

The Catholic Record

Price of Subscription—\$1.50 per annum.
United States & Europe—\$4.00.
THOS. COFFEY, L.L.D., Editor and Publisher.

Advertisements for teachers, situations wanted, etc., 50 cents each insertion. Remittance to accompany the order.
Approved and recommended by the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa and St. Boniface, the Bishops of London, Hamilton, Peterborough, and Oshawa, N. Y., and the clergy throughout the Dominion.
Messrs. Luke King, P. J. Neven, E. J. Broderick, M. J. Haggarty, Mrs. W. E. Smith and Miss Sara Hanley are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transact all other business for the CATHOLIC RECORD. Obituary and marriage notices cannot be inserted except in the usual condensed form. Each insertion 50 cents.
When subscribers ask for their mail at the post office it would be well for them to tell the clerk to give them their CATHOLIC RECORD. We have information of cardholders in a few places on the part of delivery clerks who will sometimes look for letters only.
Subscribers changing residence will please give old as well as new address.

LETTERS OF RECOMMENDATION

Apostolic Delegation.
Ottawa, June 13th, 1905.
Mr. Thomas Coffey.
My Dear Sir:—Since coming to Canada I have been a reader of your paper. I have noted with satisfaction that it is directed with intelligence and ability, and above all, that it is imbued with a strong Catholic spirit. It is directed by a man of high principles and rights, and stands firmly by the teachings and authority of the Church, at the same time promoting the best interests of the country. Following these lines it has done a great deal of good for the welfare of religion and the country, and it will do more and more, as its wholesome influence reaches more Catholic homes. I therefore, earnestly recommend it to Catholic families. With my blessing on your work, and best wishes for its continued success, Yours very sincerely in Christ,
DORRUS, Archbishop of Ephesus.
Apostolic Delegate

UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA.
Ottawa, Canada, March 7th, 1900.
Mr. Thomas Coffey.
Dear Sir:—For some time past I have read your estimable paper, the CATHOLIC RECORD, and congratulate you upon the manner in which it is published. Its matter and form are both good; and a truly Catholic spirit pervades the whole. Therefore, with pleasure, I can recommend it to the faithful. Blessings on your work, and wishing you success, believe me to remain,
Yours faithfully in Jesus Christ,
D. FALCONI, Arch. of Larissa, Apes. Dele.

LONDON, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 1912

MAX AITKEN ON HOME RULE

The fond hopes of the Irish race that Home Rule for Ireland had been cruelly dashed to the ground. Wednesday's Canadian papers had the following cable from London:

London, January 16.—Sir Max Aitken, addressing his constituents, said that in Canada there was trouble enough with Provincial Home Rule. The system caused difficulties and disagreements from one end of the Dominion to the other, owing to the fact that provincial authority was exercised from time to time in contravention of the central Government. Canadians, Sir Max said, would rejoice if the Unionists here succeeded in preventing Irish Home Rule.

It is true that in the past Beaconsfield and Salisbury, Balfour and Chamberlain, opposed the grant of Home Rule to Ireland. But despite their powerful opposition, Home Rulers hoped on and worked on, and managed to advance the cause with amazing success. To be now told that they cannot have the support of Sir Max Aitken is disappointing, and to learn that they must expect to have the opposition of so famous a statesman must bring them all to the verge of despair.

But seriously, is it not time to ask ourselves a few questions, and with such limited knowledge as we have to answer them?

Who in the first place is Sir Max, and secondly, why are his views published in our papers? From all we can learn he is a young New Brunswick who, not many years ago, managed a billiard room or bowling alley in the city of Calgary, and later by means of certain corporation mergers, became, it is said, a millionaire. His methods of getting rich in a quick way are said to be the subject of an interesting pamphlet recently published by the venerable Sir Sandford Fleming. At any rate, his wealth enabled him to secure a seat in the British House of Commons, and rumor has it that it was no hindrance to his getting a title. These, however, are incidents that we may pass by.

What we do wish to point out is the ignorance displayed by the young man in the speech of which we have a brief report. We may assume that by "provincial home rule" he means the federal system, under which the provinces have control over provincial matters. That system was established after mature consideration by the ablest men that Canada has produced. After long debate, it was submitted to the British Parliament and passed into law. It has not produced much trouble; questions of dispute as to the jurisdiction of the Dominion and Provincial Parliaments over certain subjects inevitably arise, as they arise between individuals; sometimes the Dominion was right, and sometimes the Provinces; but in every case the disputed points were submitted to the courts and settled by the judges. There had to be a division of jurisdiction, but no intelligent man would pretend that there has been any such trouble as would make the system a failure. Sir Max, when he talks on this question, talks at random and without knowing the facts of the case.

He speaks of the provincial authority acting in contravention of the central government. Again, he speaks without knowledge. If the province acts within the limits of its constitutional rights, where is the contravention? If it goes beyond them, and no province would do so wittingly, the courts can soon put the matter straight.

When Sir Max says Canadians would rejoice if the Unionists succeeded in preventing Home Rule, he has to be reminded that he has no mandate to speak for Canadians. He never occupied, and he never was elected to, any public position, by the votes of Canadians, and if he ever tries the interesting experiment of appealing to Canadians for their votes, he will soon learn what Canadians think of him. The Parliament of Canada passed resolutions in favor of Home Rule, and these resolutions had the support of the ablest and best men on both sides of the speaker. Surely they were as competent to judge the views of the Canadian people on this question as the goading knight who is playing politics in a kindergarten fashion, and whose declarations on public questions excite the derision of the well-informed.

The press agency which persistently circulates all this advertising matter with a view of building up a political reputation for this politician, is without knowing it, doing him a disservice. A little more reticence and a little more serious study of the rudiments of political history is what he is most in need of.

TO THE HONORABLE SENATOR JAFFRAY, President of the Globe Printing Co., we send our heartiest congratulations on the attainment of his eightieth birthday. He is one of the grand old men of the Canadian press. In its early days, for well over a generation, the Globe was living from hand to mouth, but during the past thirty years, since Senator Jaffray assumed control, having brought to bear upon the management a splendid business capacity, the Globe now takes rank as one of the most successful financial concerns in the country. Indeed we may say that it is almost entirely owing to the Senator's prudent captaincy that this satisfactory result has been brought about. We hope many years will yet be given him as the guiding hand in one of Canada's greatest newspaper enterprises.

THE DAILY SENSATION

A press report was sent from Montreal to Toronto, on the 26th, to the effect that the Ne Temere marriage decree will be withdrawn in the near future. Furthermore, it was laid down that there was substantial foundation for the report. As might be expected, next day there was considerable scurrying about of reporters seeking interviews. Mr. Stogal, the Papal Delegate, was told, declined to be interviewed, but his secretary gave the assurance that if there was anything in the rumor it was quite unknown to the highest Catholic ecclesiastical authority in Canada. The Archbishop of Montreal has made declaration that the report is entirely and absolutely false and His Grace was astonished that anyone should have sent it out. Many other prominent ecclesiastics were interviewed with like result. In all kindness we desire to say to some of our contemporaries that no inconsiderable portion of the public are becoming utterly disgusted with their methods. There are papers in our Dominion that are entirely reliable and are conducted upon the very highest principles, but there are others who fail would copy the style of the yellow press of the great American cities—gross, unreliable, screeching and vulgar. We have in mind a few Toronto editors who are notable for conducting their papers another way. With them it would seem that everything were lawful that serves to bring in the pennies. But what gives rise to these rumors? We will be asked. Bless you, dear reader, it is the simplest thing in the world to account for it. A little fellow behind a fountain pen in some newspaper office, finding the sensation market dull and heavy bethought him that it would be a good thing for filling up purposes to make declaration that the Ne Temere decree was to be withdrawn. Then the following day could be devoted to interviewing prominent Catholic dignitaries in regard to the matter. So you see the sub-editor relieved the market by producing a sensation which had a forty-eight hours' life. And when the readers have forgotten all about this matter then there will be something else.

AND NOW we have the Lutherans making declaration of their hostility to the Ne Temere decree. At the little village of Tavistock, in the province of Ontario, gathered these Lutheran pastors of Canada, Missouri, Ohio, etc. Not one word of argument will we hold with these people, for the reason that they appear to be men endowed with a most striking invincible ignorance. Those who have read the Hansard report of the debate in the House of Commons on Mr. Lancaster's bill and then perused the declaration made by the followers of the impure monk who broke his vows, and whose "Table Talk" would be denied a place in His Majesty's mail bags, must reach the conclusion that these gentlemen passed judgment upon a matter of which they were entirely ignorant.

A FIFTH DAY IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday of last week was a strenuous day in the Canadian House of Commons. Mr. Lancaster, the member for Lincoln and Niagara, introduced a bill favoring the enactment of a Dominion law regarding the solemnization of marriage. The purport of the bill was to deal a blow at the Ne Temere decree and prevent its application, especially in the Province of Quebec. The greatest legal minds in Canada have declared that the law regarding the solemnization of marriage belongs entirely to the provinces, but it seems that the provinces have no rights which Mr. Lancaster is bound to respect when he desires to take an excursion into the regions of bigotry. He is but the cuckoo of the Orange lodges. Mr. Lancaster is a man of grotesque peculiarities and on this and many other questions he is wont to give voice of thunder to wild schemes which rest on sand—unsundered by even a particle of common sense. Mr. Lancaster, the member for Lincoln and Niagara, fancied he is a "Tribune" and that his name will go down in history alongside that of Gladstone. In selecting the members of his cabinet Mr. Borden no doubt took measure of the member for Lincoln and Niagara and found him sadly below the cabinet standard. Hence the chagrin and trace-kicking.

The Right Hon. R. L. Borden, Prime Minister, moved a resolution to the effect that the whole matter be referred to the Privy Council. We take from the Globe report the following synopsis of the speeches made by the Premier, Sir Wilfrid Laurier and the Minister of Justice:

Premier Borden rose in silence. He agreed with the importance of the subject under consideration. Everyone knew that under the laws of Canada the decrees of any Church could not override the civil law. If the decrees of the Church had any effect it must be by reason of the laws of the Province giving effect to them. Mr. Borden took as an illustration of the effect of Mr. Lancaster's bill a supposititious British Columbia case. "If," said the Premier, "in the Province of British Columbia a law were passed that a person of European descent and a Japanese or a Hindu should be married with certain formalities before a certain official, that marriage, if performed before some other official in contravention of the law of the Province, would be valid under this statute passed by the Parliament of Canada. That, as I understand, is the object and intention of the bill which my honorable friend has placed before the House."

"That is what I mean, so far as religion is concerned. It does not deal with differences of nationality. I am speaking only of religious differences," exclaimed Mr. Lancaster.

The Premier retorted that he was dealing with the constitutional aspect of the case. Mr. Lancaster's bill would confer just as full power to override the statute of British Columbia in that regard as would the legislation he suggested. The same might apply to the marriage of a white and a colored person. The Premier then read the following carefully prepared statement:

"By the Canadian constitution, as embodied in the British North America Act, section 92, sub-section 26, the exclusive legislative authority of the Parliament of Canada extends to and includes marriage and divorce. The constitution declares, however, in section 92, sub-section 12, of the same act, that in each province the legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to the solemnization of marriage in the Province. It is perfectly clear that the words 'marriage and divorce' would include the solemnization of marriage if that subject had not been assigned to the exclusive jurisdiction of the Province under the language just quoted. The result has been expressed by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in these words: 'Solemnization of marriage in a Province is enumerated among the classes of subjects under section 92, and no one can doubt, notwithstanding the general language of section 91, that this subject is still within the exclusive authority of Legislatures of the Provinces.'

"It has also been held by the Privy Council that a Provincial Legislature has authority as plenary and as ample within the limits described by section 92 of the Imperial Parliament in the plenitude of its power as the Dominion could bestow. Within these limits of subject and area the Provincial Legislature is supreme and its jurisdiction exclusive."

"The formalities prescribed by a Provincial Legislature as necessary to constitute a valid marriage come undoubtedly within the meaning of the word 'solemnization.' It thus appears that with respect to those formalities the jurisdiction of the Provincial Legislatures is exclusive."

"The opinion of the late Minister of Justice, Sir Allen Ayleworth, the opinion of the present Minister of Justice, and the opinion of the Deputy Minister of Justice, Mr. Newcombe, K. C., are to the effect that legislation such as that now proposed is not within the legislative competence of this Parliament. To the same effect is the opinion of an eminent lawyer, the Ontario Bar, whose opinion upon the case and of which I will lay upon the table for the information of the House."

"On the other hand, the hon. member who has introduced this bill is himself a lawyer of eminence and great experience, and he is strongly of opinion that this bill is within the competence of Parliament. Other lawyers who are members of this House entertain the same view. While I do not share that opinion, I am bound to respect it."

Sir Wilfrid Laurier said it was not well for outsiders to interfere in family quarrels, and therefore he had hesitated up to this time to speak upon this question, over which so much difference had arisen between the Government and

its supporters. The question was not new. The Ne Temere decree was simply an extension to the point of view of the Council of Trent, made three hundred years ago. The decisions of the Council of Trent had not been applied by the Church to France, but many of them, including that relating to marriage, were introduced by the Kings of France into the laws of the government of their American colonies. In this way they came to the Province of Quebec, where they had been in force for three hundred years. As he understood the Ne Temere decree, it provided that to be valid the marriage must be celebrated by the parish priest of the parties. The purpose was to prevent clandestine marriages, and he was sure that everyone, whether Protestant or Catholic, would agree that the prevention of clandestine marriages was wise. It would be well to free the discussion of this question from prejudice, and simply to let it rest on the point of view of common Canadian citizenship. There was an impression that the Ne Temere decree was intended to override the authority of the King and Parliament. As a Roman Catholic he protested against such interpretation. There was no such intent, and the Ne Temere decree did not to prevent setting down rules binding upon the conscience of Catholics. It was chosen to give civil effect to its provisions or otherwise.

Mr. Maclean—But will the Right Hon. gentleman say the decree does not affect the rights of parties in a mixed marriage?

Sir Wilfrid—No. If a Catholic in the Province of Ontario marries according to the provisions of the civil law of the Province, even though it be contrary to the Ne Temere decree, he is legally married and his children are legitimate, but the Catholic who marries contrary to the provisions of the decree may be penalized by his Church. But as I understand it, it does not go beyond the conscience of Catholics. It has been understood in the Province of Quebec that the civil authorities have given effect to the religious ordinances on this subject. How far the civil laws of Quebec affect the subject is now in question before the courts. For my part, I cannot support the bill because its provisions seem to be absolutely illogical. Sir Wilfrid said that a marriage celebrated in a Province was valid or not valid, according to the law of that Province. If the same were the case in the Province of Quebec, would that be another matter, but that the law of Provinces should be overridden by the law of the Federal Parliament could not be conducive to proper administration.

"If the Province is wrong," said Sir Wilfrid, "let us go to the Province and try to make it right. Sir Wilfrid said that the matter was now before the courts of Quebec, and judgment will be delivered at no distant date. It was probable that this definite case would be referred to all the judicial tribunals and a final authoritative decision secured upon it. This, in his opinion, was a better way to handle the matter than to refer it to the confining and merely academic way proposed by the Premier. To dispose of the Lancaster bill simply by moving the adjournment of the debate, as suggested by Mr. Borden was not at all the proper or creditable manner of dealing with such an important question."

Mr. Doherty said that he had all respect for the member for Lincoln, and while he desired to treat his arguments seriously, he could not agree with his point of view and must oppose the Lancaster bill. The Minister of Justice was in accord with the view held by two of the preceptors, Hon. Edward Blake and Sir Allen Ayleworth, to the effect that the Provincial Legislatures had jurisdiction.

To Mr. Carvell the Minister of Justice said the Ne Temere decree in no detrimental way affected the civil law of Quebec or of any other Province. He admitted, however, that the decree prohibited the marriage of Protestant and Catholic, except where the ceremony was performed by a priest, but this related solely to the ecclesiastical tribunal.

Mr. Lancaster's motion was defeated on division by a vote of 81 to 61.

A CONTEMPORARY tells us that the revival of the old-fashioned market basket and a trip to the market itself is suggested as a remedy for the high cost of living, by the President of the American Manufacturers' Association. The old fashioned market-basket, it appears to us, is of little use nowadays because the old fashioned market has been taken away from us by the Big Interests, the get-rich-quick people. What the old fashioned market-basket people found in the old days on the market is now in the cold storage. The Captains of Industry have cornered most of the people's food, placed it in storage, and regulate the prices. That is the whole story. And what are we going to do about it?

THE BLUE LAW PEOPLE

Toboggan-sliding on Sunday in Toronto presently holds the floor with the Ministerial Association. These good people—very good people in their own estimation—have a weakness for the notoriety given by printers' ink. Scarcely a day passes that they are not placed on record as advocates of this or that change in our civil life. Some young people in the Queen's City have taken into their heads to have a little recreation on Sundays. They procured toboggans, climbed up a hill and slid down. That is all. There cannot be a more innocent recreation. The people are taken away from their daily grind of labor and this exercise sends the blood coursing through their veins and gives them reason to believe that life is after all worth living. But the Evangelical Alliance will not have it so. Although it is, as a rule, foreign to their nature, yet there is a bit of humor about their action. They would have the toboggan-sliding stopped because it necessitates labor on the part of the constables to watch

the proceedings. What a dark horizon would be ours if the Ministerial Association occupied seats in the House of Commons to the right of the speaker. Now that the discussion of the Ne Temere decree has been worn threadbare it is a God-send to these ungodly people to have something else to fall back upon. With some preaching of the gospel is a matter of minor importance. Meddling in the business of other people is a vocation which they seem to take very kindly to. Their bill of fare is a varied one—total prohibition of the liquor traffic, the use of tobacco, sabbath desecration, politics—all these are taken up in regular order, but when they, like unto children, tire of these playthings, the ever new and ever acceptable "Romish aggression" is discussed. How long the people of Toronto will endure this continual and offensive meddling in matters temporal on the part of their spiritual guides remains to be seen. Oftentimes we pity our good neighbors of the sects. That they are "preacher ridden" the daily press gives abundant evidence.

THE ORANGE CONSPIRACY

Conditions in Ireland give us much evidence that Orangemen spells injustice and oppression, intolerance and bigotry, wherever and whenever occasion may arise that will show it in its true colors. It will not have Home Rule for Ireland because this cabal desires to continue governing the country upon Orange principles. One of England's greatest statesmen, Mr. Winston Spencer Churchill, and Mr. John E. Redmond, leader of the Nationalist party, desire to go to Belfast to explain to the people the object of the new Home Rule bill. The Orangemen, led by Sir Edward Carson, have made declaration that they will use force to prevent any meeting held for this purpose. Here we have Orangism in its true colors—civil and religious liberty in theory, but in practice their staunch enemies. What the outcome will be we will know in a few days. The action of the Orangemen will be an object lesson to the people of England. They will now realize to the fullest that the opposition to local self-government has been carried on by a set of political desperadoes of high and low degree who are the enemies of all that Englishmen hold most dear in the government of the Empire. In the last few weeks the Orangemen have, by their insane hatred of their Catholic neighbors, given sufficient proof that they and they only, a minority of one of Ireland's provinces, are the one class who are unfit for self-government. We hope the Catholic people in this emergency will not be a party to riotous proceedings.

When the Orange fraternity proceed to play rough house in the city of Belfast the sight of the bayonets of the constabulary and the soldiers will give them a change of heart and convince them that their best course after all is to behave like civilized beings.

THE ORANGE ORDER

In previous articles we have endeavored to show that Orangism is undemocratic, intolerant, lawless, ignorant, and immoral. Another of their shibboleths is loyalty. Let us see how far and to what they are loyal. Says a recent writer in the Dublin Leader: "Ulster seems to have only one claim to this virtue, and that is on every occasion that Parliament proposes some reform for Ireland it threatens to rebel against the Crown." Loyalty in the minds of the vast majority of the brethren simply means a generous waving of Union Jacks and the playing of the "Protestant Boys." Possibly one in a hundred would tell you that being loyal meant supporting the king and the established law. But that is not loyalty in the true sense. Loyalty is the affectionate support given to a person, to a party, or to a principle. We are loyal to what we believe to be good, useful and just. Loyalty to what is unjust and injurious is not a virtue—indeed blind support given to a person or a party in their wrong doing is most mischievous, as it increases their power for evil. Orangism is loyal because it stands by the king and constitution in Ireland, whereas Nationalism is disloyal because it is against the constitution as at present established, believing that this constitution is unjust. The Orangemen are for the maintenance of the legislative union between Great Britain and Ireland because it gives him the loaves and fishes and leaves his Catholic fellow-countryman to starve. Thus it coincides exactly with his idea of equality. That he is loyal, not to the constitution but to his pocket, is clearly evidenced from history. Every time that a proposal was made to alter the constitution as to give the Catholic Irishman a crumb of the loaf, Orangism was in arms against the crown and government. So long as it paid to be loyal, well and good, but if the cash was not forthcoming the constitution, like the Pope, could go to Jericho.

But when the Orange orators spout about loyalty do they forget that the Orangemen of Ulster were the bitterest opponents of the union when first

proposed in the Irish Parliament? And after what manner have they read history if they never learned that in the last years of the reign of George IV the Orangemen of the North of Ireland were largely engaged in a revolutionary plot to exclude from the throne William IV, the rightful successor, and substitute for him the Duke of Cumberland, a dissipated scoundrel whose only claim to the throne appears to have been that he was the Grand Master of the Order. Coming down to later times to kick Queen Victoria's crown into the Boyne if the Protestant Church was dis-established in Ireland, and in our own day Edward VII. was solemnly warned that his throne would shake to its foundations if he allowed his niece to marry that arch Papist, the King of Spain. It was only the other day the cable brought us the news that Sir Edward Carson, leader of the Ulster Orangemen, had arrangements completed for starting a government of his own in Ulster in the event of Home Rule becoming law. Truly the brethren are strangely loyal! The truth is they have not grasped the fundamental idea of loyalty. A man should be loyal to his better self and to his country before he starts being loyal to an indistinct idea, such as the British Empire. The Canadian who is disloyal to the Dominion is in a poor way to be loyal to the Empire. A man's country is a practical, real thing. He lives there, was born there, he will raise his family and earn his bread there. What claim has a vague, distant idea such as the British Empire on the loyalty of any of us compared to the claims of our country. If we were forced to choose between our country and the Empire would we hesitate about the choice? But the Orangemen profess lip-loyalty to the Empire, the flag, and the throne, rather than to such an insignificant thing as the country in which he has to live his life. He is disloyal to his country. Patriotism and loyalty should, in any well-ordered State, mean the same thing. Irish Nationalists are patriotic without being loyal because, since Ireland is not under a proper form of government, they have nothing to be loyal to. The Orangemen loathe the very word patriotism.

If flag waving and drum-beating be loyalty then the Orangemen are loyalty personified. But that he is loyal, not to the flag but to the sweets of office, the incidents recorded above prove conclusively. And when the flag was in danger it was not the men of the lodges, but the Catholic peasants of Tipperary and Galway, that shed their blood in its defence.

COLUMBA

NOTES AND COMMENTS

MR. WILFRED WARD'S long-expected "Life of Cardinal Newman" was published in England by Longmans on January 32nd. It should be an epoch-making book. Mr. Ward, first by the Life of his father in the two volumes "William George Ward and the Oxford Movement" and "William George Ward and the Catholic Revival," and later by his "Life of Cardinal Wiseman," won for himself a high place among biographers. The late R. H. Hutton of the London Spectator (no mean judge assuredly) termed "Ward and the Catholic Revival" "an almost or altogether ideal biography."

"Taken as a whole," he wrote, "I am not sure that I have ever read a better one, if ever quite so good." It is improbable, therefore, that with so inspiring a subject as Newman, Mr. Ward has fallen below the level of his previous efforts.

CARDINAL NEWMAN easily ranks with the greatest names of the nineteenth century. His long life of close upon ninety years was almost equally divided between Protestantism and the Catholic Church. Whether as Anglican rector and tutor or as Catholic priest he was probably a wider influence than that of any other man of his time. As preacher and controversialist he had few equals. His knowledge of patristic literature was in its range and penetration quite unique. His pre-eminence as an authority on University questions was freely conceded by his contemporaries. We are justified from his somewhat meagre output as a poet in assuming that had he chosen to cultivate the muse more freely he would have attained the first rank. The "Dream of Gerontius" alone bears this out, and who has not felt the sweetly subtle influence of "Lead, kindly Light," and other poetic flowers of devotion? But it is as a father of souls and a guide to seekers after God that, in the end, is Newman's highest title to remembrance. And it is this quality which, through his personal intercourse with men, and his correspondence, may be expected to stand out conspicuously in Mr. Ward's biography. We shall have occasion to refer to it again.

AN INTERESTING discussion has arisen in Scotland over the portraiture of Mary Queen of Scots. Mr. Andrew Lang, whose researches into Marian history give him some title to speak

with authority, has expressed the opinion that "Mary's one good portrait is that owned by Lord Leven and Melville." Father Henry G. Graham writes to the Edinburgh Scotsman to ascertain if in so doing Mr. Lang had purposely overlooked the famous portrait preserved at Blair College, Aberdeenshire. This portrait, with whose romantic history Mr. Lang is quite familiar, has long been acknowledged by the best authorities as a true, authentic and faithful likeness. Lionel Cust, for example, whose "Notes on the Authentic Portraits of Mary Queen of Scots" is of acknowledged authority, says: "In Scotland, with the exception of the 'Morton' portrait at Dalmahoy and the memorial portrait at Blair College, a holocaust might be made of the various portraits purporting to represent Queen Mary without the loss of any valuable asset bearing on this question." And, referring further to the Blair's portrait he says: "It is to Elizabeth Curle that we owe the last painted portrait of Mary Stuart which can be accepted as an authentic likeness." Father Graham's query is put, not, as he says, as a critic but as an inquirer, and Mr. Lang's reply will therefore be eagerly looked for by those interested in the subject.

THE DEATH occurred two months ago (intelligence of which has just reached us) of a Canadian nun in far-off India.

Mother Mary of the Nativity, Superior of the Convent of Jesus and Mary, Mussoorie, after a life of zealous devotion to the work of her Order, passed to her reward on 22nd November. She was born 1st November, 1861, at Beaumont, in the Archdiocese of Quebec, was educated in the Convent of Jesus and Mary, Levis, and entered the Congregation at Sillery, in 1880. She made her profession in 1882 and shortly afterwards was sent to the United States, where her health broke down and necessitated a change to France. She remained for a year in the Mother House at Lyons, then was sent to Switzerland, and back again to America, after an absence of five years. In 1904 Sister Mary was transferred to India and became Superior at once of the Convent at Mussoorie. Here she continued her arduous devotion to the work of her calling, distinguishing herself greatly by her administrative ability, particularly in raising the house from ruins after the disastrous earthquake of 1905. Then, after a painful illness borne with fortitude and resignation, the end came, and her remains were laid to rest in the Convent cemetery. R. I. P.

THE DEPLORABLE spectacle furnished by a Toronto Methodist minister in uttering a gross and unprovoked libel upon the Society of Jesus, and then when brought to book and set right in the matter of information, refusing to retract the vile imputation, is one to bring joy to the enemies of religion everywhere. The act is as cowardly as it is dishonest, and should have some effect of another sort upon the minds of the better class of his co-religionists. We should be sorry to think that such acts meet with the approval of any considerable portion of them. Despite appearances, we do not believe that it does. It is a reflection, nevertheless, upon Protestants as a whole that conduct of this kind should go unrebuked in pulpit and press. The fact that it does go unrebuked may well cause Catholics to ask if in the estimation of the average Protestant the moral code is not binding where Catholics are to be assailed. The whole affair is a curious commentary upon the Protestant notion of religion.

FROM TIME to time we are regaled with a dissertation from some vagabond upon the threadbare topic "Why I left the Church of Rome." It is usually a Methodist or a Baptist pulpit that is made the vehicle of such racy narratives, and they are always conceived in a vein of palpable mendacity. Does it never occur to Protestants that a very damaging case could be made out against their clergy under the text "Why I could not become a Protestant?" And it could be done simply by dwelling upon the unscrupulous character of their assaults upon the Church and upon Catholic doctrine. These men will preach a series of sermons upon the Ten Commandments and in the very middle of it will turn aside to bear false witness against their Catholic neighbors; to slander their clergy; to mock at their consecrated virgins, and to misrepresent their Church's teachings—all while upon the subject of the Ten Commandments. All of which opens out a wide vein of thought. The subject is not a pleasant one and we have no temptation to pursue it here. But it does not require a very vivid imagination to conjure up the reply which any ordinarily well-instructed Catholic could make to his Protestant assailant along this line. For instance, to what extent is C. O. Johnston a temptation to a Catholic to forsake the faith of his fathers?