

The Catholic Record

Price of Subscription—\$2.00 per annum. THOS. COFFEY, L.L. D., Editor and Publisher. Advertisement for teachers, situations wanted, etc., 50 cents each insertion. Remittance to accompany the order.

LETTERS OF RECOMMENDATION. Apostolic Delegation. Ottawa, June 13th, 1909. Mr. Thomas Coffey. My Dear Sir—Since coming to Canada I have been reading of your papers and have noted with satisfaction that it is directed with intelligence and ability, and above all, that it is imbued with a strong Catholic spirit.

UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA. Ottawa, Canada, March 7th, 1909. 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.

LONDON, SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 18, 1909.

DR. ELIOT'S NEW RELIGION.

A short time ago we sketched up to a certain point this latest attempt at establishing a new religion. Without dogma and without creed, it is to be negative rather than positive—a simplicity of nothingness without form or ritual. Thoroughly democratic, it prides itself in having no authority to obey—just as having no mission it is to be purely natural. In origin, in proposed constitution and in its whole purpose it is of the earth earthy.

Oh, woodroose change, To mortals strange! But yesterday 'twas cold and drear; Some magic hand Hath touched the land And, now, the happy spring is here! O Master, we Give praise to Thee Thou answerest kindly when we pray, And this is wrought The hour we sought— The woodroose miracle of May.

kingdom destroyed and laid waste, man's pride flattered by freedom from creed or dogma, man's pleasure lulled by his power to fix right and wrong—here is the shallow superficial religion which according to Dr. Eliot is to replace Christianity. In the meantime there is the immortal Church—the abiding contradiction to the novelties of modernism or pretended paganism.

THE WHITE PLAGUE AND OTHER POEMS.

We are more than gratified at the prospect that this world has not become completely prosaic and that the poets are not all dead. A young man from Brantford, Ont., Mr. Thaddeus A. Browne, makes his debut with a number of poems which considerably above the average give promise of greater success. Both the subjects and their treatment are novel and daring—perhaps too much so for a young and hitherto unknown singer. The title of the volume "The White Plague and Other Poems," derives its name from the opening poem. Few would have looked for poetry in the gaunt and grim Plague King.

Notwithstanding the prosaic character of such ideas as debt and wealth, notwithstanding occasional faults of metre and rhythm, this poem is marked by strength and virility as well as high poetic conceptions throughout. Following the white plague is the particular example of one of consumption's victims. This poem is entitled "The Love Crime," in which a child born of consumptive parents soon learns his own wasting strength. At last—though too early in life—

Whatever precautions are necessary for a healthy progeny we can scarcely look upon the marriage of two unhealthy people as a crime. Nor would we be hasty in advocating the interference of the state in marriage unions. If a doctor's certificate is to be required from every young couple before they can approach the altar, society will be seriously confused. Nor does such a doctrine take in more than the temporal and corporal. There is a Providence of an entirely different order, caring for those who die young and filling with higher hope the sufferers of earth.

Oh, woodroose change, To mortals strange! But yesterday 'twas cold and drear; Some magic hand Hath touched the land And, now, the happy spring is here! O Master, we Give praise to Thee Thou answerest kindly when we pray, And this is wrought The hour we sought— The woodroose miracle of May.

We have transgressed our space. To say that we are charmed with this volume of poems is hardly the idea. We are more than pleased with it—partly for the songs it sings and likewise as the bud of brighter promise. Its pages are marked by genius which, still impulsive with youth, will soon show forth with more lasting influence by its steadier flame of poetic fire. The volume is well printed, chastely bound and artistically illustrated.

PROTESTANT TRADITION.

It has always been the boast that Protestantism absolutely and completely rejected tradition, basing its faith upon the Bible only. How this is working out in these days of criticism is lamentably evident. Having no authority to stop such methods and having no assurance that the faith and science are really in accord, Protestantism is burning the candle at both ends. This is not, however, the point under consideration. To our mind Protestantism, is most illogical. Its premises are unsound, its conclusions untrue. One of these premises is that it rejects tradition. It is absurd to reject tradition in a religion which is historical. But as a matter of fact Protestantism so far from rejecting tradition, is deeply attached to it, believes in it and practices it.

DR. RYCKMAN ON CATHOLIC CREED.

It is very seldom that Protestant preachers get a good hold of Catholic doctrine. They may not wish to misrepresent our creed. They have an unhappy faculty of twisting it, twisting it out of shape, presenting it in such a way that it is half truth, half falsehood. Their more discreditable habit is that of insisting that Catholics in their act of faith are slaves. Dr. Ryckman, a Methodist minister, in an address at Kingston to a body of Orangemen, is guilty of all this. Whether the gentleman did it through ignorance or malice or human respect for his select (?) congregation is quite indifferent. Ignorance in the intellect, malice in the will, cowardice or human respect in the sentiment of the soul, are about alike. They are especially inexcusable from a man taking as his text and his example the apostles, claiming the right and duty of obeying God rather than man—(v. 18. Acts of the Apostles, chap. iv. v. 18-20) Why the Roman Catholic creed should form the basis of a discourse to the Orangemen is inexplicable, except on the ground of the bribeless lawyer: abuse your opponent. Strike the Catholic Church every time. Lose no opportunity. Some of these Orangemen may have been Methodists. Not one was a Catholic: they swore to that when entering the lodge. For what reason, therefore, did Dr. Ryckman try to ex-

plain our doctrine to them? To show his liberality or the versatility of his knowledge? In neither can he be said to have succeeded.

Whether we apply a Catholic or Protestant test to his discourse, we report upon him that he refuses to his Catholic neighbors what he praised in the apostles and commended in Orangemen. It is really and candidly the first time we ever suspected that Orangemen would claim apostolicity. Sts. Peter and John took their stand for liberty of conscience. So does Orangemen. There is, with due deference to Dr. Ryckman, a slight difference. The apostles preferred to obey God rather than man: Orangemen prefers to obey man rather than God, and practise hatred more than charity. With a condescension for which we are grateful, Dr. Ryckman thinks that in the main—mark the limitation—the Roman Catholic Church is Christian. If in the main why not throughout? If the trunk be Christian, what are root and branch? "In the main," forsooth! What article in our creed ever shook the corner stone from its place? The Dr. had better look more carefully around his Methodist home. What with mythical interpretation of the early chapters of the Bible and modernistic tendencies of its professors, Methodism will soon cease to be Christian in the main and on the side. No power can stop the decline of Methodist teaching as represented in their theological colleges. The Catholic creed or the Catholic himself asks no certificate of Christianity from any Methodist; for the latter has no definite idea of the Incarnation or Redemption. Had the Catholic Church not preserved the faithful from Arianism in the fourth century there would be no Christianity in the twentieth for Methodist professors to doubt and deny. Again Dr. Ryckman says that: "Roman Catholics hold that the writings of the early fathers had as much authority as the writings of the Apostles." Roman Catholics hold no such thing. The poor man has mixed things up. More than one of the so-called early fathers have erred in their writings. We presume that what the Dr. was endeavoring to say was that the Catholic Church holds that besides the canon of Scripture there is a second font of theological teaching, viz., sacred tradition. Protestants practically admit tradition, e. g., infant baptism, the keeping the Sunday holy instead of the Sabbath, the taking of an oath under certain conditions. Protestantism not having any jurisdiction, cannot have tradition. It depends entirely upon the Catholic Church for what it preserves—for in spite of its theoretical rejection it holds to some. Let us content ourselves with one more point in Dr. Ryckman's peculiar analysis of Catholic doctrine—an analysis which is partial and misleading. He says: "Protestants believed that Christ came into the world to forgive sin, and the Roman Catholics believed that His Body and Blood were offered for sin in the Mass." That is a little special pleading rather than a candid explanation of our doctrine. There would be no Mass if Christ had not come into the world. Furthermore, Dr. Ryckman has strangely forgotten the most important point of the atonement. Christ was Redeemer and came into the world first to atone for sin and afterwards forgive it. As the Protestant case is stated we can see no reason whatever for the passion and death of Our Lord. But the gentleman has misstated the second clause. He has forgotten that Catholic doctrine insists upon repentance as a necessary condition for pardon of sin. It is very true that the Body and Blood of our Lord are offered in the Mass for the living and the dead. We cannot state that the sacrifice of the Mass is a direct offering and atonement for the sins of individuals. It will remit the punishment but not directly remove the guilt. It will obtain the grace of repentance and countless other mercies. No sinner living lies beyond the sweep of its action or the efficacy of its prayer. The Mass is the universal hymn of praise, the sacrifice of thanksgiving, the cry of the Blood mightier than that of Abel, and the impetration of Him Who in the days of His flesh was heard for His reverence. All this and ten thousand times more is the Mass in its earth-circling chain. Still it is not in the direct sense the pardon of sin. There is another sacrament for that purpose—the plank after shipwreck—the sinner's refuge, holy penance. Dr. Ryckman should for his own reputation be more precise; and in order to do that he should not cover so much ground. Catholic teaching is too vast a field to be reaped in one day.

A WOMAN'S VIEW OF WOMAN.

Mrs. Stuyvesant Fish, a wealthy lady of New York, one of the "400," comes out earnestly and edifyingly upon woman's duty. Her conclusion is that "a woman's first duty is to her home, and her second duty is to her home, and likewise her third and fourth duties, and several others." When we reflect upon the subject of home we are tempted to ask ourselves what would it have

been if, instead of an industrious, quiet, pious mother, it had had a strong minded suffragist for its ruling spirit? Suffragettes were few in those days, nor was their voice heard in the land. Home is home chiefly through the mother, who in turn is mostly mother by her devotion to her children and her formative and educational influence over them. It is no mere rhetorical aphorism that the hand which recks the cradle shapes the world. The Roman matron's jewels were her two sons. St. Monica did more for the Church by praying and caring for her son, St. Augustine, than she would have done in the palaces of fashion. Queen Blanche showed more royal dignity in impressing upon her son, St. Louis of France, the value of truth and the shamefulness of vice than by the coronet she graciously wore. We cannot compare an ideal mother in a home moderately comfortable with her years of unremitting toil and unrequited devotion—we cannot compare this humble queen with the noisy agitatrix (is that word English?) whose only work seems to be to make herself obnoxious and whose only right is to let the world know her imaginary wrongs. There are other vocations than home for women—religious calls from the poor, the ignorant, the suffering. Woman has soothed in the silent hours more sorrow than all the suffragists will ever heal. Uncomplaining she has denied herself all that can make life pleasant that she may minister to the little ones of Christ. Home, hospitals, orphanages, places of refuge for the aged, are the scenes of woman's noblest work and most lasting triumphs. Mrs. Fish is right. Woman owes a duty to her fellow woman; but her duty to home is paramount.

AN ORANGE BANQUET.

Right Worshipful Master Bro. E. T. Essery, Grand Master of Ontario West made a trip to Ireland to take part in the 12th of July festivities to perpetuate the glorious, pious and immortal memory. Last week he was given a banquet in this city by the brethren. In replying to the toast of his health he gave his experiences. He did not tell us all he had seen, however. It was not a peace congress. The Orange order, Mr. Essery declared, did not want any favors but wanted civil and religious liberty for Protestants and Roman Catholics alike. This declaration does not sit comfortably beside the fact that the brethren in Liverpool on this turbulent anniversary gave their Catholic neighbors notice to quit, or, as a policeman would put it, they were told to "move on." Right Worshipful Rev. Bro. Lowe was glad to be present as a clergyman of the Church of England and was only sorry there were not more of the clergy of that Church belonging to the Order. Rev. Bro. Lowe would have us believe that he wields the sword of the spirit; but he does not to any appreciable extent. Rather would it be correct to say that he wields very vigorously a shillelah which he brought with him from the black north. No doubt he wishes that more of the clergy would belong to the Orange order. This is not to be hoped for, however, because the majority of the ministers of that Church are well disposed gentlemen who wish to promote peace and have set their faces against those of their brethren who wear the Roman collar and take part in the draggal tail processions of the 12th of July carnivals. Rev. Bro. Lowe, it will be remembered, is the gentleman who criticized severely the habits of the Irish peasants, declaring that oftentimes chickens took roost in the rafters of their homes. One of his countrymen, with malice aforethought, remarked upon reading the report of his lecture in the papers: "Small blame to the chickens for takin' to the rafters. What else could the poor things do when they saw him comin'!"

We are indebted to our contemporary, the Antigonish Casket, for some information which will be a painful surprise to the Rev. Mr. Lowe. The editor says that the recent Orange riots in Liverpool have recalled to his memory a speech addressed to a meeting of the English Church Union at the Church house, Westminster, on March 7th, 1903, by Rev. Andrew Wakefield, an Anglican clergyman of Liverpool. In the course of that speech as given in the Church Times, the leading organ of the Church of England, he said:

"The Orangemen are a secret society. But it is unlawful as well as secret; and it is not only unlawful but seditious; and it is immoral in the way it packs juries in Ireland. It is a drunken society as well as profane. Their leader at a demonstration not long since in Liverpool, said this: 'I do wish that we could declare ourselves to be freer from Bacchus and Venus.' It was a counsel which they did most urgently need to have laid upon them. They are notorious for their drunken ruffianism. They go out, in order; but how do they come back. When Queen Victoria came to Liverpool, there was a Trades Procession through the streets of the city. The great procession had in it a contingent of Orangemen. As they came

through the parish which I serve, there was a halt for the better marshalling of the whole procession; and in the halt, which took twenty minutes, the Orangemen broke out of the procession and went to the nearest public-house, and when the word was given to start afresh they could not go on with the procession and their wooden bible (which they carry as an emblem) lay disregarded in the gutter. They are always in favour of an open Bible. The return of most people in Liverpool who know is: 'Your bible is open because you cannot shut it.' Certainly it is a bible which is never read; for the Orange processions and their agitations have been disgraceful for the immorality of their character. . . . This society's Grand Master bolted beyond the seas and has never come back; and he never will dare to return to answer for his crimes. . . . Their first rule that 'no one shall be admitted a member who has married a Catholic wife, is always enforced, and their second rule, that 'if any man, after he has become a member shall marry a Catholic, he shall be expelled; but their fourteenth rule is: If a man be a notorious prodigal, he may be expelled; and this rule is universally forgotten.

In 1795 they became the Loyal Orange League. Having changed their name, they changed their politics; they were followers of William III, and Whigs; but now they say they are Tories, but I cannot take their word for it. They also have changed their religion; for in their foundation they were vigorously restricted to the 'Church of Ireland' (established then) and now they are for the most part Dissenters and Welsh Dissenters. They also have changed those things which they might have pardonably retained, but they never have changed their character of truculent rascality; that and nothing else is unchanged. . . . They are a very secret society; for this has been admitted in answer to questions in the House of Commons. . . . They have repeatedly refused to give evidence in the coroner's court, inquests upon men accidentally killed in the initiation to their lodges. But it is unlawful as well as secret. It was declared unlawful in 1825. Then there was a very exhaustive inquiry into the character of the society, and the English lodge was suppressed by act of parliament. The society was again declared unlawful by Royal Proclamation in 1836; and again by five judges of the Supreme Court of Canada in 1882. And its acts in public are breaches of the Public Processions acts of three different dates; and its oaths are breaches of the Oaths Acts also. It wades in illegalities. . . . It is also a seditious society. . . . The purpose of the Orange League for long was to place the Duke of Cumberland upon the throne in place of Queen Victoria. They enrolled and armed and drilled for that purpose. . . . It has maintained its power every where for the set purpose of spoiling pious devotion of every kind, and of wrecking true religion. . . . It is also an immoral society. It is immoral in the way it has packed juries again and again in Ireland, and given verdicts of 'not guilty' even when the prisoner himself had pleaded guilty and desired only the clemency of the court. . . . They made it a condition of employment of any man, that he should join the Orange League—that society which is secret, unlawful, seditious, and immoral. . . . Such is Orangemen, as exposed by an Anglican clergyman, without contradiction, to a representative assembly of the Church of England.

IN THE HOUSE OF LORDS in England there are many noble men, but the majority have nothing noble about them save the title. They are making a fierce onslaught upon the new budget because it presses heavily upon their moth-eaten privileges. They are extremely patriotic, those noble lords, and they are quite willing that immense sums of money be spent upon the army and navy so that the glory of the British Empire might be preserved and enhanced. But the moment they are asked to bear a reasonable proportion of the expense vitriolic protests are placed upon record. Lord Roseberry calls the new budget a revolution. "Landowners," he says, "are damned according to the spirit of the age for holding any property at all and doubly damned for holding property and land." This is very unbecoming language from a noble lord, and unbecoming as it is unbecoming. Looking at the matter from long range most people will conclude that there is "something rotten in the state of Denmark." England is, comparatively speaking, a small country. Why should such an immense tract of its land be held by the privileged class for sporting purposes while the people are forced to look to other nations for food-stuffs? It would not be just, of course, to deprive these people of their property without fair compensation, but that the unproductive land should be placed in the hands of the people to cultivate seems to be along the line of common sense. The necessities of the country demand it. The noble lords of the House of Lords seem to riding for a fall. They have always set their faces against progressive legislation. If they reject the new budget they will be making a very uncomfortable bed for themselves.

THE NEW Briand ministry in France are becoming alarmed at the exodus of the people from that misgoverned country. They have a right of course to take every fair means to keep their people at home, but they should not misrepresent other countries. Under the sun there is not a nation to-day to