

So it seems that Rev. Mr. Johnston has been a collector of Jesuits' oaths, all of them, we surmise, taken from anti-Catholic fiction, from the leaflets of the Evangelical Alliance in England, and from the pages of the Canadian Orange organ, *The Maria Monk*. We commend the Jesuit Fathers for the action they have taken. They have remained silent, and other priests have remained silent, for a long time on the principle that it does not become a gentleman to take notice of the antics of every unruly street gambo, but it is wise to take action when bigotry has gone mad, and a class of pulpiterers, for church-filling purposes, deliver tirades of falsehoods against the Catholic Church which produce in the minds of their non-Catholic neighbors, not only feelings of distrust, but oftentimes leads to injurious discrimination in our social, business and public life.

THE ORANGE ORDER

Last week we briefly demonstrated how unhistorical and absurd is the claim of Orangism to stand for civil and religious liberty. We showed how it had its origin in religious bigotry, how it has constantly opposed every just concession to the Catholics of Ireland, and how, finally, it has ever been on the side of the oligarchy and against democracy. In this connection it may be well to quote the testimony of Lord Pirie, the Protestant head of the greatest shipbuilding firm in the world, that of Harland and Wolff, Belfast. Lord Pirie stated at a recent meeting in Belfast that in his experience he had never come across a case of religious intolerance on the part of Irish Catholic employers, but he regretted he could not say the same of his own co-religionists. "No Papist Need Apply" was generally true of the industrial north. And in the same connection he reminded his hearers that their city of Belfast had never yet elected a Catholic mayor, whilst on the other hand many Protestants had filled the office of chief magistrate of Dublin. But it is hardly necessary to go to Ireland for evidence of this kind. We sometimes see the same spirit manifested right here in our midst. The leopard finds it hard to change his spots, and even the free air of Canada cannot dispel the illusions of Sandy Row. Orangism is saturated with bigotry, and whether he hails from Belfast or Toronto, an Orangeman is an Orangeman still.

Orangism is a standing protest against Romish idolatry and superstition. Every once and a while, but more especially on the twelfth of July, we are given blood-curdling pictures of the awful fate in store for us should it ever happen that we come under the influence of Rome. Of course the brethren are the last remaining bulwark against such a dire calamity. Let us see how Orange liberty and Popish tyranny work out in practice. Are those who finger the drum stick morally superior to those who prefer to finger the beads? In the year 1910, Ulster had 1,383 illegitimate births, or half of those in Ireland, and of these 1,383 half took place in the loyal and virtuous county of Antrim, where Orangism is all-powerful. The Catholic county of Cavan had 22 such cases as against 600 for Antrim, Catholic county Monaghan 35, Fermanagh 38 and Donegal 89. Orangism apparently stretches liberty rather far. By their fruits you shall know them.

An Orangeman is nothing if not law-abiding, but here again statistics are decidedly in favor of the lawless Papist. In 1909, the latest returns available, the number of indictable offences committed in Ulster reached the total of 3,182, whereas Connaught had only 641. In the same year the claims for malicious injuries in Ulster totalled 329; in Connaught 107.

Let us see if the educational statistics bear out the assertion that Orangism spells enlightenment. According to the census of 1901 the percentage of persons over five years of age who were able to read and write was, in Ulster 79, in Munster 81. At the General Election in January 1910, the number of illiterate voters recorded in Ulster was 12,905, whilst the total for the other three provinces was 9,510. Orangism thus stands condemned as undemocratic, intolerant, lawless, ignorant, and immoral. By their fruits you shall know them. In subsequent articles we shall turn the searchlight on some other of its vain pretensions.

NOTES AND COMMENTS

THE ADMIRABLE example of tolerance and the love of free speech furnished by the Unionists of Ulster in their attitude towards the First Lord of the Admiralty will not be lost upon the world at large. It illustrates so convincingly the superior enlightenment and intelligence for which that portion of His Majesty's subjects has ever been conspicuous, and, contrariwise, brings into startling relief the obscurantism of Dublin and other Catholic cities of Ireland.

SIR EDWARD CARSON and his fellow conspirators have been at such pains to convince the world that Home Rule means oppression of the Protestant minority and the inauguration of a new

reign of darkness in Ireland, that this latest exhibition of their love of free speech may be considered most timely. Dublin may listen with patience and respect to the Unionist plea but Belfast will have none of the argument for Home Rule, and if Winston Churchill and John Redmond persist in their determination to state it, "not every policeman in Ireland, concentrated for the day in Belfast, could guarantee their safety." So, at least, the heads of the Police Department have assured the chief secretary. And the episode furnishes His Majesty's Government with the very strongest kind of justification for the immediate passing of the Home Rule Bill.

A WELL-KNOWN Protestant lawyer of Toronto, Mr. E. T. Malone, having complained to the Board of Education that he had been assessed as a Separate school supporter, and that his taxes, therefore, for the current year go to the Separate schools, the Board, at the instance of Trustee Levee, has rushed through the appointment of "an officer to look after the enrollment of ratepayers as Public school supporters, resisting the aggression of the Separate School Board along that line." Levee's antecedents as chief instigator of the "Protestant Slate" which sought the dismissal of the one Catholic teacher in the employ of the Board of Education, and as the compounder of a much-advertised curial specific, render it especially fitting that he should inaugurate the present crusade. Presumably he has already secured the new appointee's subscription for shares in his patent-medicine concern. That in the light of the past (vide Judge Winchester's court of enquiry) would be the fitting prelude to the appointment and ensure a proper degree of zeal in the prosecution of its duties. And the Separate School Board will on that account have all the more reason to carefully safeguard its own.

ALLOWING THAT the taxes in question were, through a clerical error, diverted from their proper channel, and that here and there similar errors may occur, what do these weigh in the balance with taxes that in every city in the Province of Ontario are diverted the other way? It is a notorious, unquestioned fact that, for whatever reason, taxes properly belonging to our Separate schools find their way continuously into the coffers of the Public schools, and every Catholic ratepayer knows the vigilance it requires on his part to ensure that his shall not be among the number. It would be evidence, therefore, of an enlightened public spirit on the part of the Toronto Board of Education to appoint an officer to see that taxes were properly and equitably distributed to both school systems, rather than to increase the difficulties with which Separate School Boards have already to contend in securing even a measure of their own. Unfortunately antecedents of the personnel of Toronto's Board of Education are not propitious in this regard. It rests with Separate School trustees, therefore, to checkmate the operations of the new official.

THE CHRISTIAN GUARDIAN devotes somewhat more than a column of a recent issue to a review of missionary givings of Protestant Christians throughout the world. The statistics reproduced from the Missionary Review interest us only for the light they shed on the much vaunted "movements" which, the Guardian, amongst others, assure us are "to Christianize the world in this generation." To judge from the publicity, and the whirlwind campaigns, and the banquets which characterize these movements, the missionary problem would seem to be in a fair way of being solved. The Guardian's statistics, however, are not exactly in harmony with this idea, for instead of showing an increase for the past year, they show a falling off of something more than a quarter of a million dollars as compared with 1910. Even so, we must marvel at the great total, which, if it at all represented the expenditure upon actual mission work, would be formidable indeed. It is stated, however, on good authority that the mere percentage of this prodigious outpouring reaches its destination, the great bulk being absorbed by administrative expenses at home and abroad.

THE TORONTO Methodist preacher who has been resurrecting the old so-called Jesuit oath and imputing to Jesuit theologians the doctrine of the end justifying the means, seems blissfully unconscious that he is giving himself away. It were idle to controvert him, for truth, which should be the end of all controversy, is to his kind an unknown virtue. If it were truth he were after he would give some evidence of it in his conduct and not cultivate cheap applause by the use of cowardly innuendo. To assure him then that the Jesuit is not the monster he depicts, and that no Jesuit or no Catholic theologian ever taught or practiced the vile doctrines he imputes to them, would be a waste of words.

BUT DOES NOT the Rev. C. O. Johnston, and do not others of his class, put into daily practice the very doctrine which he would fasten upon the Society of Jesus—viz., that the end justifies the means. We will assume (however extravagant the assumption) that the preacher in question wishes to serve a good end: how does he go about it? By setting at naught in the first place every precept of honor and fair play; by indulging in criminal slanders upon a venerable body of men whose very calling and high sense of the sacredness and dignity of the religion they profess precludes notice of him on their part; and by persistently giving currency to a vile document which he must know is not and never was true. These are the means made use of to accomplish what irresponsible like this C. O. Johnston call a good end. The man by his very methods wholly discredits his cause and places himself outside the pale of serious controversy. But he quite evidently knows on which side his bread is buttered.

THERE IS a remarkable passage in one of Cardinal Newman's discourses, which, though uttered sixty years or more ago, so aptly epitomizes this latest outcry against Catholics that we feel we cannot do better than reproduce it here. It is, he says, a principle of English law that no one should bring a charge against another without being under the obligation of supporting it. It is further a plain dictate of common equity that an accuser should have something to say for himself before he can put the accused on his defence. How does this righteous rule work out in practice as regards Protestant attacks upon the Catholic Church? It is, says the Cardinal, simply set aside.

"Instead of the *onus probandi*, as it is called, the burden of proof lying with the accuser, it is simply thrown upon the accused. Any one may get up of a sudden and may say what he will to our prejudice without producing any warrant at all for the truth of the charge. He is not called upon to establish his respectability, or to state his opportunities or methods of knowing; he need not give presumptive proof of his allegations; he need not give his authorities; he need only accuse; and upon this the Protestant public turns round to the poor Catholic, and asks what he has to say in his defence, as if he had yet anything to defend. There is a saying that a fool can ask more questions than a hundred wise men can answer. A bigot or a fanatic (let us say an irresponsible Methodist preacher) may be quite as successful in his way."

WE CONTINUE THE QUESTION:

"I put it to the experience,—I put it to the conscience of the Protestant world—whether such is not the justice which it deals out to Catholics as a matter of course. No evidence against us is too little; no indication too great. Statement without proof, though inadmissible in every other case, is all fair when we are concerned. A Protestant is at liberty to bring a charge against us and challenge us to refute, not any proofs he brings, for he brings none, but his simple assumption or assertion. And perhaps we accept his challenge, and then we find we have to deal with matters so vague or so minute, so general or so particular, that we are at our wit's end to know how to grapple with them. For instance, 'Every twentieth man you meet is a Jesuit in disguise,' or, 'Nunneries are, for the most part, prisons.' How is it possible to meet such sweeping charges? The utmost we can do, in the nature of things, is to show that this particular man, or that, is not a Jesuit; or that this or that particular nunnery is not a prison. . . . Thus, if the accuser is not to be called on to give proofs of what he says, we are simply helpless and must sit down meekly under the imputation."

ALL THIS applies with special force to the so-called "Jesuit oath." It never was nor never can be true. It is not to be found in any authentic code; it is a monstrous fabrication through and through—dishonest in those who coined it and no less dishonest in those who seek to fasten it upon the illustrious body of men under whose name it masquerades.

THE JESUITS are creatures of flesh and blood like the rest of us. In this as in other countries they are drawn from the best families in the land; they inherit the high traditions of honor and patriotism of their fathers, and their lives are consecrated in a spirit of self-abnegation to the good of their fellows. Like every other religious in the Catholic Church they take a vow upon their profession—a simple vow of poverty, chastity and obedience—a vow from which at any time they may be dispensed by the proper ecclesiastical authority. The exact form of that vow is the Jesuits' own personal affair, and, as such, does not concern others—even Catholics. Much less does it concern vulgar preachers or the great outside world. There is, however, no secret about it, and any honest enquiry of the proper quarter as to its terms would elicit a courteous and satisfactory answer.

FOR THE SAKE then of honest enquirers and of those weak souls whose minds are disturbed by the dreadful allegations being made against the Society of Jesus at this time, we herewith transcribe an exact translation of the vow which its members take upon their profession. This is the only "oath" which they do

take—the only "oath" which has ever been imposed upon any Jesuit from the very foundation of the Society:

"Almighty and Eternal God, I—, though altogether most unworthy, in Thy divine sight, yet, relying on Thy infinite goodness and mercy, and impelled by a desire of serving Thee, do hereby vow, before the Most Blessed Virgin Mary and the whole heavenly court, to Thy divine majesty perpetual poverty, chastity and obedience in the Society of Jesus. And I promise to enter the same Society, and spend my life therein, understanding fully all the constitutions of said Society. I supplicate implore of Thee, therefore, O my God, by the Blood of Jesus Christ, that as in Thy immense goodness and gracious mercy Thou hast been so merciful to me, this, my holocaust, in the odor of sweetness, so Thou wilt grant me abundant grace to fulfill it. Amen."

This translation was done by the late Father Francis Ryan, at the time (1901) Rector of St. Michael's Cathedral, Toronto, formerly and for many years an honored and respected member of the Society of Jesus. It should set at rest all misgivings which may have been engendered in the minds of weak or ill-instructed Catholics by the abuse now being so industriously heaped upon their Faith.

THE PAPAL DECREE ON CIVIL INDICTMENT OF THE CLERGY

London Tablet

The Archbishop of Dublin has rendered a notable service to the public, both Catholic and non-Catholic, by his clear and masterly explanation of the Papal Decree *Quantumvis diligenter*, which the average Orangeman takes in the decrees of the Pope need not be stated here in precise terms. He himself usually takes care that it is expressed in language that cannot well be misunderstood. To ordinary minds it might be a subject of surprise that a decree like that which we have mentioned should have suddenly been vested with so much notoriety in such unexpected quarters. But the situation is not without an element of humor, which after all, is what we ought to expect from an episode on the political stage in Ireland.

The *Motu Proprio* decree in question was about as commonplace and unexceptional an utterance as could be found in the dry, and sometimes fairly dull pages of Canonical law-books. It merely settled the interpretation of a disputed point in an old decree, issued as far back as 1893, some forty years ago. It was a mooted question amongst Canonists whether the ancient prohibition, rehearsed in 1893, prohibiting Catholics from bringing clerics before the secular courts, applied to the individual plaintiff or to the legislative or judicial authorities. The prohibition was not by any means a universal one, because there were parts of the Church in which the provision of Canon law, owing to circumstances, had ceased to insist upon its observance. For this reason the Decree of 1893 did not censure generally and indiscriminately all Catholics who caused clerics to appear before the Civil Courts, but only those who did so *præter canonicas dispositiones* viz., contrary to the provisions of Canon law.

Hence in countries in which, owing to clauses in Concordats, the prohibition had been abrogated, or in other countries in which, by the Canonical principle of desuetude it has ceased to be in force, the action of the Catholic suing an ecclesiastic in the Civil Courts would be contrary to Canon law. Hence in countries in which, owing to clauses in Concordats, the prohibition had been abrogated, or in other countries in which, by the Canonical principle of desuetude it has ceased to be in force, the action of the Catholic suing an ecclesiastic in the Civil Courts would be contrary to Canon law. Hence in countries in which, owing to clauses in Concordats, the prohibition had been abrogated, or in other countries in which, by the Canonical principle of desuetude it has ceased to be in force, the action of the Catholic suing an ecclesiastic in the Civil Courts would be contrary to Canon law. Hence in countries in which, owing to clauses in Concordats, the prohibition had been abrogated, or in other countries in which, by the Canonical principle of desuetude it has ceased to be in force, the action of the Catholic suing an ecclesiastic in the Civil Courts would be contrary to Canon law.

This state of equality did not at all suit the purposes of the Dublin Daily Express. It is not a Catholic journal by any means, and its subscribers are mostly members of the Orange Society, but it could not allow the Papal Decree to be taken so quietly—at least, at the present time. Its writers, belonging to a class which has been aptly described as politicians on the pounce, believed that in the Papal Decree, they had made a decided find and one which was singularly opportune in view of the present political situation. If the British elector could be assured that the Vatican barred under penalty of excommunication the exercise of civil rights and the access to the Civil Courts, and that the Catholic tailor who gave credit to his priest for ten pounds' worth of clothes could not recover his debt without the permission of the Bishop—and if, further, it could be shown that a Home Rule Parliament, composed mainly of Catholics would compulsively give to this provision the force and sanction of civil law, and thus extend it to the debt which the priest might also owe to the Protestant merchant, what a serviceable and telling argument would not all this afford to the orator on the hustings and on the platform of electoral meetings in the political campaign of the

next few years—especially if the harrowing picture of that poor Protestant merchant on his knees before the Popish Bishop, begging leave to get within reach of the King's justice, while the recalcitrant priest stands laughing behind the Bishop's shoulder, were rhetorically worked up, so as to play upon the feelings of a sympathetic audience! That the Catholic Church teaches that no authority on earth, whether of Pope, Bishop or priest, can ever supersede or traverse a claim of natural justice; that Pius X., in issuing his decree has no more wish or notion of perpetrating such enormities than has the man in the moon, are apparently mere matters of detail which the journalists interested have not had time to take into account. The political possibilities of the decree as a text for a rousing election cry, and the securing of votes are quite independent of considerations of that kind, and they constitute the main chance, and are much too tempting to be left unutilized.

As a result, the Daily Express of Dublin proceeded with a certain kind of courage that knows no fear, not only to publish in *extenso*, but for the benefit of its readers, to give a translation of the Papal Decree. The writer seems not to have been deterred by his lack of capacity for the task. The fact that the document was a legal one, couched in technical language, that the making of a decently correct translation would demand at least some elementary knowledge of Canon law and of the style of the Roman tribunals, does not appear to have troubled his literary conscience. No one expects the journalist to possess such specialist requirements, but then no one expects the journalist to turn out as the public translator of Papal Canonical Decrees. In such a case the "sensitive conscience" of the Archbishop of Dublin very properly calls him, could hardly help avoiding pitfalls and could not easily escape giving to those who know some amusement, which is not the less poignant because he seems to be all the while so deadly in earnest. As a matter of fact, he not only blundered, but contrived to select for his blunder the very clause—the *præter canonicas dispositiones*—which, as a limiting provision, happens to be the very keystone to the interpretation of the whole document. Had he even kept to a literal rendering of the words, and used *præter* in the Teresian sense of "contrary," he might have veiled his mystification but he insisted upon proving that he has not a notion of the meaning of what he has undertaken to English by translating the clause as "without canonical dispensation." As the Archbishop points out, *dispositio* is not *dispensatio* and no Canonist would ever dream of confusing the one with the other. It is easily seen that this perversion of the clause utterly falsified the whole import of the Decree.

The meaning in the original is that the summoning of the Clergy before the civil courts is punished with excommunication if it is done contrary to the Canon law. It would not be contrary to Canon law in countries where special arrangements had been made by Concordats, or in countries in which the Clergy had fallen into desuetude. Consequently, the clause cuts off an enormous area of the Catholic world from the application of the Decree. But according to the amateur translation, it would mean that the Decree held good over the entire area of the Catholic world and could only be escaped by the persons in each individual case applying for and obtaining a "dispensation." In other words, the Papal Decree in itself need have no application to people in these countries, but the Papal Decree as "translated" by the Dublin Daily Express would mean that no Irish Catholic could sue a cleric in the civil courts without first procuring a dispensation, and this, in adept hands, could be dressed up as a bogey in the political campaign and duly staged on the platforms of the anti-Catholic minority.

Following upon the exploit of its translator, there is a decided touch of Celtic political humour in the way in which the Daily Express and its colleagues have received the Archbishop's letter. The evidence adduced by His Grace had completely pricked the bubble which had been blown for the entertainment of the British electors. As a result, they have agreed to consider the Archbishop's letter as "unsatisfactory." Naturally, when a zealous and hard-working organ of the press has carefully elaborated a portentous argument to show that Home Rule means Rome Rule and has gone to the lengths of publishing the translation of its own free will, it is "unsatisfactory" to have a Catholic Archbishop, who presumably knows more about such decrees than a non-Catholic journalist, proving about as clearly as evidence can prove that the Papal Decree has no reference to Ireland and that it has more to do with Home Rule than it has with the signs of the Zodiac or the binomial theorem. Of course, the Archbishop may state in the most considerate and painstaking way the reasons which to every impartial reader, and certainly to every canonist, are conclusive and convincing, but how can that possibly help or satisfy men whose very object is that an explanation should not be forthcoming? They have made up their minds that the Pope should be convicted of tramping upon civil rights in Ireland. How then can it be "satisfactory" that the Archbishop clears the Pope from any thought or intention of doing so? On the contrary as the Times correspondent gravely informs us, they have unanimously found it to be "utterly unsatisfactory." If the Archbishop could only have written a letter showing that the Decree meant all that the daily express wishes it to be—that the Vatican was busily engaged in plotting against the civil liberties of Irishmen and especially of Irish Protestants—a letter which could be distributed broadcast in the shape of political leaflets and read amid applause from political platforms, the Times correspondent would have had the more pleasant task of announcing to all whom it might concern that the Archbishop's letter was found to be supremely satisfactory. As it is, the unanimous cry of the Irish Protestant Press that it is "unsatisfactory" is precisely its most

eloquent tribute to the success with which his Grace has disposed of a ludicrous attempt to bolster up the Rome Rule contention with a mistranslation of a Papal Decree, which has not the remotest bearing upon the political situation in Ireland.

When we pass from the narrow-minded factionist, with whom reasons are nothing and political pleadings are everything to the normal and fair minded public, there are a few notable points in the matter which it is desirable to keep in view. The ancient custom by which the clergy were tried in their own courts—the *privilegium fori*—dates back to the earlier centuries of Christianity and was a recognised part of the Church discipline of Christendom under the Christian Emperors. Here in England from the time of the Conquest to the Reformation, it was an integral part of the Constitution. It was founded in the Catholic and religious feeling that cases affecting clerics would be more suitably and becomingly dealt with in their own tribunals, and by their own superiors. After the Reformation, in most countries affected by the movement, the privilege no longer had the recognition of the civil law. In some, it continued in force amongst Catholics, in others it has gradually fallen into desuetude. Even in Catholic countries it has been modified by Concordats, and cases affecting wills or debts have been reserved for the civil jurisdiction. Even apart from its legal aspect, it is in most cases felt to be a matter of ordinary Christian procedure and of spiritual decency, that before a Catholic takes his priest into the secular court his Bishop or ecclesiastical superiors should be approached, so that they may do what in them lies to settle the matter in dispute in an amicable way. The Catholic plaintiff can lose nothing by so doing, as the civil court remains always open to him and the permission to proceed thither is not left to the arbitrary discretion of the Bishop. On the contrary, in those places where the privilege still obtains, by a Decree of the Holy See (January 23, 1886) the Bishop, if he cannot bring about a peaceable arrangement, is bound to give the required permission to take the case into the civil court. It would be difficult to see how any real grievance or prejudice to civil rights could arise through the working of so simple and straightforward a regulation.

In countries where the privilege has fallen into disuse and therefore, by the rule of Canon law itself, has lost its Canonical binding force, the matter is still further simplified, since, in such a hypothesis, the Papal Decree, by its own wording—*præter canonicas dispositiones*—has no application. The evidence in the Archbishop's letter goes to prove that amongst these countries must be classed Ireland and the United States of America. Great Britain, by analogy, would enter into the same category. Naturally, His Grace cannot be expected to assume the role of the Pope or the Rota in Ireland, and therefore most properly added a postscript to his letter to say that it expresses his opinion, while an authentic judgment on the point naturally belongs to the Supreme Church Authority. We need hardly say that in the way of expert opinion his conclusions have the highest value, and his judgment on the crucial point—the limiting clause—coincides with that of one of the most learned Canonists in Rome, Father Heiner, the accuracy of whose conclusion was officially vouched for in the reply of the Vatican to the German Ambassador.

But all this fails to satisfy the political Canonists of the Dublin Daily Express, for who shall satisfy those politicians whose chief interest it is to remain unsatisfied?

DR. WALSH TELLS OF MODERN SUPERSTITIONS

A reporter who was questioning Dr. James J. Walsh, the noted Catholic physician, educator, author and lecturer, recently on his interest in the thirteenth century, ventured to ask whether the people of his day were not very superstitious.

"They weren't any more superstitious than we are," replied Dr. Walsh. "Dowie founded a city of his own, and in 1896 people in Chicago formed a line five deep and two blocks long to pass in front of Healer Schlatter and have him touch them."

"Come to think of it," the doctor chuckled, "there isn't any number 13 on this street." We have 12 and 14. "Superstition is appealed to now under the name of science, and the people will fall for anything. Think of the quantities of patent medicines that go down the public's throat and the 101 cure-all devices. Just look at these."

The doctor took out of a drawer a couple of hind legs of a metal. One was copper and other zinc.

"You put one in each shoe and they make a battery which will cure all sorts of ailments," he said. "The fellow that bought these paid \$2 for them and they must have cost 25 cents at least. I've got some fine electric belts here, too, if you want to see them."

"I can remember the blue glass cure very well and have a good picture in my mind's eye of my uncle sitting patiently under a blue glass for his rheumatism. Lots of folks were cured by the blue glass treatment. When anybody talks to me about the superstition of the Middle Ages I wonder if he isn't joking."

"How did you come to get interested in the Middle Ages," was the next question.

"I spent three years abroad after completing my medical course," answered the doctor, "and I noticed that almost everything that I wanted to see had 1300 written on it. It might be a picture of a fine piece of embroidery or a wonderful cathedral, or almost anything that Baedeker put down as interesting, and I usually found that it was built or carved in the thirteenth century. That started my interest, and since then it has been my hobby."

"The spirit of fraternity which socialists are aiming at now was the very spirit of the Middle Ages. In England there were 30,000 guilds for 3,000,000 inhabitants. They carried fire insurance, life insurance and insurance against robbery and shipwrecks."

"And you've heard of that fine new idea about visiting and district nurses. Well, they had them in the Middle Ages. They were furnished by the guilds especially for night services, and the members were expected to pay if they could, and if they couldn't it came out of the guild treasury."

"And were they happier? Of course they were, for they had an opportunity to do what they liked best. In an English cathedral the wonderful gilded doors are a sight for tourists. There is a bill for those doors still in the library of the chapter house, and they were built by the village blacksmith, and the town carpenter made the exquisite choir stalls. Do you suppose they would have none so well if they hadn't liked their work? And the delicate embroidery of the women is still a marvel."

"The subway and the elevated with steam and electricity have given us so much more time than they had. But who's got any time now? Nobody I know of except the farmers who haven't put in modern improvements yet."

"And how about education for the people? We're just getting around to the manual training idea. Then there were art guilds, craft guilds, and merchant guilds, not to speak of the various trade guilds. Boys were apprenticed to men following such vocations as the youth had a liking for and received an adequate training."

"The town of York 12,000 citizens when the cathedral there was built, and the town of Lincoln the same number, and neither had to send out for a workman. And when we want to build a monumental structure we search the world for artisans and then model after something in the Middle Ages."

"The people were not taught to read and write, the printing press had not been invented and few books were available, but they were taught to work and to think. The fact that they could construct such wonderful buildings and appreciate them after they were erected means a whole lot. How much do you get out of their present ability to read the scandals of yesterday, the rumors of to-day and the comic supplement."

CHURCHES IN SCOTLAND AND MORAL DEGRADATION

Under the heading "The Churches and Moral Degradation," an article in the Scotsman (principal daily paper of Scotland) tells of the churches which impel the Protestant churches to union. The writer does not mince words (remarks the Catholic Herald, from which we quote). He is perfectly candid. "It is," says he, "the growing mass of the religiously indifferent and the problem of social misery which is summoning the churches most urgently to 'close the ranks.'" The committee who draw up reports for church courts have an amazing power of self-deception, but not even church courts can deceive themselves as to the condition of religion at present in this country. The testimony of history is that wherever the religious restraint loses its power, there the people will have the churches bent down to moral degradation. A report has been issued lately regarding the moral state of Glasgow, which shows that vice has increased to an alarming extent in that city. If the facts given in that report are true—and they have not yet been disproved—then the question presents itself, what have the churches been doing when they allowed such a condition of things to come about without lifting a voice of warning? Can it be the case that while they were wasting their resources on suicidal and irrelevant competition amid dwindling populations, they allowed great masses of people to become the prey of irrepressible forces without making urgent efforts to bring the religious motives to bear on them?"

"Have they washed their hands of all responsibility for the forces which produce moral degradation, deeming it enough that the State taught the people to read and count? Have they not realized that it is useless teaching our boys and girls the abuses of letters and the tricks of figures, and then leaving them to turn their arithmetic to roguery and their literature to lust? Shepherding the two and three in the zeal for sect, have they parted with the power of shepherding the thousands? Can it be the case that the condition of things on which we have the churches bent down in Glasgow is a condition not applicable to Glasgow alone, and yet the churches raise not their testimony, and look on without power, because their energy is dissipated through disunion? It is these questions, and questions such as these, which the people of Scotland will ask of the churches, and, asking, will require an answer."

The Protestant churches of Scotland will not give satisfactory answers to these questions. Only in the "One Fold and under the One Shepherd" can a solution be found of the problem presented by the Scotsman writer.

O Would I Were in Ireland

Rev. J. J. Johnson, P. E. I.
Oh, would I were in Ireland,
My own long suffering land,
When the sun of freedom brightens
Her vale and ennobles hills,
And hear the joy bells ringing
The glad tidings bringing,
Of victory descending
On her lakes and rippling rills,
The harp that long was silent
Under the dark harp of my land,
That once the halls of Tara,
With melody made gay,
Would lose its note of sadness,
Exchanged for one of gladness,
And sing the song of freedom,
In old Ireland far away.
The Isle of saints and sages,
Renowned for history's pages,
The Noble of nations,
Weeping for her martyred dead
Would turn in ecstasy
From sadding contemplation
To watch the light of freedom,
Over her hills and valleys spread,
Her scars, her badge of glory
Her ruins, her vestiges of
Would shine with quickening ray
And that that quickening ray
And round all God's creations
Proclaim the dawn of freedom
In old Ireland far away.
Oh, would I were in Ireland!
God bless her hills and miry-land,
When by concentrated wisdom
In Parliament is sent
To mould her future story
While on its ruins it flashes
The harp entwined with shamrocks
Flaunts upon its fields of green
The rank of the noble's great
Our Emmet's honored ashes
Announces to the nation
Old Erin's new birth-day.
The green flag waving o'er us,
Well join the joyful chorus,
And sing the song of freedom
In old Ireland far away.