

The Catholic Record

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

Advertisement for teachers, situations wanted, etc. Approved and recommended by the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa and St. Boniface, the Bishops of London, Hamilton, Peterborough, and Oshkosh, N. Y., and the clergy throughout the Dominion.

When subscribers ask for their mail at the post office it would be well 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

Apollonia Delegation. Ottawa, June 13th, 1905.

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

Yours faithfully in Jesus Christ, D. FALCONE, Arch. of Larissa, Anos. Deleg.

UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA. Ottawa, Canada, March 27th, 1900.

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. It matters and form are both good; and a truly Catholic spirit pervades the whole.

Yours faithfully in Jesus Christ, D. FALCONE, Arch. of Larissa, Anos. Deleg.

LONDON, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 1912

FOREIGN MISSIONS PAST AND PRESENT

Ambassador Bryce, in an interesting article in the International Review of Missions, speaks of the immense improvement wrought in the condition of uncivilized peoples amongst whom the missionaries work. He tells us that the missionaries are now less concerned with making proselytes than in endeavoring to spread education and enlightenment.

Still he concedes that the spread of the Gospel is slow and its effect less complete than there was ground for hoping when one considered the amount of effort expended. Why is it, asks Mr. Bryce, that when Christianity was able to overspread and conquer the world against all the forces of imperial persecution in the first four centuries after it appeared, its progress in these last four centuries, with all the impulse of civilization behind, should be still in many quarters so slow and its results so far from perfect?

Then he tells us that the contact with the white races is not confined to missions. "When the Spaniards began to conquer the new world one of their chief objects was to convert the Indians and they excused their invasions and the cruelty which accompanied them by the defence that all was done for the propagation of the gospel. Crowds of friars accompanied the Spaniards, and much preaching to the Indians and the desire to make the Gospel reign over American lands was a genuine desire. But they did many other things besides preach. They were greedy for gold. They recognized no rights in the natives; they forced them to till the soil and labor in the mines. They did this with ruthless cruelty."

Now let us look at some incontestable facts. South America was civilized and Christianized by the Spaniards, and the bulk of the population in South American countries is still of the aboriginal stock. A fact that some people might remember when contrasting South America with the northern half of the Continent. What of the Indians of North America? Will the few remnants of the race of red men that have escaped extermination compare with the native races that still people the southern countries civilized by Spain?

Then consider for a moment the Philippine Islands. Many millions of the Filipinos are civilized and Christianized, eye and have their universities and due proportion of highly cultured men. Let any unprejudiced student of the patent facts of history tell us what country in the world did more for the uncivilized races than Spain. True, Spanish adventurers were far from aiding the missionaries; but the two facts of history and geography that we have given are incontrovertible.

True, progress in spreading the Gospel of Christ amongst those who sit in darkness and the shadow of death is slow during the last four hundred years; but Spain has done her share. If every Christian nation had done as much there would be little left to do.

We must do Mr. Bryce the justice of quoting still further:

"Down to our own time the same thing has gone on though in later years with far less violence and cruelty than that which marked the doings of the sixteenth century. Everywhere the native has suffered; everywhere the white adventurer or trader has attempted to treat him as a mere instrument by the use of which he can profit."

This he considers the great hindrance to the spread of the Gospel. And to

this we might add the endless varieties of Christianity presented to them by the sects.

The "crowds of friars" who went out with the Spaniards all preached the same thing, Christ and Him crucified.

A SUBSCRIBER writes us about a book sold amongst our Protestant neighbors entitled "The Second Coming of Christ," and adds that much of it is against the Catholic Church. We have not seen the work, and therefore cannot offer intelligent criticism on it. If, as our informant states, "much of it is against the Catholic Church," it shows the wisdom, from the viewpoint of dollars and cents, of the author or compiler. Now-a-days, any miserable scoundrel "against the Catholic Church," will be found a "ready seller." That is precisely why the market is supplied so well by men who have no conscience and who would readily write similar books "against Protestantism" were the venture equally remunerative. The pity of it is that the average Protestant will not read Catholic books, in which the truth about the Church is plainly told.

FALSE WITNESS

THE WAY TO GET RID OF YOUR PROTESTANT WIFE

Here is the doctrine, as printed in the Kingston Freeman, of October 18, 1911, quoted from Rev. E. R. Hull, S. J.: "There is one case, and only one, in which the Church allows the recision of a full valid marriage. If a married person is converted to the (Roman) Church, and the unconverted party refuses to live at peace with her in the new religion, the convert is allowed to break off all connection, and even to marry a Christian (that is Roman Catholic) partner. The principle underlying it is that the former marriage was a natural marriage, whereas baptism elevates marriage into a sacrament. And the chasm between the two orders possess a certain potentiality to dissolve the contract."

What do Protestants think of this doctrine? Thus does the Orange Sentinel of Feb. 1st fan the flames of bigotry with regard to the Catholic teaching on marriage. Now this is not the doctrine of the Church; this is not what Father Hull said; and finally it is not what the Freeman reported.

It is the doctrine of the Church, and the express teaching of the Ne Temere decree that Protestants legally married are validly and sacramentally married. Hence if one of them were to become a Catholic, the marriage bond would remain until death dissolved it.

But the Church does allow the recision of a full valid marriage, that is to say she allows a legal divorce in the single case where one of the parties is unbaptized. Why do our Protestant friends, who have made divorce not only easy but very respectable, quarrel with us for recognizing the single exception?

We have the best authority, or at least what some Protestants still believe the best authority, for this exception, namely, that of Holy Writ. St. Paul in his first epistle to the Corinthians, fifth chapter, speaking of the marriages of Christians with pagans, says:

"If any brother have a wife that believeth not, and she consent to dwell with him let him not put her away. "And if any woman that believeth have a husband that believeth not, and he consent to dwell with her let her not put away her husband. "But if the unbeliever depart let him depart: for a brother or sister is not under servitude in such cases."

The civil law does not recognize this Pauline privilege, so that they would still be legally married; but the Church permits a legal dissolution of the marriage because it is a natural not a sacramental marriage. However, if a Catholic should marry an unbaptized person, having a disparity of cultus, then death alone can dissolve the marriage bond.

The explanatory words in parentheses, in the quotation given above, are therefore maliciously misleading.

Discussing the Lancaster marriage bill, this paper makes this astounding statement: "It is clear that the Quebec law with regard to the solemnization of marriage discriminates against Protestant ministers. The law makes it perfectly legal for a priest to marry a Roman Catholic and a Protestant, but makes it unlawful for a Protestant minister to marry a Roman Catholic and a Protestant."

There is nothing of the sort in the civil law of Quebec. No court of the Province of Quebec ever decided that the marriage of a Protestant and a Catholic by a Protestant minister is illegal. Courts have decided that it is illegal for a Protestant minister to marry two Catholics. Where is the Protestant grievance in this? Why should Protestant ministers not respect the law of the Province in which they live, why not respect themselves, their office, and the marriage contract, and say to the two Catholics who present themselves to be married—no, I am not a competent officer under the laws of the province to receive and register your consent to marriage. Go elsewhere. I should be doing you a grave injury if I pretended I could legally marry you; and I should forfeit my self-respect.

And the Sentinel, which on this question, at any rate, is not much worse than some very dignified and learned clergy-

men, should read the marriage law of Quebec before bearing false witness against our fellow Canadians, and inflaming the ignorant bigotry of its readers.

THE WORLD-WIDE UNITY AND THE RULANT STRENGTH OF THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH

THE WORLD-WIDE unity and the rulant strength of the Roman Catholic Church was contrasted with a "divided and skim-milk and watery Protestantism" last night in Broadway Tabernacle by Rev. Dr. W. H. Hincks, who preached on the subject of "United Protestantism." So says the Toronto Globe of the 5th inst. Dr. Hincks firstly stated that six months ago he had resisted the movement to unite the Methodist, Presbyterian and Congregational churches, but having studied the unity of the Catholic Church he had undergone a change of heart. A short time ago he would call the warring opinions of the sects a splendid diversity. Now he deprecates such a condition. What he will be thinking when another six months passes, no man knoweth, nor does he know himself. But we will suppose that the three sects named pool their resources and form a trust styled, "Wesley, Knox & Co." What then? There still remain two or three hundred other fragments of heresy which have been established for the purpose of pleasing the whimsicalities of poor humanity on a broad ocean with a rudderless ship. Dr. Hincks will find a safe anchorage only when he boards Peter's barque.

THE ULSTER EMBROGLIO

The late Lord Randolph Churchill it was said, would not accept Home Rule, "Ulster would fight and Ulster would be right." Well, Ulster did not, and will not, fight. Or rather it did not fight to any appreciable degree. It merely made a demonstration. The demonstration was the customary turbulence of the 12th July mob, held in check by the batons of the constabulary. An unsuccessful effort was made to attack the automobile in which Mr. Winston Churchill was seated. It is all over, and no one was hurt—but the Orangemen. Their reputation as Orangemen has suffered, but there was not much reputation left to suffer. In Ireland, as in Canada, it is a politico-religious organization, kept together by mediocrities with the view of thereby climbing into prominence. In Parliament on the Bench, in municipal life, we find them holding positions by virtue of their Grand Masterships. It is a dangerous conspiracy against the well-being of every country which has given it countenance.

The time is coming—indeed it has come—when the Protestant young man will realize that enrollment in the Orange order, at the behest of designing ward politicians, adds nothing to, but rather detracts from, his standing in the community.

At the Belfast meeting an outline of the Home Rule Bill was given by Mr. Winston Churchill. He delivered a splendid oration, as also did Mr. John Redmond and others. Following are the chief features of the proposed measure of self-government:

Belfast, Ireland, Feb. 8.—Without closely particularizing the terms of the Home Rule Bill to be brought in by the government, Mr. Churchill in the early part of his speech here to-day said that the Irish parliament and senate would fairly represent the minority as well as the majority of the people of Ireland. He explained the bill as follows:

The crown will be in a position to refuse its assent to any unjust law and the imperial parliament will be able to repeal any such law. Religious freedom will be secured. The privy council will be able to declare void any law which goes beyond the limits of the Home Rule Bill. The military will remain under the control of the imperial government. The financial proposals of the bill will give a fair start to the Irish government and insidious taxes will not be able to be placed upon Ulster.

The Irish parliament will have real control of its finances but the system used must be consistent with the financial system of the United Kingdom. The imperial government will continue to carry out the land purchase and old age pensions schemes. The Irish representation at Westminster will be reduced.

John Redmond, the Irish leader, made an impassioned appeal for a United Ireland upon broad national grounds. After accepting the speech of Mr. Churchill as a noble utterance the Irish Chief Minister emphasized the point that whatever power they would receive would not be abused. Otherwise they should be condemned as unworthy of their country and their trust. Mr. Redmond appealed to Ulster in the name of Ireland and in the name of the British Empire, in the name of justice and good will, to help settle the Irish question, wisely, well and forever. A noble utterance, indeed, but we fear the Orange leaders will pay little heed to it. They will go on in their madness. Civil and religious liberty they want—for themselves. They are still imbued with the ascendancy spirit, still desirous of riding rough shod over their Catholic neighbors, still claiming that these Catholic neighbors have no rights which they are bound to respect. The whole story is a sad one, the outcome of the brutal mission of the seeds of religious hatred by the

Castlereagh of the old days and our own time. The Orangemen were born and brought up in Ireland, but they are not Irishmen worthy the name. Shame will be theirs when they experience—and experience they will—freedom, kindness, liberality, and Christian consideration from their Catholic fellow countrymen when Ireland's Parliament is restored.

The village of Sherrington, in the county of Napierville, Quebec, enjoys the unique distinction of having carried a local option by-law without a dissenting ballot. This is an indication of the general trend of public opinion, irrespective of race or creed.—Toronto Globe.

THE ABOVE extract furnishes much food for thought. While in the Province of Ontario there is a world of controversy as to the advisability of adopting local option by a majority or a two-thirds vote, in the Catholic Province of Quebec local option may, and often is, carried without a dissenting voice. Herein it may be observed that the pastors in Quebec lead their flocks in every movement intended to ennoble humanity, while in the Province of Ontario the preacher's voice counts for little. One leads. The other is led. The whiskey sellers of Sherrington will now have cause to cry out against "Romish aggression."

A VERY UNDESIRABLE CITIZEN

Some one has again sent us a copy of a paper called "The Menace," published at Aurora, Missouri, by Phelps and McClure. Rev. Theo. C. Walker is the editor. We would ask our readers not to mail us any more of these papers. We are glad to receive in our editorial room the publications of the sects, for we are thus given an opportunity of putting their editors on the straight road when they stray away from fact when writing about the Church of Christ. We like to have converse with gentlemen, and many of our Protestant contemporaries are edited by such. Rev. Theo. C. Walker is not, however, in this class. He appears to be in a class by himself. He has no regard for the truth when a falsehood will better suit his purpose. He allows matter to be published in "The Menace," which would, were he a responsible person, involve him in difficulties, but he cannot be involved, for the reason that he has said farewell to good conduct, his sensibilities are dulled beyond recuperation, and his poverty of decency is a distinct smirch on the town of Aurora. He would not write as he does were he not libel proof, and he has put his purse in a place which bids defiance to the verdict of judge or jury. Rev. Mr. Walker must surely have a charred past, and most certainly he has a bleared future. That he is a Christian we refuse to believe. As an inventor of Catholic Bishops' oaths, Jesuit oaths and even Catholic laymen's oaths, Rev. Theo. C. Walker has become renowned. In this business he appears to have become the agent of the Father of Lies. There is a movement on foot to exclude Rev. Mr. Walker's literature from the mail. May it be successful. If so he will then take to the pulpits of such weak minded ministers as will give him entrance, and tell a number of ignorant people and a number of more or less lettered people, who carry about with them a peak load of bigotry, like our own Mr. Samuel Blake, K. C., that the Catholic Church dignitaries are no better than they ought to be, and that if we desire to preserve our civil and religious liberties we should anchor them to the persons of preachers of the gospel who do not know what they believe, or, if they do know what they believe to-day, have no assurance as to what they may believe to-morrow.

A WILD MAN

Rev. C. O. Johnston, of Toronto, Methodist, preached a few days ago on "Jesuit Morality" and the World tells us it proved a "powerful attraction." The utterances and antics of this clergyman gives one the same sensation as the sight of a runaway horse. Here are some nuggets: "The training the Jesuits receive sends them out as cadavers—as corpses. This is true also of the Jesuitesses—for there are Jesuitesses." The Jesuits have come into Canada on the quiet. The order has a distributing centre. If they are not in Toronto at present it is their purpose to be." Some time ago he asserted there were Jesuits in Toronto. Upon finding out that such was not the case, now he tells us they will soon come to the Queen City. Then again: "In Canada, a Roman Catholic paper (no name) says: 'As Catholics we do not want them!'" We will not take Mr. Johnston seriously. It is a pity his superiors, if he has any, do not intervene to save him from himself. He is evidently a protege of Margaret Shepherd. When he is before a judge and jury, as he will likely soon be, his froth and fury, his wild utterances—truth standing by abashed—will out a sorry figure. Meantime he will continue to make an exhibition of himself that he may gain the applause of the unthinking mob. Mr. Johnston's presence in Toronto is a poor asset for that city.

AN ILL-INFORMED PREACHER

Rev. Dr. Mavey is pastor of Bell street Methodist Church, Ottawa. Having found that striking out at Rome brings a loudly congregation to some of his neighbors of the cloth in the meeting houses, where love of God and hatred of one's neighbors are proclaimed in the same breath, has determined that he should have a share of the good things. On Sunday last he considered it his bounden duty, as a good British subject and a follower of John Wesley, the first Salvation Army General, to denounce the Ne Temere decree. Said Rev. Dr. Mavey: "The Ne Temere decree has been in vogue for centuries, and it is now a question whether the law or the Church is to be the greater power." As the decree was promulgated in 1908, we have here another proof that many of the spiritual guides of our non-Catholic neighbors are shamefully ill-informed. They do not and they will not seek information about our faith where alone the truth may be had, but go floundering about for points against the Church amongst those who know no more about it than themselves. Hence the ridiculous position in which they have often placed themselves, and hence the scant regard which men of intelligence, who are not devoured by bigotry, place in these pulpit utterances.

SIDE-LIGHTS ON HOME RULE

I HOME RULE FROM THE IMPERIAL VIEW-POINT

That much discussed question, Home Rule for Ireland, is to-day the outstanding feature in the British political world, and readers of the RECORD, who for the most part claim the United Kingdom as their motherland, are naturally interested in it. Even those who are not of British blood are eagerly following the course of events that lead up to the establishment of a native

REV. MR. JOHNSTON AND THE "OATH"

Rev. C. O. Johnston, of Toronto, co-lector of spurious Jesuit oaths, and general dealer in bigotry for drawing purposes, is likely to have a strenuous time before the Courts. He read from his pulpit a horrible oath which he claimed the Jesuits took at their ordination, but, upon being threatened with a libel suit, he made a statement which puts him in still worse plight in the minds of hon-

orable men. In reply to a query from the Star Rev. Mr. Johnston says: "Very respectfully, but quite candidly I wish to answer the priest who wrote in your issue of yesterday regarding the Jesuits. Now, Jesuits are not what they used to be and if they are different in different countries and if their doings in South America are not possible in Canada, then let this priest come forward and make the statement that Jesuitism has changed in doctrine and spirit, and not wrong in circumstances. But his statement, to be of value, must be over the signature of the Pope, for Cardinal Manning says no priest can be held to his word unless it be approved by the Pope." Here we have an exhibition of clerical quibbling on a par with that of a boy caught stealing apples. What is expected of Rev. Mr. Johnston is proof that the oath he claims to be the Jesuits' oath is genuine. His answer has as much to do with the point at issue as if he had given us an essay on reciprocity. Quibbling will be of no avail when he faces the judge in a court of justice. The poor man is in a plight. If he enters a plea of "not guilty" he will be condemned, and if his plea is "Guilty" his occupation will be gone as a preacher of the gospel of hatred.

What we may term a villainous annex to this controversy was sent out in a press despatch. It was stated, by whom nobody knows, that the Jesuit oath in question was once taken by the members of that order, but had now become obsolete. This report was, however, promptly contradicted by the Jesuit Fathers. Such an oath was never taken by any Jesuit. The grist mill of anti-Catholic falsehoods keeps merrily grinding on. Some day it will suddenly stop when the operators are either mulcted in large sums by way of damages, or put on bread and water diet.

A WILD MAN

Rev. C. O. Johnston, of Toronto, Methodist, preached a few days ago on "Jesuit Morality" and the World tells us it proved a "powerful attraction." The utterances and antics of this clergyman gives one the same sensation as the sight of a runaway horse. Here are some nuggets: "The training the Jesuits receive sends them out as cadavers—as corpses. This is true also of the Jesuitesses—for there are Jesuitesses." The Jesuits have come into Canada on the quiet. The order has a distributing centre. If they are not in Toronto at present it is their purpose to be." Some time ago he asserted there were Jesuits in Toronto. Upon finding out that such was not the case, now he tells us they will soon come to the Queen City. Then again: "In Canada, a Roman Catholic paper (no name) says: 'As Catholics we do not want them!'" We will not take Mr. Johnston seriously. It is a pity his superiors, if he has any, do not intervene to save him from himself. He is evidently a protege of Margaret Shepherd. When he is before a judge and jury, as he will likely soon be, his froth and fury, his wild utterances—truth standing by abashed—will out a sorry figure. Meantime he will continue to make an exhibition of himself that he may gain the applause of the unthinking mob. Mr. Johnston's presence in Toronto is a poor asset for that city.

AN ILL-INFORMED PREACHER

Rev. Dr. Mavey is pastor of Bell street Methodist Church, Ottawa. Having found that striking out at Rome brings a loudly congregation to some of his neighbors of the cloth in the meeting houses, where love of God and hatred of one's neighbors are proclaimed in the same breath, has determined that he should have a share of the good things. On Sunday last he considered it his bounden duty, as a good British subject and a follower of John Wesley, the first Salvation Army General, to denounce the Ne Temere decree. Said Rev. Dr. Mavey: "The Ne Temere decree has been in vogue for centuries, and it is now a question whether the law or the Church is to be the greater power." As the decree was promulgated in 1908, we have here another proof that many of the spiritual guides of our non-Catholic neighbors are shamefully ill-informed. They do not and they will not seek information about our faith where alone the truth may be had, but go floundering about for points against the Church amongst those who know no more about it than themselves. Hence the ridiculous position in which they have often placed themselves, and hence the scant regard which men of intelligence, who are not devoured by bigotry, place in these pulpit utterances.

SIDE-LIGHTS ON HOME RULE

I HOME RULE FROM THE IMPERIAL VIEW-POINT

That much discussed question, Home Rule for Ireland, is to-day the outstanding feature in the British political world, and readers of the RECORD, who for the most part claim the United Kingdom as their motherland, are naturally interested in it. Even those who are not of British blood are eagerly following the course of events that lead up to the establishment of a native

REV. MR. JOHNSTON AND THE "OATH"

Rev. C. O. Johnston, of Toronto, co-lector of spurious Jesuit oaths, and general dealer in bigotry for drawing purposes, is likely to have a strenuous time before the Courts. He read from his pulpit a horrible oath which he claimed the Jesuits took at their ordination, but, upon being threatened with a libel suit, he made a statement which puts him in still worse plight in the minds of hon-

parliament on Irish soil, because this century-old struggle of a small nation for national recognition, often against seemingly overwhelming odds, has won the ear of the world. We feel, then, that we owe no apology to our readers if we briefly set before them some aspects of this question.

The Unionist party in England are opposed to Home Rule for various reasons, the principal of which is that to grant legislative autonomy to Ireland is equivalent to the disruption of the Empire. If it is urged against them that the granting of Home Rule to Canadians, Australians and Boers had no such effect, they deny that the cases are similar. Canada, Australia, and South Africa, they say, are far removed from the seat of Empire, and consequently to give them autonomy could not endanger Imperial unity, but Ireland, from their view-point, is as much a part of England as Yorkshire, and therefore to set up an independent parliament in Dublin would be to court the destruction that is the inevitable portion of a house divided against itself. Devolution spells weakness, whereas centralization is strength; in other words, united we stand, divided we fall. Home Rule for Ireland is to be brought about only by the destruction of the empire.

Now, granted that Home Rule will bring peace and prosperity to Ireland, yet if the Unionist argument can hold water, it is not worth the price. But we think that a calm and unbiased consideration of all the facts of the case will show that so far from weakening the Imperial bond, a self-governing Ireland will prove to be the strongest link in the chain.

"The movement of the modern world," to quote Mr. Winston Churchill, the British Minister for War, "is not towards the concentration of millions of individuals upon a single centre, but the consolidation around that centre, not of individuals, but of other perfectly-formed subsidiary centres. This is the true type and model alike of the great modern nation, and of the extended empire, in which both devolution and centralization must proceed simultaneously or successively to a harmonious balance." Drawing an analogy from military organization, Mr. Churchill alludes to the glories of the Union Brigade at Waterloo. There never was, he says, a body more essentially Federal in character. Each of its three regiments—the Royals, the Inniskillings, and the Greys—was organized separately, under its own officers, with its own interior economy, and with its own traditions, upon a national basis, and then, and not till then, combined together. If devolution and centralization worked so well together in this titanic contest, why should we fear to apply it in matters of legislation?

"The two greatest modern states with whom we have to compete (the German Empire and the American Union) are to-day administered, respectively, through 23 and 46 separate, but subordinate Parliaments," and he argues, it is vitally necessary that "we, like our most formidable rivals, should know how to combine the fullest expression of national and local aspirations and activities, with the strongest framework of Imperial unity." Thus, according to Mr. Churchill, even if Ireland did not demand the management of her own affairs, modern political conditions call for Home Rule, and not only Irish Home Rule, but Home-Rule-all-round, that is, Home Rule for Scotland, Wales, and England as well.

"The British Party system," Mr. Churchill thinks, "is not sufficiently representative of the local and provincial life of the nation. Home Rule all round will, by opening other roads to political distinction, notably enrich it. New and vivifying pulses will begin to beat, and the new nerve centres of a higher organism will spring into being. It is idle to argue that centralization is right, or that devolution is right. These terms are purely relative. Neither is exclusive. Either separately would be wrong. The truth resides in a harmonious combination of the two." Home Rule all round, towards which the first step is Home Rule for Ireland, by entrusting to local legislatures the local business of the different counties concerned, leaving the Imperial Parliament free to deal with Imperial matters, is neither devolution nor centralization. It is, in Mr. Churchill's words, "a harmonious combination of the two," and such a combination is the only system fitted for present-day political conditions. In this way alone can we combine "the fullest expression of national and local aspirations and activities with the strongest framework of Imperial Unity."

Even in the interests of the British Parliament Home Rule is a necessity. The House of Commons is notoriously overwhelmed with unfiled business. When it should be devoting its time to the broad field of Imperial policies and interests it is wasting days and weeks over some wretched patch of bog-land in Kerry or a grouse moor in Scotland. Home Rule will relieve it by devolving such parochial legislation on subordi-

ate assemblies, leaving the Imperial Parliament free to deal with Imperial matters.

Lastly, a disaffected and discontented Ireland so close to the empire's heart must prove a source of weakness. Home Rule will bring peace and contentment in its train. The recognition of their national aspirations is the open sesame to the people's hearts. Canada, in the words of Sir Charles Gavan Duffy, was not given Home Rule because she was loyal. She is loyal because she has Home Rule. Irishmen are "agin the law" because they know from sad experience that the law is not made for them. Let them but make their own laws and no people in the Empire will be more generously and enthusiastically loyal to the throne and the flag. And the loyalty of such a people will be of more value to the Empire than mailed battalions and many dreadnoughts. These are some of the reasons that go to prove that Home Rule, so far from wrecking the Empire, will work out to be to it a tower of strength.

NOTES AND COMMENTS

THE SIMPLEST solution of the Irish Home Rule question would perhaps be to transport the entire brood of Ulster (reconcilable to some as yet uninhabited island in the southern Pacific, where they could have a free hand in developing their peculiar notions of free speech and liberty of conscience. The Ulster contingent could occupy themselves for a year or two in laying out town sites where lots might be sold at a good profit to their Ontario sympathizers who, out of terror of "papal aggression" or "Jesuit Oaths," might wish to join them. What a happy family they would be!

THE TRAGEDY of February 4th, in the Niagara River, has made a deep impression upon the people of a whole continent. Rarely has it fallen to the press to tell so pathetic a tale or to chronicle so selfless an act of heroism and devotion. The spectacle of a husband choosing to go down into the dark valley in his young wife's company rather than forsake her, as he might, in the supreme hour, is one to revivify one's faith in human nature. Even more inspiring, if that were possible, was the act of young Heacock, in placing his own life at the service of a stranger. The pathetic, the pitiful scenes incidental to this great sacrifice, while calculated to bring tears to the eyes of the most callous, and to stir to their very depths the most cherished emotions of humanity, have also in them the power to exhilarate and inspire. They furnish new proof that even in this prosaic age, when the race seems at times given over to an overmastering materialism, it is still capable of the supremest acts of self immolation. That is not the least important lesson which this great tragedy has unfolded to the world.

If the circulation of the Bible in the emaculated form known as the King James could Christianize the world, it should ere this have made great progress towards that very-much-to-be-desired consummation. Last year, the members of the Upper Canada Bible Society were informed at their annual luncheon, nearly eleven million copies, translated into almost every language under the sun, were put into circulation, and this stupendous output has been going on for well nigh a hundred years. And yet the mere circulation of the printed book, divorced from its authoritative teacher and interpreter has yet to convert a single nation. The reason is not far to seek. The entire propaganda runs counter not only to the first principles of revealed religion, but to the dictates of common sense as well. It is a vain beating of the air, an attempt to subdue the world with the weapons of a child.

THE BIBLE is the first of all books and contains within itself the most blessed truths of revelation. But divorced from the Living Voice, which by the Divine Founder Himself was commissioned to interpret and instruct, the mere printed page is a dead thing, incapable of itself of leading mankind to the goal of all its hopes. The cry of the Ethiopian to St. Philip: "How shall I understand unless some man show me," becomes therefore the universal cry of human nature, and no conceivable multiplication of the book itself (more especially when mutilated and misused) can take the place of that authoritative Teacher to whom God committed the task of collecting and interpreting the books of which the Bible as we now have it is composed. That is a self evident truth and if proof of its soundness were needed, we have it in the condition of Christianity to-day outside of the Catholic Church. All is confusion and discord. Men boast of the wide circulation of the Bible, but all the while their reputed leaders and guides are tearing it to pieces and trampling under foot the most cherished teachings, which even a generation ago, were the reputed possession of all who bore the Christian