

The Catholic Record

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.
 United States and Europe—\$2.50.
 Publisher & Proprietor, Thomas Coffey, L.L.D.
 Editors—Rev. James T. Foley, D.D.,
 Thomas Coffey, L.L.D.
 Associate Editor—H. F. Mackintosh.
 Manager—Robert M. Burns.
 Address business letters to the Manager.
 Classified Advertising 15 cents per line.
 Remittance must accompany the order.
 Where CATHOLIC RECORD Box address is
 required send 10 cents to prepay expense of
 postage upon replies.
 Ordinary and marriage notices cannot be
 inserted except in the usual condensed form.
 Each insertion 50 cents.
 The Editor cannot be held responsible for
 unsolicited manuscripts. Every endeavor will
 be made to return rejected contributions when
 stamped addressed envelopes are enclosed.
 The CATHOLIC RECORD has been approved
 and recommended by Archbishops Falconio
 and Shevett, late Apostolic Delegates to
 Canada, the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston,
 Ottawa, and St. Boniface, the Bishops of
 London, Hamilton, Peterborough and Oshawa,
 N. Y., and the clergy throughout the
 Dominion.

LONDON, SATURDAY, JUNE 18, 1926

LAYING THE CORNER STONE OF THE NEW SEMINARY

Whitsunday's bright morning, giving assurance of a glorious summer day, dispelled many a fear and turned worry into joy in all parts of the Diocese of London. For on Pentecost Sunday the corner stone of the new St. Peter's Seminary was to be laid.

Eminently fitting was the day chosen for this epochal event in the history of the Diocese. Nineteen centuries ago when the days of the Pentecost were accomplished the Spirit of God descended on the apostles and they were all filled with the Holy Ghost. Then these weak, timid, cowardly men, hiding from fear of the Jews, received such light and strength that they went forth with indomitable courage and flaming zeal to transform a sinful world into the Kingdom of God. They had received their final preparation for the work of the Christian priesthood, that work which is to go on unto the consummation of the world.

These things the Feast of Pentecost brings to the minds of all Catholics, for that is the very meaning and purpose of the Feast. The whole liturgy proclaims and fulfils this purpose. The Gospel of the Pentecost Mass with its Lesson from the Acts of the Apostles tells in the sublimely simple language of Holy Writ of the mighty promise, its fulfilment and its effects.

But to the Catholics of London Diocese this far-off Pentecost was become singularly near; the first priests baptized in the Holy Ghost nineteen centuries ago had their successors, adown the ages even to their own beloved priests gathered there with them for the solemn function that brought from every parish in the Diocese the thousands that thronged the Seminary grounds. Aided by the earnest eloquence of the Bishop they envisioned the endless procession of priests that year after year, generation after generation, would be trained within these walls and go forth to minister to them, to their children, to their children's children, to their remote posterity in that dim but certain future toward which even the wings of imagination faltered in their flight.

Those who guide the Church today are heirs to nineteen hundred years of experience—a priceless heritage. And in the economy of Divine Providence human experience and human wisdom have their place. But today as on the first Pentecost the Church of God enjoys the guidance of the Holy Ghost, the spirit of truth, who, according to Christ's promise, will abide with her forever.

That wisdom born of age-long experience, enlightened and guided in all such essential things by the Holy Spirit of God, has prescribed the education and training which young men shall receive in preparation for the sacrament of Holy Order that sends them forth priests to carry on the mighty mission committed by Jesus Christ to His Church. That education and training is the exclusive work of the Great Seminary.

It was the realization of all this that moved the vast multitude of people gathered to witness the laying of the corner stone of St. Peter's Seminary. This it was that accounted for the feeling of reverent joy and pride; that made hope more buoyant and faith more living, and charity more ardent in everyone present. And in the unity of faith that was sensibly felt the emotions of each reacted on all until their hearts sang: "This is the day the Lord hath made: let us exult and rejoice therein."

Many were surprised and delighted to find the walls had reached such a height as clearly to outline the building and suggest how worthy

an embodiment of the Seminary idea it will be when completed. All felt a glow of pride and gratitude in the thought that they each and all shared in the great work not alone of the building which their generosity and faith made possible, but in the high and holy purpose the Seminary is intended to serve.

"A sacerdotal order is historically the essence of the Church." According to the prescriptions of the Church a Seminary training and education is an essential prerequisite for the ordination of young men to the priesthood.

The laying of the corner stone of St. Peter's Seminary on Pentecost Sunday was, then, an event of vital importance and deep significance in the history of the Diocese of London; indeed, in the history of the Church in Canada.

"INDIVIDUAL OPINION" AND THE "AUTHORITY OF THE CHURCH"

Were it not an old story the despatch carried by the newspapers under date of June 1 would be astounding reading.

The cable tells us that Bishop Barnes of Birmingham, preaching before the Royal Institute of Public Health, thus openly advocated birth control:

"Human welfare," he said, "is now menaced by human fecundity. The change from large to small families is not to be impatiently condemned. Victories in medicine and hygiene may be disastrous for public welfare unless the desire for many children, which is natural and until recently laudible, is held in check."

The subject of birth control is one that until very recent years Christian decency would relegate to a place amongst those things that St. Paul forbade to be so much as named amongst clear-minded and self-respecting Christians. But we have changed all that. And now this pagan practice, revolting to every instinct of Christian morality, is openly discussed, even advocated, by shameless women and 'scientific' clergymen who have 'advanced' so far beyond the Gospel of Jesus Christ as to find therein nothing sufficiently 'progressive' to suit the needs of this age of enlightenment and progress.

Bishop Barnes, the cable informs us, is well known as a scientist and the only Fellow of the Royal Society on the Episcopal bench. Scientist Bishop Barnes may be, for the term is elastic and often stretched to cover the most obscure in the world of scholarship. Bishop Barnes is not amongst the most obscure it is true; but his chief eminence comes from his office in the Church of England as by law established. He is bishop in the Established Church by the grace of the Prime Minister and the favor of the political powers that be—or that were at the time of his appointment. The Established Church is often fondly called the national Church, the Church of the nation. For the princely emoluments attached to the office the nation has some right to expect from its well-paid religious functionaries some service to religion. But the term 'scientist,' vague and elastic as it is, carries with it a superstitious reverence the more profound as we go deeper down into the great multitude who, we do not say could give no clear-cut definition of the terms, but who, to save their lives, could give no intelligible idea of what 'science' and 'scientist' means to them. To high office in the national Church there no longer attaches widespread reverence, superstitious or otherwise. So perhaps Dr. Barnes was solely tempted to take up and advocate advanced 'scientific' views. Yet, scientists there are aplenty who utterly disagree on scientific grounds with the scientific Bishop Barnes. And even amongst scientists as well as amongst other God-fearing people there are many who may think that Bishop Barnes would have contributed much more to the public health discussions had he inculcated the lessons of clean living and social justice to be drawn from the gospel of Jesus Christ.

But it is not so much the incongruity of the Bishop's position that we wish to note here as the fact that the Anglican Canon Hicks withstood to his face the Anglican Bishop in the familiar Anglican way. Here is the worthy Canon's pale and amusing imitation of St. Paul:

"In the evening the vicar of Brighton, Canon F. C. N. Hicks, said he owed it to the people of his congregation and Brighton at large to announce he disagreed profoundly with the Bishop's teaching."

"Bishop Barnes was not preaching in the diocese of which he is the Bishop, and was therefore expressing merely an individual opinion without carrying the authority of the Church. The canon would say nothing on the value of the Bishop's words as contributions to the discussions of the Public Health Institute and had no wish to foreclose the discussion in its proper place, but he intended himself, he said, to abide by the Church and its teaching."

We can not withhold our sympathy and even a certain admiration for Canon Hicks. He is evidently one of those many sincere Christian souls in the Church of England who cling with a faith—heroic or pathetic according to the point of view—to the idea that the Church as by law established is the Church of God in England.

That it is a teaching Church, a Church teaching in the name and with the authority of Jesus Christ. Otherwise the Canon's words are meaningless. Canon Hicks 'disagreed profoundly with the Bishop's teaching' and professed his intention "to abide by the Church and its teaching."

So evidently the teaching of the Bishop conflicts with and contradicts the teaching of the Church in which he holds high office. Will the heterodox bishop be disciplined? One need not be a prophet nor the son of a prophet to predict with certainty that he will not be called in, in any way to account. When a bishop's teaching contradicts the teaching of the Church it only proves that that Church has a new mark or note which is proudly proclaimed "comprehensiveness!"

It would seem, however, that sincere and earnest Anglican souls would be troubled and sore at heart over such "teaching of the Church." Well of course many are and they finally either drift into agnosticism or find their way into that Church which is the pillar and ground of truth and whose teachings are always consistent with themselves because they are the teachings of Jesus Christ.

But the worthy Canon shows us the Anglican way out of Anglican difficulties:

"Bishop Barnes was not preaching in the diocese of which he is the bishop and was therefore expressing merely an individual opinion without carrying the authority of the Church."

A splendid proof of the clear thinking and plain speaking of the straightforward and forth-right Englishman who has infinite scorn for what he contemptuously terms 'casuistry'!

But if Bishop Barnes should "preach in the diocese of which he is the Bishop" the "individual opinion" he holds on this question of elementary morals, would it then become the "teaching of the Church"? Wherein does the teaching authority of the Church of England reside? The supreme tribunal in all these matters for the Church by Law Established is the power that established it—the King, Lords and Commons of the realm of England.

Canon Hicks is without doubt a sincere, earnest and pious Anglican clergyman of the established Church; and equally without doubt the type of a large class.

With such earnest souls the cause of loyalty to "the Church of their baptism" would seem to be wonderfully well served by a complete and absolute lack of the sense of humor.

THE SITUATION IN FRANCE
 BY THE OBSERVER

Since I wrote in this column a few comments on the political situation in France, I have seen a letter by Francois Veulliot of Paris in L'Action Catholique, of Quebec, which confirms, apparently, the view I took of that situation.

Francis Veulliot, under date of May 25th, writes a very interesting account of affairs in France, and says:

"At certain periods, we have seen the Catholics unite and protest against the assaults of the Freemasons, but never so wholeheartedly, or with so much discipline, or tenacity as in the past six months. And their manifestations had sometimes a good deal of amplitude and energy. But before the War, the

opinion of the masses remained indifferent if not hostile to what was called the clerical agitation. Public opinion did not feel profoundly that the Catholics had the right of it, and that the country was injured deeply by the persecution of religion. Today this mentality, blind or inert, has been greatly changed—to sum it up, the general opinion is, even amongst those who do not share the convictions of the Catholics, that they have the right to be left in peace and free. The new Premier announces that it is necessary in the public interest and to promote concord, to change the policy of the Government. The controversy is, he says, damaging to the credit of France. So while fifteen or twenty years ago the attempts at resistance failed to galvanize the opinion of the masses, doped by material prosperity and by political lies, while at that time the resistance did not interrupt the march of administrations, today the Catholic protest awakes profound echoes in popular opinion. In two words, the sentiment and temperament of the French people will no longer support the anti-clerical virus. But I repeat that the victory of April, 1925, is a victory of The Marne. It is a check which leaves the enemy at our gates; still with power and still willing. Such victories are precarious if the victors lay down their arms and relax their vigilance."

Mr. Veulliot thinks that if the Catholics permit themselves to be lulled, they will be again attacked later on when public opinion is satisfied in respect of other matters. He draws attention to the fact that the new government is drawn from the same groups and supported by the same majority as the Herriot government. He says that the change of policy is due to the Catholic resistance, but not wholly to that resistance, as the Catholic resistance was powerfully assisted by the change in public opinion generally, and by the events of the day, by which he means no doubt the unsatisfactory condition of the French franc in the exchange market.

In a general way these views and facts stated by Mr. Veulliot confirm what we had gathered from the despatches and other sources of information. If the Catholics had not taken the bold course they did take, the change in public opinion would have had no impetus to manifest itself. The brilliant and razor-edged satire of Father Donceour, and the blunt patriotism and straightforwardness of General De Castelnau, could hardly fail to appeal to a nation of generous minded men even if a great many of them have lost the faith; and the fall of the franc came in handily to show the people who had worshipped material prosperity that the franc was not wholly safe in the hands of men merely because they were loud mouthed proclaimers of that queer conception of worldliness—a state without religion.

NOTES AND COMMENTS

A BAPTIST preacher laments that there are 50,000 "foreigners" in Western Canada "who will never hear the Gospel except through missionaries speaking their own language." He further laments that certain individuals from the old countries who volunteered for this service were found later to be preaching, not the Gospel, but socialism and worse. Does not this describe accurately the policy of so-called missionaries, Baptist and others, who masquerade as Catholics and celebrate bogus Masses with a view to seducing the "little ones of Christ" from the Faith of their fathers?

In his sermon as retiring Moderator of the now defunct Presbyterian Church in Canada, the Rev. Dr. MacKinnon of Halifax said: "In the 'Book of Assumptions,' about two or three years after the Reformation in Scotland, there is a quaint entry, marking the gift of twenty Scottish pounds (they were worth about a shilling each) to some Cistercian nuns who had been dispossessed from their convent at North Berwick and were in poverty. What a tale lies hidden in that simple entry! It is an epitome of all that we are trying to say. One can fancy one of these nuns, an elderly one, living through the upheaval of the Reformation. What unexpected and perplexing changes has not the poor old lady witnessed, from those happy days when as a merry-hearted girl she

passed the convent gates and joined the pious sisterhood and entered on those years of devotion to her books, her garden, her needlework, the help of the poor and the care of the stranger, in which she had hoped to spend the remainder of her life!"

But, the preacher went on to say, "strange rumors disturbed the quiet of the cloister—rumors as wild and incredible as those that first broke on the modern ear from revolutionary Russia—the passionate sermon of John Knox, the riot at Perth, the rifling of the churches, the destruction of the monasteries, the overthrow of all that seemed fixed and eternal. Then fast upon the heels of rumor came the feet of the mob itself. Her convent was dismantled, her vestments were forbidden, and while the kindly Scottish heart did not suffer her to starve, she lived in penury and labored with her hands, and at times one can fancy her as she plied her needle, giving a jab with that sharp-pointed weapon into the imaginary flesh of John Knox at the mention of the name of the great Reformer."

THE ABOVE may be taken as a touching and, with limitations, a true picture of that old Catholic and conventual life of Scotland which the man Knox, more than any other single individual, was responsible for bringing to an end. The contrast between the peaceful life of the cloister with all its good influences upon the life of the nation as sketched by the preacher, and the noisy fanaticism of the fanatical Knox, has impressed many a student, as apparently it has impressed Dr. Mackinnon. The greater the marvel then, that, shutting his eyes to the howls of the mob—Knox's "rascal multitude,"—he should proceed to the averment that "God was in that movement!" What further proof need we that one can read into history what the genuine warrants of history categorically deny!

IN THE present state of feeling in England as to the future of the churches, there is significance, which might be absent at other times, in the placing of a portrait of the present Pope in the Bodleian Library at Oxford. The portrait, which is said to be an excellent likeness, is by the Anglo-Hungarian artist, de Lazo, who presented it to the library. The Bodleian, it may be added, is particularly interested in Pius XI, since His Holiness studied there while making a prolonged stay in Oxford many years ago. Another Pope who visited England was Pius II. (Silvio Piccolomini) in the fifteenth century. It was during his cardinalate that he made an extended tour of England and Scotland.

ON THE question of the relation of Science to Revelation about which so much nonsense is talked, Mr. Chesterton, always timely and pointed in his remarks, has something to say. He is commenting on a London daily which said: "We are beginning to recognize that religion must accept the conclusions of science." "When we read this in the leading article every morning," G. K. C. writes, "we never seem to have sufficient scepticism or liveliness in us to ask the obvious question about it. That religion may accept the conclusions of science, it is necessary that science should conclude. And science never does conclude. It is the whole claim and boast of science that she never does conclude. To conclude means to shut up; and the very last thing the man of science is likely to do is to shut up. When we say 'You must accept the conclusions of the Court of Chancery,' we mean something by it. We mean that even a Chancery suit does come to an end at last. When we say that we must accept the conclusions of the Home Secretary, we mean something very practical indeed. We mean that a particular man will be hanged on a particular morning, not having sufficient social influence to get his insanity accepted as one of the conclusions of science. We mean that when he has been hanged, it becomes a delicate matter to offer him an apology. But it is the whole point of science never to be in this sense final or irrevocable. Of course, this does not mean that we shall not work more wisely if we work in the light of the suggestions of science, or take note of the general tendencies of science. It only means that

the people who use these words ten thousand times a year have not taken note of what they are saying. As a matter of fact, if men had altered their doctrines to suit discoveries, they would often have had to alter them back again, when the discoveries were, so to speak, undiscovered again. Religion was asked to accept the conclusions of science, when science no longer accepted the conclusions of science. But the main point is not a particular one of science but a general one of reason. If science had concluded, it would mean almost literally that science had shut up shop."

U. S. SUPREME COURT KILLS OREGON LAW

THE SWEEPING DECISION IS UNANIMOUS—"REPUGNANT TO THE CONSTITUTION AND VOID"

Washington, June 1.—The Supreme Court of the United States today held the Oregon anti-private school Act of 1922 to be unconstitutional and sustained the injunction granted by the Federal District Court of Oregon restraining officials of that State from enforcing the law when, under its terms, it would become effective next year. Mr. Justice McKeen delivered the opinion of the Court. The full membership of the Supreme Bench was present and there was no dissenting opinion. Today's decision affects the cases of the Sisters of the Holy Names of Jesus and Mary, and the Hill Military Academy.

By virtue of the decision the rights of parents to direct the education of their children are sustained against improper restraints by State legislation so long as the Federal Constitution is the basic law of the land. The Court's statement on this issue was one of the most sweeping and far reaching in the history of that tribunal.

"The fundamental theory of liberty upon which all governments in this Union repose excludes any general power of the State to standardize its children by forcing them to accept instruction from public teachers only," the decision reads. "The child is not the mere creature of the State; those who nurture him and direct his destiny have the right, coupled with the high duty, to recognize and prepare him for additional obligations."

In such words the Supreme Court granted the request, made in briefs filed by Oregon officials when the case was being argued that the fundamental constitutional question involved be decided.

The decision delivered by Justice McKeen today upholds the ruling of the lower Court that the Fourteenth Amendment is a guarantee against deprivation of property without due process of law and that the right to conduct schools is property within the meaning of the Amendment. Pointing out that no emergency requiring the exercise of extraordinary powers was alleged to exist in Oregon in 1922 and that no evidence had been introduced to indicate that the Private schools had been guilty of abuses calling for corrective measures, the decision reads:

"As often heretofore pointed out, rights guaranteed by the Constitution may not be abridged by legislation which has no reasonable relation to some purpose within the competency of the State."

The Supreme Court, by today's decision, also accepts the ruling of the lower court that the suits for injunctions brought by the Sisters of the Holy Names of Jesus and Mary, and by the Hill Military Academy prior to September 1, 1926, the effective date of the Act—were not prematurely brought. The complete text of the decision reads:

TEXT OF DECISION

"These appeals are from decrees, based upon undenied allegations, which granted preliminary orders restraining appellants from threatening or attempting to enforce the Compulsory Education Act adopted Nov. 7, 1922, under the initiative provision of her constitution by the voters of Oregon. Jud. Code Section 266. They present the same points of law; there are no controverted questions of fact. Rights said to be guaranteed by the Federal Constitution were specially set up, and appropriate prayers asked for their protection.

"The challenged act, effective September 1, 1926, requires every parent, guardian, or other person having control or charge or custody of a child between eight and sixteen years to send him 'to a Public school for the period of time a Public school shall be held during the current year' in the district where the child resides; and failing to do so is declared a misdemeanor. There are exemptions—not especially important here—for children who are not normal, or who have completed the eighth grade, or who reside at considerable distances from any Public school, or who hold special permits from the County Superintendent. The manifest purpose is to compel general attendance at Public schools by normal children, between eight and sixteen, who have not completed the eighth grade. And without doubt enforcement of the statute would seriously impair, perhaps destroy, the profitable features of appellees' business and

greatly diminish the value of their property.

Appellee, the Society of Sisters, is an Oregon corporation, organized in 1880, with power to care for orphans, and educate and instruct the youth, establish and maintain academies or schools, and acquire necessary real and personal property. It has long devoted its property and religious education and care of children, and has acquired the valuable good will of many parents and guardians. It conducts independent, primary and High schools and junior colleges, and maintains orphanages for the custody and control of children between the ages of eight and sixteen. In its primary schools many children between those ages are taught the subjects usually pursued in Oregon Public schools during the first eight years. Systematic religious instruction and moral training according to the tenets of the Roman Catholic Church are also regularly provided. All courses of study, both temporal and religious, contemplate continuity of training under appellee's charge; the primary schools are essential to the system and the most profitable. It owns valuable buildings, especially constructed and equipped for school purposes. The business is remunerative—the annual income from primary schools exceeds thirty thousand dollars—and the successful conduct of this requires long time contracts with teachers and parents. The Compulsory Education Act of 1922 has already caused the withdrawal from its schools of children who would otherwise continue, and their income has steadily declined. The appellants, public officers, have proclaimed their purpose strictly to enforce the statute.

"After setting out the above facts the Society's bill alleges that the enactment conflicts with the right of parents to choose schools where their children will receive appropriate mental and religious training, the right of the child to influence the parents' choice of a school, the right of schools and teachers therein to engage in a useful business or profession, and is accordingly repugnant to the Constitution and void. And, further, that unless enforcement of the measure is enjoined the corporation's business and property will suffer irreparable injury.

"Appellee, Hill Military Academy, is a private corporation organized in 1908 under the laws of Oregon, engaged in owning, operating and conducting for profit, an elementary, college preparatory and military training school for boys between the ages of five and twenty-one years. The average attendance is one hundred and the annual fee received for each student amount to some eight hundred dollars. The elementary department is divided into eight grades, as in the Public schools; the college preparatory department has four grades, similar to those of the Public High schools; the courses of study conform to the requirements of the State Board of Education. Military instruction and training are also given under the supervision of an Army officer. It owns considerable real and personal property, some useful only for school purposes. The business and incident good will are very valuable. In order to conduct its affairs long time contracts must be made for supplies, equipment, teachers and pupils. Appellants, law officers of the State and County, have publicly announced that the Act of November, 7 1922, is valid and have declared their intention to enforce it. By reason of the statute and threat of enforcement appellee's business is being destroyed and its property depreciated; parents and guardians are refusing to make contracts for the future instruction of their sons, and some are being withdrawn.

"The Academy's bill states the foregoing facts and then alleges that the challenged Act contravenes the corporation's rights guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment and that unless appellants are restrained from proclaiming its validity and threatening to enforce it irreparable injury will result. The prayer is for an appropriate injunction.

"No answer was interposed in either cause, and after proper notices they were heard by three judges (Jud. Code Sec. 266) on motions for preliminary injunctions upon the specifically alleged facts. The Court ruled that the Fourteenth Amendment guaranteed appellees against the deprivation of their property without due process of law consequent upon the unlawful interference by appellants with the free choice of patrons, present and prospective. It declared the right to conduct schools was property and that parents and guardians, as a part of their liberty, might direct the education of children by selecting reputable teachers and places. Also, that appellees' schools were not unfit or harmful to the public, and that enforcement of the challenged statute would unlawfully deprive them of patronage and thereby destroy appellees' business and property. Finally, that the threats to enforce the Act would continue to cause irreparable injury; and the suits were not premature.

"No question is raised concerning the power of the State reasonably to regulate all schools, to inspect, supervise and examine them, their teachers and pupils; to require that all children of proper age