the law of Christ to follow, and they must follow it at all hazards. They may interpret it wrongly, but they must be faithful to the interpretation which they adopt." And it adds that "when the Catholic Church says to a man legally married to a woman that he is not truly married and that he should induce her to return to the Catholic church, that Church may be acting within its rights." It is very unlikely, however, that the principles here enunciated will find any expositors at the meeting in Dublin. Rather will it be said for an obvious purpose that the State has all power in the matter of the Sacrament of Matrimony, and the Church has no power in granting a new measure of self-government.

Lot it be kept in mind, too, that we have not yet heard the other side of the question. We naturally wish to know what the man has to say for himself. Granted that the man acted as a sinner in the first instance, and lived with a woman to whom he believed he was not validly married, what was he to do if he repented of his sin and wished to settle matters with his conscience by getting properly married according to the way his conscience directed? The woman acknowledges that he tried to do this in one obvious way, and that she refused to consent to it.

Amongst those who delivered violent speeches on the question in Belfast was the Rev. Samuel Prenter, D. D. of Dublin, brought there specially to reply to Father Hubert, C. I. who has so ably and so bravely vindicated the position of the Catholic Church with regard to marriage, dwelling at length on the features of the unfortunate case before the public. Father Hubert appealed to Scripture and History, to human and divine law, in defence of the recent legislation of the Church, including the "Temenore" Decree. Dr. Prenter, not daring to take up the preacher's arguments, threw aside Scripture and history and law, and delivered a furious onslaught on the Pope, and the priests on the grounds of cruelty alone, calling the latter "demonized cellmates," and accused them of corrupting the home by means of the Confessional, of which he professed to have most abominable evidence. Of course, that is just what we should expect from a no-Popery orator of the calibre of Dr. Prenter, but it is disconcerting to find in the announcement of a meeting of protest against the "Temenore" Decree to be presided over by the Protestant Archbishop of Dublin, that this no-Popery orator is to hold forth again amongst others on the same question. As I said at the beginning, the language used in Ireland by reverend and very reverend orators has fast called forth very adverse criticism from respectable Anglican organs. The Church Times (Protestant) says, amongst other things about Dr. Crozier's diatribe in the North against the Papal Decree: "We are filled with shame hearing such rubbish poured from the lips of a Bishop of our Communion into the greedy ears of Belfast groundlings." And our Non-conformist friends in Dublin might hear the conduct of this Bishop Weekly, an important English Non-conformist paper, says on the subject of marriage: "If we are asked to say that the Church, or any particular church, is invariably wrong, we must be faithful to the marriage whatever may be legal marriage, according to the decrees of a State, we must clearly answer in the negative. The case of the man who has a Catholic wife, who constitutes a Christian marriage. They have the law of Christ to follow, and they must follow it at all hazards. They may interpret it wrongly, but they must be faithful to the interpretation which they adopt." And it adds that "when the Catholic Church says to a man legally married to a woman that he is not truly married and that he should induce her to return to the Catholic church, that Church may be acting within its rights." It is very unlikely, however, that the principles here enunciated will find any expositors at the meeting in Dublin. Rather will it be said for an obvious purpose that the State has all power in the matter of the Sacrament of Matrimony, and the Church has no power in granting a new measure of self-government.

Lot it be kept in mind, too, that we have not yet heard the other side of the question. We naturally wish to know what the man has to say for himself. Granted that the man acted as a sinner in the first instance, and lived with a woman to whom he believed he was not validly married, what was he to do if he repented of his sin and wished to settle matters with his conscience by getting properly married according to the way his conscience directed? The woman acknowledges that he tried to do this in one obvious way, and that she refused to consent to it.

Amongst those who delivered violent speeches on the question in Belfast was the Rev. Samuel Prenter, D. D. of Dublin, brought there specially to reply to Father Hubert, C. I. who has so ably and so bravely vindicated the position of the Catholic Church with regard to marriage, dwelling at length on the features of the unfortunate case before the public. Father Hubert appealed to Scripture and History, to human and divine law, in defence of the recent legislation of the Church, including the "Temenore" Decree. Dr. Prenter, not daring to take up the preacher's arguments, threw aside Scripture and history and law, and delivered a furious onslaught on the Pope, and the priests on the grounds of cruelty alone, calling the latter "demonized cellmates," and accused them of corrupting the home by means of the Confessional, of which he professed to have most abominable evidence. Of course, that is just what we should expect from a no-Popery orator of the calibre of Dr. Prenter, but it is disconcerting to find in the announcement of a meeting of protest against the "Temenore" Decree to be presided over by the Protestant Archbishop of Dublin, that this no-Popery orator is to hold forth again amongst others on the same question. As I said at the beginning, the language used in Ireland by reverend and very reverend orators has fast called forth very adverse criticism from respectable Anglican organs. The Church Times (Protestant) says, amongst other things about Dr. Crozier's diatribe in the North against the Papal Decree: "We are filled with shame hearing such rubbish poured from the lips of a Bishop of our Communion into the greedy ears of Belfast groundlings." And our Non-conformist friends in Dublin might hear the conduct of this Bishop Weekly, an important English Non-conformist paper, says on the subject of marriage: "If we are asked to say that the Church, or any particular church, is invariably wrong, we must be faithful to the marriage whatever may be legal marriage, according to the decrees of a State, we must clearly answer in the negative. The case of the man who has a Catholic wife, who constitutes a Christian marriage. They have the law of Christ to follow, and they must follow it at all hazards. They may interpret it wrongly, but they must be faithful to the interpretation which they adopt." And it adds that "when the Catholic Church says to a man legally married to a woman that he is not truly married and that he should induce her to return to the Catholic church, that Church may be acting within its rights." It is very unlikely, however, that the principles here enunciated will find any expositors at the meeting in Dublin. Rather will it be said for an obvious purpose that the State has all power in the matter of the Sacrament of Matrimony, and the Church has no power in granting a new measure of self-government.

Lot it be kept in mind, too, that we have not yet heard the other side of the question. We naturally wish to know what the man has to say for himself. Granted that the man acted as a sinner in the first instance, and lived with a woman to whom he believed he was not validly married, what was he to do if he repented of his sin and wished to settle matters with his conscience by getting properly married according to the way his conscience directed? The woman acknowledges that he tried to do this in one obvious way, and that she refused to consent to it.

Amongst those who delivered violent speeches on the question in Belfast was the Rev. Samuel Prenter, D. D. of Dublin, brought there specially to reply to Father Hubert, C. I. who has so ably and so bravely vindicated the position of the Catholic Church with regard to marriage, dwelling at length on the features of the unfortunate case before the public. Father Hubert appealed to Scripture and History, to human and divine law, in defence of the recent legislation of the Church, including the "Temenore" Decree. Dr. Prenter, not daring to take up the preacher's arguments, threw aside Scripture and history and law, and delivered a furious onslaught on the Pope, and the priests on the grounds of cruelty alone, calling the latter "demonized cellmates," and accused them of corrupting the home by means of the Confessional, of which he professed to have most abominable evidence. Of course, that is just what we should expect from a no-Popery orator of the calibre of Dr. Prenter, but it is disconcerting to find in the announcement of a meeting of protest against the "Temenore" Decree to be presided over by the Protestant Archbishop of Dublin, that this no-Popery orator is to hold forth again amongst others on the same question. As I said at the beginning, the language used in Ireland by reverend and very reverend orators has fast called forth very adverse criticism from respectable Anglican organs. The Church Times (Protestant) says, amongst other things about Dr. Crozier's diatribe in the North against the Papal Decree: "We are filled with shame hearing such rubbish poured from the lips of a Bishop of our Communion into the greedy ears of Belfast groundlings." And our Non-conformist friends in Dublin might hear the conduct of this Bishop Weekly, an important English Non-conformist paper, says on the subject of marriage: "If we are asked to say that the Church, or any particular church, is invariably wrong, we must be faithful to the marriage whatever may be legal marriage, according to the decrees of a State, we must clearly answer in the negative. The case of the man who has a Catholic wife, who constitutes a Christian marriage. They have the law of Christ to follow, and they must follow it at all hazards. They may interpret it wrongly, but they must be faithful to the interpretation which they adopt." And it adds that "when the Catholic Church says to a man legally married to a woman that he is not truly married and that he should induce her to return to the Catholic church, that Church may be acting within its rights." It is very unlikely, however, that the principles here enunciated will find any expositors at the meeting in Dublin. Rather will it be said for an obvious purpose that the State has all power in the matter of the Sacrament of Matrimony, and the Church has no power in granting a new measure of self-government.

Lot it be kept in mind, too, that we have not yet heard the other side of the question. We naturally wish to know what the man has to say for himself. Granted that the man acted as a sinner in the first instance, and lived with a woman to whom he believed he was not validly married, what was he to do if he repented of his sin and wished to settle matters with his conscience by getting properly married according to the way his conscience directed? The woman acknowledges that he tried to do this in one obvious way, and that she refused to consent to it.

Amongst those who delivered violent speeches on the question in Belfast was the Rev. Samuel Prenter, D. D. of Dublin, brought there specially to reply to Father Hubert, C. I. who has so ably and so bravely vindicated the position of the Catholic Church with regard to marriage, dwelling at length on the features of the unfortunate case before the public. Father Hubert appealed to Scripture and History, to human and divine law, in defence of the recent legislation of the Church, including the "Temenore" Decree. Dr. Prenter, not daring to take up the preacher's arguments, threw aside Scripture and history and law, and delivered a furious onslaught on the Pope, and the priests on the grounds of cruelty alone, calling the latter "demonized cellmates," and accused them of corrupting the home by means of the Confessional, of which he professed to have most abominable evidence. Of course, that is just what we should expect from a no-Popery orator of the calibre of Dr. Prenter, but it is disconcerting to find in the announcement of a meeting of protest against the "Temenore" Decree to be presided over by the Protestant Archbishop of Dublin, that this no-Popery orator is to hold forth again amongst others on the same question. As I said at the beginning, the language used in Ireland by reverend and very reverend orators has fast called forth very adverse criticism from respectable Anglican organs. The Church Times (Protestant) says, amongst other things about Dr. Crozier's diatribe in the North against the Papal Decree: "We are filled with shame hearing such rubbish poured from the lips of a Bishop of our Communion into the greedy ears of Belfast groundlings." And our Non-conformist friends in Dublin might hear the conduct of this Bishop Weekly, an important English Non-conformist paper, says on the subject of marriage: "If we are asked to say that the Church, or any particular church, is invariably wrong, we must be faithful to the marriage whatever may be legal marriage, according to the decrees of a State, we must clearly answer in the negative. The case of the man who has a Catholic wife, who constitutes a Christian marriage. They have the law of Christ to follow, and they must follow it at all hazards. They may interpret it wrongly, but they must be faithful to the interpretation which they adopt." And it adds that "when the Catholic Church says to a man legally married to a woman that he is not truly married and that he should induce her to return to the Catholic church, that Church may be acting within its rights." It is very unlikely, however, that the principles here enunciated will find any expositors at the meeting in Dublin. Rather will it be said for an obvious purpose that the State has all power in the matter of the Sacrament of Matrimony, and the Church has no power in granting a new measure of self-government.

Lot it be kept in mind, too, that we have not yet heard the other side of the question. We naturally wish to know what the man has to say for himself. Granted that the man acted as a sinner in the first instance, and lived with a woman to whom he believed he was not validly married, what was he to do if he repented of his sin and wished to settle matters with his conscience by getting properly married according to the way his conscience directed? The woman acknowledges that he tried to do this in one obvious way, and that she refused to consent to it.

Amongst those who delivered violent speeches on the question in Belfast was the Rev. Samuel Prenter, D. D. of Dublin, brought there specially to reply to Father Hubert, C. I. who has so ably and so bravely vindicated the position of the Catholic Church with regard to marriage, dwelling at length on the features of the unfortunate case before the public. Father Hubert appealed to Scripture and History, to human and divine law, in defence of the recent legislation of the Church, including the "Temenore" Decree. Dr. Prenter, not daring to take up the preacher's arguments, threw aside Scripture and history and law, and delivered a furious onslaught on the Pope, and the priests on the grounds of cruelty alone, calling the latter "demonized cellmates," and accused them of corrupting the home by means of the Confessional, of which he professed to have most abominable evidence. Of course, that is just what we should expect from a no-Popery orator of the calibre of Dr. Prenter, but it is disconcerting to find in the announcement of a meeting of protest against the "Temenore" Decree to be presided over by the Protestant Archbishop of Dublin, that this no-Popery orator is to hold forth again amongst others on the same question. As I said at the beginning, the language used in Ireland by reverend and very reverend orators has fast called forth very adverse criticism from respectable Anglican organs. The Church Times (Protestant) says, amongst other things about Dr. Crozier's diatribe in the North against the Papal Decree: "We are filled with shame hearing such rubbish poured from the lips of a Bishop of our Communion into the greedy ears of Belfast groundlings." And our Non-conformist friends in Dublin might hear the conduct of this Bishop Weekly, an important English Non-conformist paper, says on the subject of marriage: "If we are asked to say that the Church, or any particular church, is invariably wrong, we must be faithful to the marriage whatever may be legal marriage, according to the decrees of a State, we must clearly answer in the negative. The case of the man who has a Catholic wife, who constitutes a Christian marriage. They have the law of Christ to follow, and they must follow it at all hazards. They may interpret it wrongly, but they must be faithful to the interpretation which they adopt." And it adds that "when the Catholic Church says to a man legally married to a woman that he is not truly married and that he should induce her to return to the Catholic church, that Church may be acting within its rights." It is very unlikely, however, that the principles here enunciated will find any expositors at the meeting in Dublin. Rather will it be said for an obvious purpose that the State has all power in the matter of the Sacrament of Matrimony, and the Church has no power in granting a new measure of self-government.

Lot it be kept in mind, too, that we have not yet heard the other side of the question. We naturally wish to know what the man has to say for himself. Granted that the man acted as a sinner in the first instance, and lived with a woman to whom he believed he was not validly married, what was he to do if he repented of his sin and wished to settle matters with his conscience by getting properly married according to the way his conscience directed? The woman acknowledges that he tried to do this in one obvious way, and that she refused to consent to it.

Amongst those who delivered violent speeches on the question in Belfast was the Rev. Samuel Prenter, D. D. of Dublin, brought there specially to reply to Father Hubert, C. I. who has so ably and so bravely vindicated the position of the Catholic Church with regard to marriage, dwelling at length on the features of the unfortunate case before the public. Father Hubert appealed to Scripture and History, to human and divine law, in defence of the recent legislation of the Church, including the "Temenore" Decree. Dr. Prenter, not daring to take up the preacher's arguments, threw aside Scripture and history and law, and delivered a furious onslaught on the Pope, and the priests on the grounds of cruelty alone, calling the latter "demonized cellmates," and accused them of corrupting the home by means of the Confessional, of which he professed to have most abominable evidence. Of course, that is just what we should expect from a no-Popery orator of the calibre of Dr. Prenter, but it is disconcerting to find in the announcement of a meeting of protest against the "Temenore" Decree to be presided over by the Protestant Archbishop of Dublin, that this no-Popery orator is to hold forth again amongst others on the same question. As I said at the beginning, the language used in Ireland by reverend and very reverend orators has fast called forth very adverse criticism from respectable Anglican organs. The Church Times (Protestant) says, amongst other things about Dr. Crozier's diatribe in the North against the Papal Decree: "We are filled with shame hearing such rubbish poured from the lips of a Bishop of our Communion into the greedy ears of Belfast groundlings." And our Non-conformist friends in Dublin might hear the conduct of this Bishop Weekly, an important English Non-conformist paper, says on the subject of marriage: "If we are asked to say that the Church, or any particular church, is invariably wrong, we must be faithful to the marriage whatever may be legal marriage, according to the decrees of a State, we must clearly answer in the negative. The case of the man who has a Catholic wife, who constitutes a Christian marriage. They have the law of Christ to follow, and they must follow it at all hazards. They may interpret it wrongly, but they must be faithful to the interpretation which they adopt." And it adds that "when the Catholic Church says to a man legally married to a woman that he is not truly married and that he should induce her to return to the Catholic church, that Church may be acting within its rights." It is very unlikely, however, that the principles here enunciated will find any expositors at the meeting in Dublin. Rather will it be said for an obvious purpose that the State has all power in the matter of the Sacrament of Matrimony, and the Church has no power in granting a new measure of self-government.

matters will make the facts I am about to give more intelligible and may not be without interest in themselves. The elections are held under the local government act, passed by the last Tory government. Prior to this act all local administration was practically in the hand of the grand jury of each county. The grand jury was appointed annually by the county high sheriff, who was himself nominated by Dublin Castle. This act, however, changed all that and gave extensive power in local affairs to the people.

In addition to the administration in cities the people now elect public bodies who administer the affairs of counties, towns, villages and districts. The various bodies have after their own election the power to meet and elect a chairman and to make appointments to other offices, some of them quite important. What we would call the mayor in America is not in Ireland, whether in city or town, elected by direct vote of the people, but is elected by the council as their chairman from one of their own number. This office and that of high sheriff are the most important in the gift of the various councils, as both are well paid in themselves and have considerable patronage at their disposal besides. In three cities, Dublin, Belfast and Drogheda, the chief magistrate has the title of lord mayor, while in eight others he has the title of simply mayor.

Then there come the county councils for the county administration, the urban councils for the villages and the rural councils for the country districts. All these have now met and elected their chairman or chief magistrate and have made their other appointments of importance. The returns show clearly that the Catholic vote is a strong one and has been entertained and where rejected.

It can be broadly stated that in Catholic districts, towns and cities it has been acted upon, when in Protestant (Ulster) it was not even listened to. One can pick out from lists a number of Catholic and Nationalist cities and towns where Protestants and Unionists have been given the posts of honor and emolument. In Ulster there is not a single instance where a Protestant or Unionist council in town or county has selected a Catholic for any post of honor, and Limerick selected Protestant high sheriffs, and both are Unionist to boot. Catholic Wexford selected a Protestant mayor.

Three other Catholic towns selected Protestant chairmen and two more Protestant vice-chairmen. In Derry the Catholic vote is in the majority, but the city is so gerrymandered as to always give the posts of honor and emolument to the Unionist majority. This time the outgoing mayor, a Protestant, made a plea for more tolerance and advised that the Catholic should be given an opportunity to represent the city. The result of his plea was that not a single Unionist was found or could be to rise to say a word on the vote of the Council proposed to the mayor on his retirement.

The Protestant mayor-elect of Wexford—Wexford—made a statement with regard to the Catholic vote in his own close subject. After declaring himself a convinced Home Ruler and stating that there need be no fear of intolerance at the hands of his Catholic fellow-men, he said: "If Ireland was called in prose and verse, an enthusiastic student in Gaelic literature in general, and of the works of Sir Samuel Ferguson in particular. But for many years she has been best known in a rough, for the prominent part she took in works of charity and philanthropy. A meeting was called for the purpose of organizing a presentation to Miss Alexander on the occasion of her leaving the city. The politics of her aged father are, as I explained at a previous time, very bad. He is also head of that denomination which for generations lorded it over the Catholics of Ireland and exacted tribute from a people who did not believe in it and would not have it. But the meeting referred to showed abundantly that the Catholics of Ireland are not vindictive, that they are more willing to be bygones, that they are willing to live in peace and charity with all, and that apart from politics and religious differences they can easily appreciate good neighbors and express gratitude for kind service.

Cardinal Logue was not content merely to "lend his name" to the movement for organizing a testimonial to the daughter of the Protestant prime minister. With that easy grace and consummate simplicity which have made him the most beloved figure in Irish public life he came to the meeting in person and made one of those neat, appropriate and tactful addresses for which he will be so well remembered in America by those who had the good fortune to hear him. The work which Miss Alexander had done, said the Cardinal—and he had ample opportunity of knowing it—was done with great efficiency and without loss of time.

Dr. Alexander occupied a considerable place in literature and it was an honor to their city to have had him

among them—and also to have had Miss Alexander, who had written a charming book on Armagh, showing that she had inherited the talent of her distinguished father and of her no less distinguished mother. In conclusion, therefore, said the Cardinal, he was glad to join with those present in showing his esteem for Miss Alexander.

This, I repeat, is the attitude of the Catholics and Nationalists of Ireland.

A LENTEN PRACTICE

Would it not be an admirable practice for the holy season of Lent if we made, each week, or oftener, a visit to the poor or the sick, whether in hospitals or in their homes? For, so doing, we are told by Jesus Christ that we visit Him. And yet a recent article in an English magazine expresses only too well a reprehensible tendency of our modern times, as follows: "We point to all our admirable public institutions, we are always anxious to add to their number—schools, hospitals, asylums, institutes. "We instance these to prove what Christianity has done for us; this large exercise of charity and forbearance for those who have gone down in the struggle. Yet, so low much does our charity amount? Are not those great dark enclosing walls, behind which we shut away the grievous sights of life, testimonies rather that we are careless than that we are kind? We pay our subscriptions, we organize dances, concerts, bazaars, and build the needful prison for pain—and why? Is it not to shift from our shoulders a personal charge to convert what would be a private bore into a public duty? "Every charity, excellent as it may be, which enables us to discharge an obligation to our brother by handing over some unconsidered coin for his relief, may be to his benefit, but is greatly to our loss, with such discharge we are content. "Of old, there was but one kind, hospita for, guest and host, because they exchanged hospitality. We as hosts today have built houses, guest-houses, which we call hospitals. You might call them host's houses just as pretty; only, alas! though guests are always to be found there, the hosts have a habit of keeping out of the way. We pay for our guests' entertainment, but we do not like to go near them. That is not the finest form of hospitality; indeed, it might very easily be improved. To the sick, who have no superfluity of such things, there is much in a welcome and remembrance, even in a farewell. We might offer them, now and again, a smile or a word of sympathy, a token very scarce in our day. We need it, and we might perhaps learn too, by a larger experience, that, more often than is reported, men have 'entertained angels unwearied.' "Do not these words from a non-Catholic source apply only too frequently to ourselves? We build hospitals and asylums, we provide money for day-nurses and working-boys' homes, and we give to the poor, we give to the conferences of St. Vincent de Paul. But how often do we visit these institutions, or carry to the poor in their own dwellings the ministrations of our kind and friendly words along with our loving gifts? Let us consider then this Lenten practice making it one of self denial as an act of personal services. Let us give up, for this holy season, our literary clubs, our whist clubs, our concerts and our social gatherings, and let us devote the time thus gained to visiting the sick and poor, our true brothers and sisters in Jesus Christ. "Who is wise will ponder these things."—S. H. Review.

AMERICA AND THE POPE

New York, March 5.—At the next meeting of the archbishops of the United States, Cardinal Gibbons will bring to their attention the plan which has already met with wide approval in Roman Catholic ecclesiastical circles of a yearly contribution to the Pope by the clergy of this country. This proposed gift is not in any way connected with the Peter's Pence collection taken up yearly in the United States, which concerns the laity alone, but it is to be made by the priests and bishops. This year has been chosen as most appropriate time for inaugurating these customs because the ordinary sources of revenue for the Vatican will be curtailed to a considerable extent because Pope Pius X. has declared that there will be no consistory, no pilgrimages and no solemn receptions in Rome this year