

The Catholic Record

Price of Subscription—\$1.50 per annum.
United States & Europe—\$2.00
THOS. COFFEY, LL. 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. Hagarty, Mrs. W. E. Smith and Miss Sara Hanley are authorized to receive subscriptions and to transact all other business for the CATHOLIC RECORD. Obsolete 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 were they 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, 1903.

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 stands firmly by the teaching and authority of the Church, at the same time, it is the best of all papers in the country. Following these lines it has done a great deal of good for the welfare of religion and 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,
Donatus, Archbishop of Ephesus.

Donatus, Archbishop of Ephesus.
Apostolic Delegate

UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA.
Ottawa, Canada, March 7th, 1906.

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. Blessing you and wishing you success, believe me to remain,
Yours faithfully in Jesus Christ,
T.D. Falgout, Arch. of Laval,
Assoc. Deleg.

LONDON, SATURDAY, JANUARY 27, 1912

"THE DEMORALIZATION OF COLLEGE LIFE"

A pamphlet with this title has just been published by R. T. Crane, of Chicago, who tells us that it is a report of an investigation, extending over ten years, into the moral conditions that obtain in the great secular universities of the United States. He tells us further that for a long time he refrained from giving this report to the public because it was so nauseating in its details; but that the great interest shown in those parts of it which appeared in The Valve World, in Aug., 1911, induced him to publish the report in full—excepting a few portions unfit for publication.

It may be well to state at the outset that Mr. Crane frankly admits that he does not believe in higher education, a fact which may have unconsciously biased his views, even on questions of fact.

But there is evidence that he wished to be fair and unprejudiced. In his instructions to the University man, who investigated for him the conditions of student life at Harvard, he says:

"In all such large institutions there is sure to be quite a number that will go to the bad, and the vital question is to determine something of the proportion of this class to the whole number of students. The next idea would be to determine whether the surroundings of the college have any very decided tendency in the way of demoralizing the boys."

Mr. Crane then prefaces the detailed report of his Harvard investigator by quoting from the San Jose Herald, wherein an old college man contrasts the past with the present college life:

"We are bound to voice our own strong conviction that almost every remnant of effective moral discipline has disappeared from our larger colleges and universities."

"Forty years and more ago in all reputable colleges of the country, discipline was a reality. The standard of conduct, industry and subordination was fairly high, and it was maintained. Particularly was there a code of morals which was reasonably strict, and which was enforced with reasonable strictness. The community life was regulated by wholesome laws, and these laws were far from being a dead letter."

Those who point to the number of eminently successful university men as a refutation of Mr. Crane's contentions, entirely overlook the fact that the university life of to-day is in sad and striking contrast to that of the time when these successful men were university students.

The detailed report which follows presents an awful picture of the degenerate college life of to-day. We shall not enter into the details; but they fully bear out the statement quoted from Clarence F. Birdseye's book, "The Re-organization of our Colleges."

"In many of our larger colleges and universities, and too many of our smaller ones, a very considerable part of the college home life is morally rotten—terribly so."

The following is from a letter received by Mr. Crane from a physician residing in Columbus, Ohio:

"I have for several years tried to get the university authorities to take some interest in the morals of their students, but thus far without success. They seem to feel that they are responsible for the students in the classroom but not outside, and the students have come to be notoriously immoral. Physicians in the north end of the city, where the university is located, assure me that practically all of them are diseased as the result of immorality."

The partial publication of Mr. Crane's report in August last of course called forth some indignant denials, or attempted palliation or justification of existing

conditions. The New York Times had an editorial along the lines to which a mother of a college son replies. Space forbids its reproduction, but we shall give some extracts.

"As the mother of a boy who has managed to survive his freshman year, with the resultant average of scars—physical, mental and moral—I feel qualified to speak."

"It is begging the question to say that 'professors can only advise the average boy.'"

"The mothers who spend themselves in the effort to 'reinforce young minds with sturdy ideals,' and who then see their boys flung into an atmosphere reeking with viciousness—where chaps girls and street walkers and drink and disease and the 'dope' doctor have an equal if not pre-eminent influence (with the professors) in the daily mental diet, will do well to heed Mr. Crane. It is perfectly true that college life, as it is lived to-day, ruins more boys than it ever makes good men. And the fault is not with home and mother so much as with the system."

Another phase of college life, and perhaps one of even greater menace to the national life, is the rowdiness and utter lawlessness of students. In this connection a report was compiled by an Oberlin Alumni committee of Chicagoans, consisting of attorney Joseph B. Burt, Attorney Edwin H. Abbott, and H. H. Matheson, and the data were collected from all over the United States. The general finding bears out the charge that college men are the most lawless element in the nation.

The answers from various universities, received by the committee, may be judged from this one from Shaw University, Raleigh, North Carolina:

"The reason college men do not get into action against lawlessness is because college men are law-breakers themselves. The college student is very indifferent to the rights of any outside of his university, his class, or his fraternity."

"The students of a single great university have caused the death of two young men at society or fraternity initiations, and the death of an aged woman at a class supper. Yet no one was punished by the law."

"College presidents are not willing to enforce the law, or even to allow it to be enforced, when it will cause them the loss of students, especially rich or influential ones."

"The first essential of a good education is the gaining of a wholesome respect for law and order. Are we not educating criminals in many of our colleges when we furnish an education devoid of moral instruction?"

Professor David Starr Jordan, in an address delivered at the University Club, Chicago, in May, 1910, said among other things:

"One time we celebrated a great football victory. Two hundred students from the University of California spent the night on the campus. The fraternity houses were open all night. Two hundred drunken rowdies marched through the library, a thing the library was not accustomed to. Beer kegs were carried over the steps of the sorority house and some of the boys made a night of it there. Later one student went to a saloon down town, got drunk, came back, and got into the wrong house. Some one shot him. That decided the authorities. We suspended the ring-leaders of the gang that invaded the library. Then one hundred and thirty other students said they were just as guilty. What were we going to do about it? We let them go, too."

That our Canadian secular universities are superior in many important respects to those of the great republic we feel to be quite true. But from them also, the all-important, the essential element of real education is necessarily barred, namely, religion, which alone vitalizes moral instruction. The divorce of education from religion has been disastrous from the primary school to the great university, and if the results are more evident in the United States, the cause is the same everywhere. The wisdom of the Church is again amply verified by the sad experience of those who have cast that wisdom aside, and proceeded on the principle that education alone was all-sufficing. Such education, though supported by tens of millions of dollars annually, taken from the taxes of the many for the benefit of the few, will inevitably forfeit the respect and support of the people.

Side by side with these great state universities, on which millions are spent, have sprung up the Catholic colleges and convents which cover the land, and which reinforce education with the holy and powerful influences of religion. Without state aid, with little aid from the rich, but with something that neither state nor millionaire can give, the consecrated lives of thousands of men and women, our institutions of higher education have ever held that "the first essential of a good education is the gaining of a wholesome respect for law and order." And hence we have the wholesome discipline of Catholic college life.

Another phase of modern education against which the Church has always sternly set her face, is co-education of the sexes. In this connection it is interesting to note the opinion of Rev. Dr. George E. Hunt, pastor of Christ Presbyterian Church, Madison, the seat of the far famed University of Wisconsin.

"If I did not live in Madison, I never would send a young girl to the University of Wisconsin—or any other State university for that matter."

"I do not believe that there are enough safeguards thrown around our girls here. I am talking about the girls

and young women now. Conditions as regards our boys are even more deplorable."

Our convent boarding schools "send back to their parents the same sweet minded and sweet-mannered girls they were when they left home," something Dr. Hunt deprecates that the State university fails to do in a great many cases.

Imagine if you can "beer kegs" being carried into a convent, and "some of the boys making a night of it there!" And yet this is what Professor Starr Jordan tells us happened in the "sorority house" at Chicago University. We feel inclined to agree with Rev. Dr. Hunt that "there are not enough safeguards thrown around our girls" where co-education exists.

We shall not attempt to point the moral from all this; those Catholic parents, who know the conditions that obtain in secular universities, will draw their own conclusions. We thought it well to place the foregoing facts before them so that they may be in a position to form their opinions intelligently.

There may be and doubtless are cases where proximity to a secular university or high-school, and inability to send their children to Catholic institutions, make it desirable for Catholic parents to take advantage of the facilities at their doors. But they cannot be excused from the gravest negligence, for which they will render an account to God, if they fail to supplement the godless education with all possible religious influences, and take every means to safeguard their sons and daughters from the dangers to faith and morals.

There is a Dr. Tasse in Montreal and he aspires to the majority. Dr. Tasse is the possessor of a set of principles which call to mind the Reign of Terror in France and some of the characters in Charles Dickens' "Tale of Two Cities." Here are some of the changes which Dr. Tasse would like to bring about in the government of Canada's metropolis:

"Licensed concert halls where light drinks will be obtainable; all day and all night saloons; Sunday theatres and concert halls; all stores open on Sunday until noon."

We respectfully submit to the Minister of the Interior the advisability of inquiring into the case of Dr. Tasse. If he is not a native of Canada, but a recent arrival from France, he should be deported. Most assuredly he is an undesirable citizen.

A FEW REMARKS

At the beginning of the year we are accustomed to look over the past and promise to avoid in the future our mistakes and shortcomings and sins. And in our opinion this is a very wise thing if we set about it resolutely and without fear. It may occasion us trouble and pain, for we must take off the scales from our eyes and go out from our house of enjoyment. We must try to see ourselves as we are. We may have money and position, but these are no proof that all is well with us. We may even be journeying on with the utmost complacency and all the while with dust and ashes in our hearts. But if we seek vision we may learn much that is, perchance, discouraging, but instructive withal and a deterrent to self-conceit. We may see ourselves as we were some years ago, and wonder how different we are to-day. In our youth we had ideals, our visions, our castles illumined with the light of noble endeavor and flawless purity. We were on the mountain-tops bathed in air with never a taint in its faintest tremor. We looked forward to our work joyfully and with the firm resolve to bear ourselves knightly so that, victor or vanquished, there would be no stain on our shield. There was our youth radiant and garbed in innocence. And how are we to-day? Have our castles been swept away and our visions as if they had never been. Is our ear attuned to the harmony of the spheres or filled only with the sounds of earth? Is our resolve to die rather than be defiled as clean-out and as compelling as in the days that are gone? Have we wandered from the magic land of youth into the dreary deserts of vulgarity and triviality? We can each answer that question. But it is certain that only in the land of high ideals is the joy that cannot be bought with all the riches of the Indies. Poor or rich—it matters not—if accompanied with visions. We can laugh at adversity and hear the music of the angels. We may wonder why men and women, having but a short time, should flitter it away on the things that are valueless. Having within us a source of strength we can be content however the winds blow and inspect our memories of the time when life was like a story, holding neither sob nor sigh.

And these memories may be our richest possession. They may fill our hearts with fragrance and warmth; they may web the eyes and bow us to the earth in gratitude; they may speak to us of love and self-sacrifice, but, part of our being, we would not surrender them for any price. They are ours, and at the beginning of the year they may serve as remedy for our indifference and self-seeking. They may by their beauty and significance compel us for very shame not to sully this year with unworthy thought or act. With them as guides we may wander back to the land where "every bush is afire with God" and see again the miracle of earth and sky and the deeds of Love, the wonder-worker, and cast out from us all cant and hypocrisy and go on our way with a song in our heart.

Suppose that we resolve at the beginning of the year to be kind and forbearing. No easy task, you say, while cynics taunt and human nature seems often to justify them. But it is the law of the game of life. We must play hard and earnestly and all the time but joyously to hearten the brother who is playing beside us. We can smile when knocks are hardest, and play on till the game is over. It may be for a time, short or long, but our business is to play with every energy, alert and watchful till the shadows fall and the call for rest is sounded.

We may not score according to the world; we may work hard and fare poorly and be dubbed a failure, but the buoyant heart of the worker unafraid and guided by the light of eternity cares little for the standard of time.

We should resolve to avoid all uncharitableness. The mean gossip, the sarcastic quip, the carrying of stories, slander as unlovely as hell, should be regarded as evils that make humanity despicable and a libel on Christianity. No wonder that uncharitable Christians, with their big prayer-books, are the scoff and byword of the critic. Professing a belief in Christ, they try to show by their language that the ways of the gentle Christ are not their ways, and that the love of which they speak has no abode in their hearts. Instead of ministering to their brethren they harass and despise them: instead of being bearers of the oil and balm of charity, they garner gossip and slander and spread it broadcast, numbing the while prayers and wondering why others do not discern the hold of sanctity which, according to them, is their chief adornment. They are blind to the beauty of right Christian living. Ghoul-like they wander in cemeteries and interest themselves in things that rot and smell. But why go so far afield. For many of these people might find in closed chapters of their own lives an incentive to unpleasant words and a reason why they should be chary of invective and sarcasm. Let them pray for vision. We have all of us our burdens and our crosses: we may smile while the heart throbs with agony: we are all on the highway, plodding along in the dust and heat, and we all need the word that solaces the heart and lightens the burden and gives us courage. Love will make the way less toilsome and transmute the little things of life into living beauty. It is the greatest thing in the world and it costs but so little. To come to the end of the way—to stand before the eternal gates with our hands filled with gossip, with memories of hearts wounded and killed with calumny and evil words—to find out at last that a whole life was but a medley of discords, would be a terrible revelation. Surely it is the very essence of aroidness to live with hearts tenanted by evil spirits. Aye, and more, it would make this world but the porch of hell. But the kind word that helps us over the rough places—the love that fills the air with sunshine, however grey be the clouds, the sympathy that binds up our wounds—all this is within the resources of all. And then the night is come, the memories of gentle speech and loving deed shall plead our cause before the Great White Throne.

Our old friend has been here to wish us the compliments of the season. Some of his friends regard him as archaic—very old fashioned. We esteem him as a very wise man. He has not much of the world's gear because he has never had time to work for it. He is content, however, and sees all things and men by the light of a kindly heart. He believes indeed that money stands for character, but he wonders why men destined to die should plan and toil to heap up money. He laughs at the stories of the Captains of Industry and regards as the dearest drive the glorification of their exploits in the market. To scheme and work and tread on the faces of brothers in the wild rush after the dollar, and to exude platitudes to a money-mad generation makes him despair of our civilization. So you see he is hopelessly out of step with modern progress. But he owns the stars and the sun and the flowers and the hues and prisms that nature turns out of her winter's workshop. The laughter of children is for him the sweetest music. Back of them he sees the Divine Conductor evoking from hearts unstained the melody that but echoes the choir celestial. Some of these days he will go into the black box with the gilded nails. But his friends will remember him as a wise man who sowed and bound up his sheaves in the eventide and went home rejoicing.

We think that children should resolve to show more affection for their parents. It would take an angel's pen to write

down what we owe our mothers. The debt is always there, and the devotion and love of a life-time cannot cancel it. But we can at least acknowledge its existence by our thoughtfulness, by words and deeds that bring sunshine into the eyes and hearts of the dear little women who are going down into the valley and want but the assurance that they are remembered by the men and women whom they once crowned to sleep on their laps. And what greater privilege and happiness for the son and daughter. To have a mother and to know that her heart is in our keeping; to look into her eyes and see the love mirrored therein, and to be able to cherish and guard her—this is the sweetest happiness this side of heaven.

Many readers of the daily newspapers have been led to believe that Dr. Grenfell was the first good Samaritan to hasten to the succor of wind-swept Newfoundland. The good people who took the doctor's story at its face value were impressed with its narration of his hardships and of the dangers that accompany the men who go down to the sea in ships. The Western Star, published at Bay of Islands, Nfld., calls attention to the fact that there is more need for missionary work in England and America than there is in that God-fearing and prosperous country. It also says that long before the days of Dr. Grenfell missionaries toiled and suffered and went their way without any beating of drums. They, as our other men who are away at the outposts of civilization, gave of their talent and work, seeking no other reward than the salvation of souls.

In reply to a correspondent we beg to say that the Y. M. C. A. is not non-sectarian but Protestant in its works and aims. The claim of non-sectarianism is sometimes advanced to entice money from the pockets of Catholics, but it has no foundation in fact. We do not believe that our children cannot be taught to love serious reading. We are of the opinion that boys and girls can be trained to read books which demand thought. Take them in their impressionable period; place them in a world of worthy standards and you have given them a source of instruction, consolation and strength. It is of little avail to advise adults, who know but the current magazines and fiction. But perhaps they might learn to be ashamed at allowing their minds to be sewers through which flows a stream of triviality and vulgarity—at allowing their eyes to rest upon illustrations which in no wise reflect modesty and purity. If, however, they wish to keep spiritually fit they should take a tonic—moderate doses—of reading which can steady them and reveal another world which they can live in to their spiritual benefit. There are a few what we should call "smart" writers, who with quip and jest and flippant phrase, inveigh against religion. We might give names, but we are not going to give them any advertising in our columns. They talk as if religion were in honour only among the ignorant and benighted. They plume themselves as being independent thinkers, though they are known as pocket-book editions of Voltaire. They affect the scientific pose because it attracts the dollar of the half-educated. Professor Sayer declares that "there are few leading scientists who are irreligious, but the vast majority, so far as any knowledge goes, are quite the reverse." The "irreligious" are for the most part those who have merely a smattering of scientific knowledge.

Some of these articles are very declamatory against the Church. They bring on the stage Galileo, Bruno, etc., as witnesses to the Church's antagonism to science. They wax flippant about the monks of old and the Catholic who is in a back water moored to a Church that is out of touch with modern conditions. Thus they wander on through a maze of words to the delight of those who contribute to the upkeep of these vocal nuisances. But the man who can read is finding out the attitude of the Church towards science. He knows now that there is not and never can be any opposition between Catholic dogma and the findings of true science. And he is aware that in every department of human activity there have been and are men and women who prove that exquisite culture and profound thought are not incompatible with the piety and docility of Catholic life.

"THE RED RAG AND THE BULL" comes to mind when reading press despatches dealing with the conduct of Belfast Unionists. They have always been, they declare, the champions of law and order, but now they are willing to break particles. They have ever been the champions of freedom of speech, but as John Redmond and Winston Spencer Churchill differ from them as to the best method of governing Ireland, they will not allow these gentlemen to be heard on a Belfast platform. They have declared it to be their purpose to fill the hall, in which these gentlemen are to speak, days before the meeting, with five thousand stalwart Orangemen, and the

trains will bring seventy-five thousand other stalwarts who will surround the building. The Unionist party in England are somewhat perturbed at the conduct of their followers in Ireland, but they have only themselves to blame. For generations they have planted and watered and nurtured the seed of hatred of their Catholic fellow citizens amongst the Orangemen of the North. They now find that the crop is a bountiful one. The only class in Ireland which have demonstrated themselves utterly unfit for self-government are the Irish Unionists. They still remain foreigners in the country in which they were born.

SOMETHING NEW

It is more than probable that our friends of the Ministerial Association will now swing their batteries off the No Temperance decree for a period as they have something new and startling to occupy their attention. In the English-speaking world there has commenced a furious discussion as to whether the word "obey" should be retained in, or expunged from, the marriage ceremony. The Archbishop of Canterbury has contradicted the rumor that he insisted on the use of the word in uniting in marriage two well-known suffragettes. Coming nearer home His Lordship the Bishop of Huron declared that his clergy always include the word "obey." Upon being asked if the omission of the word would invalidate the ceremony he declared that he did not know. The Methodists, we are told, do not include the word "obey" in the ceremony unless by request of one of the parties. It is their custom to use the words "love, honor and keep." Presbyterian ministers, a Free Press interviewer was told, are given considerable latitude. "Some of our ministers," said Dr. Ross, of St. Andrew's Church, London, "leave it out or use it. They are allowed to use their own judgment." Of all the sects the Methodist appears to be the most up-to-date, relegating to the rummage room the old standards. But even the form of words used by the Methodists avail but little at times. The bridegroom is expected to "love, honor and keep" his wife; but what, may we ask, would be the result in case the wife fails to "keep" the husband, or in other words, where "everybody works but father?" Then another question will arise: When this is the situation would the wife be justified in making application to the Senate Committee for a divorce. It would be a nice subject for debate at a meeting of the Ministerial Association. This discussion gives us one more vivid illustration of the topsy-turvy condition of the headless sects who have out themselves loose from the Chair of Peter. A pity it is to see so many good men vainly striving for the unattainable—that peace of mind and happiness and certitude of faith which Catholics enjoy. They are not cast about by every wind of doctrine.

SIR MAX AIKEN, addressing his constituents in London, England, took strong ground against Home Rule for Ireland and said that in Canada there was trouble enough with the Provincial Home Rule system which caused difficulties and disagreements from one end of the Dominion to the other. This wild declaration of Sir Max will be news indeed to the people of the Dominion. In the British North America Act the rights and privileges of the Federal Parliament and those of the Provincial Legislatures are clearly set forth, and since the time of confederation there has been no serious disturbance in relation thereto. In minor matters, such as jurisdiction in the granting of railway charters, there have been disagreements, and will there have been settled without any ruffle in the body politic. If Sir Max were to come to Canada and advocate the abolition of Provincial Legislatures he would have a hornet's nest about his ears.

THE SANCTITY OF THE CHURCH

"Over thee Jerusalem hath the Lord arisen and His glory shall be seen in thee." The prophet in these words foretells the sanctity of the Church. We find them in the epistle for the Epiphany when we celebrate the appearance of the star which led to and gave exterior manifestation of the presence of Jesus. The star led the Wise Men to Jesus. So the presence of saints and sanctity make manifest the presence of Jesus in His New Jerusalem. Sanctity is the star guiding men to the presence of Jesus. For when Jesus commissioned His Apostles to preach He assured them of success. "Go," said He, "and teach and behold I am with you." Now in Holy Scripture, when God is said to be with "anyone," it indicates the infallible success of the work undertaken. So when Christ says that He will be with His Church teaching, He simply foretells the success of His Church in its work of sanctification. According to Christ the teaching of the Church which He assists can never remain unfruitful, but must, as from a constant and necessary law, produce saints and sanctity, and succeed in the supernatural work of sanctification in spite of all the powers of darkness. It is useless to quibble or equivocate. Christ's Church is essentially

holy; and every church which claims to be the Church of Christ must stand or fall by the test of sanctity. And just as its success in the supernatural work of producing saints must ever stand before men and nations as a perpetual argument that she is from God, assisted and approved by God, so also the inability of any church to produce saints proves that she does not enjoy God's assistance, that her teaching has not His approval and forever brands her as an impostor.

GAMBLING—HIGH AND LOW

One very marked characteristic of Andrew Carnegie is his rugged candor. Presently there is an investigation going on in Washington in regard to the operations of the Steel Trust. Its method of doing business, as indeed the methods of almost every other line of activity in the Republic, are giving the authorities a very strenuous period. The dishonesty, the chicanery and the trickery of many who have the money power at their back has become a scandal and a reproach. Just here we may mention, that not alone in the United States are these conditions to be found. Canada, too, seems to be in the grip of the money-crazed trust magnates, while the men at the head of our legal machinery are playing Rip Van Winkle. Mr. Carnegie in giving evidence before the commission in Washington was asked why he, when connected with the Steel Company, divided his stock into \$1,000 shares. He replied: "To keep them off the Stock Exchange because he did not believe in stock gambling. I never in my life bought or sold a share of stock on the speculative market. I was reared differently. I had a grandfather ruined in Scotland by stock speculation, and I resolved when a young man that it was ruinous. Throughout my business career I never bought long nor sold short." In another portion of his evidence he said: "I am against all stock gambling. If there has to be gambling would it not be better for men to gamble at cards or on horses instead of on bread or meat or industrial stocks." The faultlessly groomed gentlemen who gamble on the Stock Exchange he described as "parasites." This is the situation. Are we then to consider that gentlemen who are ranked high in the community—gentlemen who are up to their eyes in the business of the stock exchange and the produce exchange—are engaged in the same line of business as the blackleg who endeavors to eke out a living at the poker table? If we recognize that gambling is gambling we must place them in that class. So long as their operations are confined to fleecing one another the honest, hard-working, law-abiding citizens suffers but little. When, however, their gambling has the effect of raising to an almost prohibitive figure the food products and other things of necessity in the homes of the people they should be called to account quickly and sharply. Lavishly they spend of their ill-gotten gains to defeat the ends of justice and if those in whose hands are placed the destiny of the country will not rise to the occasion there will be an awakening of the people. Those who watch the trend of events must conclude that a great struggle is confronting us. The contending forces will be The People vs. The Trusts. Will the ballot-box crush the latter? Time will tell. To retain their ill-gotten power they will have to count upon a corrupt electorate who will for a price cast their ballots for corrupt aspirants for office in high places. Meanwhile the Godless school, the Godless college and the Godless university will continue to grind out men many of whom have strangled conscience, and will not recognize in their daily lives what they owe to God or their fellow man.

THE JESUITS' OATH

A press despatch from Toronto, appeared in the daily papers on the 20th. It is as follows:

"Toronto, Jan. 19.—A legal battle, the like of which has never been seen in Canada or anywhere else, is what, in all probability, will be the final result of the controversy which has arisen in Toronto over the alleged oath of the Jesuit Order, which Rev. C. O. Johnston read to his congregation in the Queen Street Methodist Church a week ago last Sunday."

The head of the order in Montreal has interested himself in the matter to the extent of securing the legal services of Mr. E. V. O'Sullivan. Mr. O'Sullivan has been requested to ask the papers which published the alleged oath to make a fitting apology, and to request Rev. Mr. Johnston to do the same. If the papers do not care to do that, and if Rev. Mr. Johnston refuses, the understanding is that Mr. O'Sullivan is to proceed against them for alleged libel and slander."

The statement which Rev. Mr. Johnston made to-day is as follows:

"I have before me the oath which Mr. O'Sullivan says is the real Jesuit oath, but as it entirely fails to account for the conduct of the order, there must be another. The oath I read to my people is the only one I have found which contains the spirit attributed to Jesuitism by history. It is too late to whitewash the order with an innocent oath such as Mr. O'Sullivan has given."

"The oath he gives is doubtless one of their oaths. I have several others. His is not the only one, and if Mr. O'Sullivan stands by the Jesuits he must stand by their history as presented by his own church."