The Catholic Record

Price of Subscription-\$1.50 per annum

THOS. COFFEY, LL. D., Editor and Pul

nt for teachers, situations wan order.

proved and recommended by the Archbishops of poproved and recommended by the Archbishops of bonto, Kingston, Ottawa and St. Boniface, the ops of London, Hamilton, Peterborough, and ensburg, N. Y., and the clergy throughout the

When subscribers ask for their mail at the p fice it would be well were they to tell the clerk ive them their CATHOLIC RECORD. We have inf ation of carelessness in a few places on the part slivery clerks who will sometimes look for lett

nly.
Subscribers changing residence will please give old
well as new address.

LETTERS OF RECOMMENDATION
Apostolic Delegation.
Thomas Coffey.
Ottawa, June 13th, 1905.
Dear Sir.—Since coming to Canada I have a reader of your paper. I have noted with satison that it is directed with intelligence and ty, and, above all, that it is imbued with a strong tolic spint. It strenuously defends Catholic iples and rights, and stands firmly by the teach and authority of the Church, at the same time toting the best interests of the country. Follow-these lines it has done a great deal of good for welfare of religion and country, and it will do and more, as its wholesome influence reaches: Catholic homes. I therefore, earnestly recomit to Catholic families. With my blessing on work, and best wishes for its continued success. Yours very sincerely in Christ.

Donatus, 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 settimable paper, the CATHOLIC RECORD, and congraulate you upon the manner in which it is published to matter and form are both good; and a truly Catholic spirit pervades the whole. Therefore, with yeleasure, I can recommend it to the faithful. Blessing you and wishing you success, believe me to remain.

Yours faithfully in Jesus Christ. †D. Falconio, Arch. of Larissa Apos. Deleg.

LONDON, SATURDAY, JANUARY 13, 1912

FATHER CLINE'S LAST WORD ANENT LOCAL OPTION

Dear Mr. Editor : - After reading your comments upon my letter of the 23rd inst. I feel some regret for having wasted so much ammunition upon positions I naturally assumed you had maintained, but which you claim you have never held. My first letter was mainly a project against your institute. mainly a project against your justifica-tion of Local Option "on theological grounds." You ask me in your issue of the 23rd why I took grounds." You ask me in your issue of the 23rd why I took up this phase of the question? I shall let your own words answer: "Though it may be unnecessary to notice the rather ludicrous fears of some timid Catholics who see the germs of Mohammedanism or Manichaeism in giving a municipality the right to do away with licensed liquor selling within its limits, still it may be well to forstall their objection on theo-logical grounds." You end your theotreatment of the subject thus theological phase of the question. less you intended your words to be ac-cepted in their unnatural rather than their obvious or natural sense you can-not blame me for attaching to them the

meaning I did.

My second letter was in part provoked by your recommending local option as "judged in the light of experience" regardless of its ethics or theology, forgetting that if it were opposed to either, neither your nor any ody else's experience counts for anything. While no doubt many reforms have been effected by force such as dynamite and revolution, you could not, however, recommend the method by which they were carried. In spetting Local Option you are to my mind the advocate of a wild theory unshared by any theologian holding a professorship in any seat of learning on the continent. You should not therefore be alarmed if the horizon is black with "free lances."

Local Optionists make no secret that their main object is general prohibition. They action the principle of felling the forest by cutting down a tree at a time. They show their hand when they say in temperance publication called the merica Issue," "if Local Option is "America Issue," "if Local Option is good enough to be called prohibition when it reaches the Victory stage it is entitled to recognition as local prohibition in the preliminary stages."
Its aim therefore is to coalesce the dry municipalities into one prohibition stronghold that will prevent the manu-facture and sale of alcholic drinks. I hold as I did in my last letters such law to be unconstitutional. A compulsory stoppage such as this is against the individual rights of the citizen, which neither Church nor State can absolutely remove. The right to drink wine its basis in natural law as much as the right to drink water, tea or coffee, because they are all four nature's Legislation was never intended to

absolutely forbid the use of things the bountiful Creator gave to man, as The object of legislation prohibition. The object of legislation is rather to make easy the doing of good, and difficult the doing of evil good, and difficult the doing of evil.
But Local Option in its last analysis makes the doing of the sin of
drunkenness an impossible evil by
forbidding the manufacture and
sale of that which intoxicates. It abridges by statute the rights that taken away by abuse or forfeiture. All such legislation is both extravagant and intolerant. It makes law of self-sacrifice of the It creates an enforced virtue of temperance, which in view of the fact that virtue is essentially voluntary is not less absurd than compulsory self sacri-fice. Regarding such legislation Ed-mund Burke says: "The human system which reas for its basis on the heroic virtues is sure to have a superstructure of weakness or of profligacy." This has weakness or of profligacy." This has been amply attested in the history of Paritanism. We can at once see that between the Paritanism of Local Option and the personal freedom of Catholic and the personal freedom of Catholic total abstinence, there is as much differ-ence as there is between Rationalism

But there is as little likelihood of the Church favouring a surrender of the individual rights of her children to such a martial law as there is of the Creator

turning over his omnipotence to a con-quering army. Hence any party that shampions compulsion and majority right will never find favor with the Church, jacket. Human devices are as power-less to make a man temperate as they are to make him chaste. The Pharisees of old had recourse to certain artifices for the cultivation of the virtue of purity. In order to avoid looking at a woman they muffled their faces and ground their way through the atreats like blind men, but when Christ challenged the one that was innocent to cast the first stone

cast the first stone they all fied in shame. It is always so with the mechanical virtue acquired behind stone walls and bolted doors. The most sober community in Ontario is Kingston Pentientiary. Yet if you unlock the doors and throw open the gates its members will part with their temper-ance at the first whiff of freedom as

ance at the first whiff of freedom as eagerly as with their prison garb. And despite all this my theological friend thinks it is quite probable that Local Option belongs to the armory of the Catholic Church!

You say with evident satisfaction "but we do not consider ourselves unhorsed."
In jumping over the breast-works you erected in favor of Local Option you showed horsemanship worthy of a showed horsemanship steeple chase moralist.

You say "our reason for maintaining that Local Option is a perfectly free question remains unanswered." I am sorry to see you play the part of um-pire in your own trial. Your defence rests upon one argument and a negative rests upon one argument and a negative one at that, "because no one entitled to speak with authority has condemned it." If all the practices that came and went in the Church were accepted as Catholic belief because they obtained for a certain period without any outspoken protest I fear the orthodoxy of the Church would be well nigh undermined Ohurch would be well nigh undermined before now. As the great defender of liberty the Church has to bear the burdens of liberty. She cannot always separate its blessings and benefits from its obligations and its difficulties. Hence she often hesitates to disentangle the weed lest in doing so she may hurt the flower. She has for instance tolerated a married Ruthenian clergy to certain numerical extent for centuries certain numerical extent for centuries in the hope that they may of their own accord sooner or later come to the prac-tice of purity in its heroic form, celi-bacy, and receive her approval. Does bacy, and receive her approval. this mean that marriage is at least on the same footing as cellbacy in the eyes of the Catholic Church, or that it is an

according to the reasoning of the RECORD.
You do not deny that Local Option is prohibition. In fact you assert it, and yet you state "it is only an extension of the liquor law." But as prohibition prevents the manufacture and the sale of liquor, the liquor law can have no "ex-

open question? It would seem

tension" under prohibition.
You seem to think that hotels improperly kept or that cater to no need cannot be dealt with unless by Loca

How did Toronto get rid of its forty undesirable hotels? It was not by Local Option. You must have heard of a by-law that, being submitted and assed by a municipality, can reduce

the number of licenses.

Lastly, you say the license law is nade up of prohibition. Prohibition on Sunday, prohibition between certain hours of the night. This is mere word I can hardly believe that you play. I can hardly believe that you could confound restriction and regulation with prohibition, for they are

poles apart.

I now retire from the discussion of this very live topic in the hope that some one abler and with more time at his disposal may say the last word on it. Though I have always admired the RECORD's treatment of Catholic subjects in general, I think that on the question of Local Option it has allowed its zeal to carry it into mistaken paths. At the same time it still retains my esteem. I respect its manly Catholicity,

openly and without a stammer. M. CLINE. It is a pleasure to us in this concluding article to find ourselves so much in accord with our reverend critic. We are entirely agreed in matters of principle, not quite, but nearly so, on matters of fact, but there remains a diversity of opinion as to the application of some of the principles, and we fail to see some

facts quite in the same light. We meant the words I quoted by Father Cline in opening his letter in their plain, obvious and natural sense. But Father Cline goes on to say; "You end your theological treatment of the subject thus: So much for what may be called the theological phase of the sub ject.

And then we went on, prescinding altogether from moral or theological considerations, to answer Father Voisin's question about our experience with Local Option in Ontario. But Father Cline would persist in mixing up theological and moral considerations with this part of the article, reminding us for instance, that experience was no test of morality, and that our theological standards were those of the Ecumenical Conference. That is why our friend wasted so much ammunition on positions which we never held.

It appears we are entirely agreed a to the undesirability of country hotels; now this is the whole distance we went, in endorsing Local Option. Thelaw is there. It is national, constitutional and moral, We should advise those who think "these hotels have no right to live " to take advantage of it. We did not say it was the only means; they might be abolished by the use of dynamite, but we prefer the legal method endorsed by Catholic practice, never condemned by Catholic authority and opposed to no principle of Catholic theology; unless, indeed, the authority of the free lances which father Mathew had wrought.

"The circumstances under which the drink curse arose anew amongst the Irish people are painfully reproachfulito our law-makers and administrators. There were scores, probably hundreds, of districts in Ireland from which drink-

of theology armed with the negative argument " Local Option has not been

Happily, we are also in agree to Prohibition. Prohibition in the usual application of the word means the absolute suppression of alcoholic drinks, the prevention of their manufacture and sale except for medicinal purposes This is something that differs toto caele from Local Option, which, though it may properly be called prohibition, cannot with either truth or propriety, be called Prohibition in the ordinary accepta tion of that term as defined above. Here is where Father Cline differs from us, and, not keeping in mind the different senses of which the word is susceptible, accuses us of playing upon words. Local Option we conceded was prohibi tion, but of the self-same kind that necessarily makes up the very principle of the License Law which regulates the liquor traffic. Prohibition with regard to time, Prohibition with regard to persons, and Prohibition with regard to locality are all included in the ordinary License Law, even without the Local Option provision of that same law, which gives the ratepayers of a municipality Home Rule on the question of whether or not they shall allow the sale of intoxicating drinks within the limits of the municipality. That is the whole sum and substance of Local Option.

But as to Prohibition in the sense de fined both by Father Cline and the RECORD, and which, for the sake of convenience, we shall call Total Probi bition, we are in absolute agreement We are opposed to it for all the reasons put forth by Father Cline and for others as cogent. We are opposed to it whether applied to Dominion or Province.

We differ, however, both as to the underlying principle of Local Option and as to its ultimate effect. We have not the remotest fear in the world that it will lead to total prohibition, the obscure Prohibition sheet quoted by Father Cline to the contrary notwithstanding : at any rate, it does not do our thinking for us.

This fear expressed sometimes those for whom our friend is spokesman reminds us of the old story of the old maid who was found sobbing bitterly on the sea-shore. On being asked the cause of her trouble she replied : " I was thinking that if I got married and nad a son and he should grow up and go to sea and get drowned - " here her emotions overcame her again. We believe that the chances were against the old maid getting married, or if married having a son, or having a son that he would grow up.go to sea and get drowned. We consider the fears that Local Option will lead to total prohibition are still more groundless.

At all events we shall cross that

oridge when we come to it. We confess that we are not able to follow our critic, when he starts out with Edmond Burke, winds up with the Ruthenian married clergy, and concludes triumphantly that if we reason consistently we must be unsound on clerical celibacy or the celibate state, as compared with marriage. However, we hasten to assure him that we hold to the orthodox belief and practice with regard to celibacy.

A great deal of Father Cline's argucention : any prohibition cranks who believe this are amongst those from whom we dissociated ourselves at the outset. The majority of staunch local optionists are moderate drinkers, and make no apology for it.

In the township referred to in the first article, Local Option some years ago just failed to carry. Licenses were granted the next year as usual. That was the time when our friends in Toronto seemed a bit afraid of their own three-fifths clause, and for the next two years the licenses were refused. Then came another vote on the by-law, when it was carried with an overwhelming majority. Two years' experience without bar-rooms converted two hundred voters who had previously voted against Local Option. Experience does not always follow the lines of prejudice. cometimes it overcomes prejudice. Recently we came across something in our reading which struck us as serving to noint a moral or adorn a tale.

A. M. Sullivan, in New Ireland, has an appreciative and discriminating sketch of the great Father Theobald Mathew the "Apostle of Temperance." Apart altogether from its bearing on Local Option the chapter is well worth reading, as indeed is the whole book, though a newer Ireland has arisen since it was written.

"I have said that the astonishing suc enthusiasm, and was certain to be followed by a reaction. Even if no un-usual misfortune had befallen, some such retrocession would, I am confident, have been suffered, but nothing that would have seriously impaired the reformation which Father Mathew had wrought.

shops bad long totally disappeared; and had there been at any time any statutable conservation of this 'free soil' area, three-fourths of Father Mathew's work would have endured to the present hour. But what happened within my own experience and observation was this. When the Government relief works were set on foot all over the kingdom, close by every pay-office or depot there started into operation a meal store and a whiskey-shop; nay, often the pay clerks and road-staff lodged in the latter and made it 'headquarters.' Only too well the wretched people knew what the firewater would do for them; it would bring them oblivion or excitement, in which the horror and despair around them would be forgotten for a while. In many a tale of shipwreck we read with the horror and despair around them would be forgotten for a while. In many a tale of shipwreck we read with wonder that at the last dread moment the crew broached the spirit casks and drank till delirium came. In Ireland the starving people seemed possessed by some similar infatuation when once more the fatal lure was set up before them. In the track of the Government relief staff, and specially "licensed" by law, the drink-shops reappeared, and, to a large extent, reconquered what they had lost. Not wholly, however. There are thousands of men in Ireland to-day, who "took the pledge from Father Matthew," and hold by it still. There are clies and towns in which the flag has never been hauled down, and where its adherents are now as numerous as its adherents are now as numerous a opinion in favor of temperance legisla-tion, which Ireland has so notably and so steadily exhibited. The pure-soul

and great-hearted Capuchin has not lived and labored in vain." The italics in the above passage are ours. Thank God there is just such a statutable provision in the License Law of Ontario, in the clause giving to municipalities the right and privilege of ridding themselves of the drink shops when the sentiment of the people is overwhelmingly against their continuance. Indirect benefits, similar to those Mr. Sullivan indicates as resulting from the Father Mathew movement in Ire land, also follow the Local Option agitation in this province, as we pointed out in our first article.

In conclusion, we again thank Father Cline for opening up the discussion on our article. We should be very sorry to commit the CATHOLIC RECORD to one view of a controverted question, still we could not think of avoiding difficulty by maintaining a silence that would be cowardly. For this reason we gave Father Cline's able presentation of the other side of the question equal prominence with our editorial remarks, and now we feel that we have been absolutely impartial.

With regard to our remark about being unhorsed, the little figure of speech in which it was used, we are sure our friendly critic when he doffs his war paint will see is susceptible of a very good-natured reading. We certainly did not imagine we were " on trial and perhaps did not show sufficient deference to our judge. We should rather consider ourselves and Father Cline as two opposing advocates before a remarkably intelligent jury-the readers of the CATHOLIC RECORD. With them lies the verdict.

TREASON-FELONY

Many a time, up to less than a generaion ago, noted characters in Irish history, including Daniel O'Connell himself, were sent to prison because they were engaged in a peaceful agitation for ments, and good forceful arguments they the restoration of Ireland's parliament. are, is based on the assumption that Words uttered which were not in any Local Option means compulsory total degree treasonable were deemed to be so by the authorities and speedy trial and confinement in Kilmainham gaol was the result. Now-a-days, however, the law officers of the English Crown do not seem to be quite so active in the matter of smelling treason, otherwise Sir Edward Carson, K. C., member for Dublin University and Solicitor General for Ireland in the last Unionist government, would not be sitting as member for the University but sitting in a cell in prison. It is another case of people becoming wrathy and indignant at the prospect of being compelled to deliver up special advantages accorded them in the old days for being distinctly un-Irish and pro-English. Sir Edward Carson and his co-laborers in the Unionist cause in Ireland are Loyalists so long a it pays, but when it ceases to be profitable they will talk treason and threaten to do all sorts of things. When the time comes for action they will not be able to make a respectable cabbage garden escapade. Edward has declared that "Ulster, for which he speaks, would under no circumstances accept Home Rule even if passed by the House of Commons, and intimated that if necessary he would lead an armed rebellion against it. These be valiant words, Sir Edward. So the Unionists, if they cannot have their own way, will become rebels and Sir Edward and his brother Orangemen will be prepared to fight against what cess of the temperance movement from he terms "the crime of the age." It is 1838 to 1845 was largely the product of a curious spectacle. The rebels of a curious spectacle. The rebels of other days have become loyal to the British Crown and are prepared to shed their blood for its maintenance, and the Loyalists from the teeth outwards would trample upon the Union Jack itself rather than see their fellow-countrymen happy and prosperous as in other parts of the United Kingdom and its colonies. Sir Edward Carson tells us that under present conditions Ireland is prospering

and we should " leave her alone." He attributes this to the Land Purchase Act which he and his party opposed tooth and nail. No doubt Ireland is prospering to some extent by the operation of the Land Act, but Home Rule is needed to bring that full measure of prosperity to Ireland which she deserves Fifty years ago Ireland had 8,000,000 of people; to-day she has half that num-ber. This is the condition of things brought about by Sir Edward Carson and his followers who formed the foreign garrison in Ireland. Ireland will not " let alone." She must have her full measure of justice. The prospect of an uprising is really laughable. If to try the experiment they could re-Cork and Limerick to clean out the whole batch of anti-Irish Irishmen who have been for many generations but a curse to the country. They are men without a country and are like unto the sutlers who follow an army in time of war, hoping that hostilities may con-

IN THE FAR FUTURE

For twenty or thirty years it has been the custom of some gentlemen of the legal profession, when occasion calls them together in a body, to discuss the question of establishing Divorce Courts in those provinces of he Dominion in which they do not now exist. A souple of provinces at the time of conederation were permitted to retain hese courts as they had already been established there before their entrance into the Dominion. It would be ungracious to impute selfish motives to those gentlemen who have advocated this new departure. Some papers have. however, gone that far. The Toronto Globe says "A Divorce Court might be more beneficial to the members of the law society than to the morals of Ontario." It also adds: "It is not yet certain that it is good for a community to make divorce cheap and easy." The London Free Press draws a striking contrast between the methods of obtaining divorce in the United States and in Ontario. It very truly says that while "In the United States the proceedings take place in an open court, with all the attendant publicity that the frequent sordid details receive in the public press, in Canada there is never more publicity to the proceedings before the Committee of the Senate than is contained in the official notice of divorce application and the bare announcemen the decision." Our contemporary also gives us a sound note when it declares that "there should be a stiffen ing rather than making easy the conditions under which a marriage shall be dissolved." In conversation with a non-Catholic gentleman the other day in regard to this question he made the remark that it was notable that

were not on record as advocates of the establishment of divorce courts. It has often been claimed that to obtain a separation of man and wife be fore the divorce committee of the Senate the outlay of a large sum of money. altogether beyond the means of the average citizen, is necessary. There is no foundation whatever for this claim however, where the applicant is a poor man or poor woman, as the case may be, the \$200 deposit is refunded. Were a divorce court established in Toronto lawyers would have to be retained and the expense connected with the summoning of witnesses would have to be taken into account. It will thus be seen that the poor man, so far as money is conplight before a divorce court as before the Senate Committee. The only difference would be in the fact that witnesses would not have as large a bill for travelling expenses if there were a divorce court in each province.

lawyers who had a good practice

To us it seems extraordinary that anyone having at heart the well-being of Canada, with the awful disclosures which the divorce courts in the United States reveal, should become the advocate of the introduction of like conditions in our Canadian nationhood. In the Republic the divorce courts are looked upon as institutions for the promotion of progressive polygamy. It is all very well to claim that such conditions would not prevail were we to have divorce courts in Canada, but as human nature is pretty much the same on both sides of the border, it would not be many years before our Canadian divorce courts would take rank with those prevailing in the States of the American Union. For our part we would like to see even the divorce committee of the low journalism and sending across the Senate abolished. The proceedings before that body often reveal scandalous conditions. Separations are sought on the most trivial of excuses and quite frequently for the sole reason that the man or the woman tire of each other and wish to be free to marry again. Our non-Catholic fellow citizens have reason to be grateful to the Catholic Church for the stand it has taken in this mat-

ter. Were there no Catholic Quebec it is more than likely that long ago we would have had divorce courts, bringing us the same scandalous conditions which are now the shame of the great Ameri-

REV. W. C. RIDDIFORD, BAPTIST

So long as a pulpit topic draws a large assemblage we may expect some of the ministers will continue to discuss the Ne Temere decree. Rev. W. C.I Riddiford, pastor of Park St. Baptist Church, Peterboro, in a sermon recently delivered, gives us a crude and unfair statement of the case which keeps him in line with his brother Baptist the British Government were inclined preachers. He did not, however, confine himself strictly to a discussion of cruit enough Home Rulers in Tipperary, the decree, but launched out into other matters pertaining to the Catholic Church. "We can tolerate purgatory," said he, "even though we do not believe in it." If Mr. Riddiford were a member of the House of Commons he would often be called to order. As the text of his sermon was "Uniform Marriage Law," what has that got to do with purgatory? Well, if our dear good brother does not believe in purgatory there is nothing in the British North America Act or the revised statutes of Canada to prevent him going to the other place. We had intended devoting a little time

to the Rev Mr. Riddiford, but as he has made the announcement that Rev. Patrick Morgan, late of the Capuchin Fathers, - a person whose life work gives one an unlimited opportunity for the exercise of the charity of silence - is about to give a mission in his church, we touch our hat to him and say good-by. Before he leaves us, however, we desire to slip in his vest pocket the following editorial taken from the Toronto Mail and Empire of January 2: is misunderstood. The general

"Much as it has been discussed, the chief feature of the "Ne Temere" decree ms to be that the decree forbids marriages between Roman Catholics and Protestants. The decree does not forbid these marriages. It declares them to be no marriages if they are performed by a Protestant clergyman. If they are solemnized by a priest of the Roman Catholic Church they are recog-nized by that Church. The Roman marriages between members of its faith and non-Catholies; but for that matter Protestant clergymen do not encourage them either, experience having shown that the more husband and wife have in common the greater the chances are for a happy marriage. When religion is a vital matter to them, it is difficult to find a middle ground of compromise, and when there are children to be reared in one faith or the other, the problem be-comes one of the most serious that any man and woman have to face. It does not become less serious because a priest has married them.

A NEW EXPEDIENT

The so-called Unionist party in England are beating about for new expedients to generate a wave of opposition to Home Rule. Mr. Bonar Law, the leader Home Rule. Mr. Bonar Law, the leader of the Conservative party in England, a Canadian unworthy the name, and who had been given his present position as a matter of compromise, is particularly was apparently proven to be absolutely so fixed and comprising a data comprising a backen by the authorities of St. Boniface the put on the case with the result that the matrimonial state of Mrs. active in the work of preventing Ireland from obtaining the same conditions which prevail in his native country. Had Mr. Bonar Law been to the fore in the thirties and forties in Canada he Applicants for a divorce before the would have been amongst the Unionists Senate Committee are required to make of those days, who claimed that granting first Mrs. Brewer died on December 16 a deposit of \$200. In addition a law. us responsible government would smash ver's fee and the expense of summoning the British Empire. It had, however, witnesses have to be met. In cases, the contrary effect and it will have the contrary effect in Ireland. A cable tells us that a persistent effort is Brewer whose name appeared on the being made by the opposition press to use the recent papal decree forbidding Roman Catholics from bringing priests into lay courts on pain of excommunication for disobedience as an argument against the Government's Home Rule proposals. What such an ecclesiastical cerned, would be in almost as bad a regulation as this has to do with the granting of Home Rule to Ireland it would be difficult to perceive. A Catholic having a grievance against a priest brings him before a civil instead of an ecclesiastical court, therefore the people of Ireland are not to be trusted to deal with matters of trade and commerce. A family of three persons named Riley, presumably Irish, refuse to join a labor union in England. The union members on this account wished them dismissed, but their employers refused to grant their request. As a consequence hundreds of thousands of employees are on strike. Mr. Bonar Law should advance this as another reason why Home Rule should not be granted.

The Dublin Express and a few other organs of the anti-Irish faction are busily employed in misrepresenting the actual condition of things in Ireland. Bigotry and self interest may be taken as the prime reasons for their opposition. The Irish correspondents of the London papers, too, are dealing in yelchannel the most ridiculous and unfounded canards. An associated press despatch tells us that :

"The Dublin correspondent of the Pall Mall Gazette says the theory there is that the revival of the decree, which is an old one put in clearer form, is due

correspondent admits, however, that this theory does not jibe with the facts, as Cardinal Logue has been preaching Home Rule for a lifetime.

e Dublin Express, a strong Pro-"The Dublin Express, a strong Fro-testant organ, which was the originator of the propaganda, is now being backed by other anti-Catholic newspapers, which are evidently making an effort to influence Englishmen and Scotchmen who favor Home Rule to change their

Old shoes die hard. The advocates of vested wrongs are spending themselves unstintedly to preserve their illgotten privileges. That Home Rule will come there can be no manner of doubt, for the men in the gap are made of sterling stuff. Their English confreres, too, are equal to the occasion and giving noble aid. The school master has been abroad amongst the English masses. You cannot fool all the people all the time.

POLLUTING THE PRESS

Last week the gentleman having charge of the transmission of news in the Canadian Press Service in Winnipeg sent out a despatch containing some harrowing details bearing on the Ne Temere decree. It was represented that a Catholic man who was lying sick in a Catholic hospital in St. Boniface, was refused permission by the Mother Superior to see his "wife" for the reseon that their marriage, one being a Catholic, the other a non-Catholic, was celebrated before a Protestant minister. and that therefore such a marriage was not legal in the eyes of the Church. The following article from the North-West Review, Winnipeg, puts a new light on the matter. It will be noted that the manager of the Canadian Press Service in Winnipeg did not follow up the first report by sending another despatch conveying the real facts of the case. All the newspapers of the East gave great prominence to this sensational story, but none up to date so far as we have seen have published the correct version. A Catholic Society of Winnipeg has very properly taken up the matter and a libel suit against the Winnipeg dailies may be the outcome. The following is the article from the North-West Review:

Two of our daily papers, the Telegram and the Tribune, of Winnipe recently published several columns of would-be sensational character in which it was claimed that a certain woman by the name of Mrs. Brewer was unlawfully refused permission to visit her sick husband in the hospital. The stand husband in the hospital. The stand taken by the nurse of St. Boniface Hospital was on the ground that the Mrs. Brewer who claimed to be the law-ful wife of Mr. Brewer, the sick patient, was not what she claimed to be. The nurse had it on good authority that the said Mrs. Brewer was not married at all to Mr. Brewer but was simply unlaw fully living with him as his wife and fully living with him as his wife and that moreover she was not of a good moral character. After several attempts to gain admittance to the hospital had been fruitlessly made Mrs. visited the office of these dail and complained bitterly on the The marriage certificate of Mrs legal. wer was looked up, it was scrutinized

and found satisfactory to them. The above named newspapers stated formed on October 5, 1904 McMillan Moreover that the records

reporters failed to notice that the Mrs was not the Mrs. Brewer who claimed he the wife of Mr. Brewer. These are the hospital case, was serving a sentence in the Brandon jail, her daughter con-tracted with Brewer the marriage which Rev. Dr. McMillan solemnized on the 5th of October, 1904. It can be seen at a glance how utterly impossible it was for Mrs. Brewer of the hospita case to be the legal wife of Brewer. The attempts of those Winnipeg dailies to bring the Ne Temere decree into the case are at once seen to be perfectly ridiculous. The Ne Temere had nothing whatever to do with it. The nurse of St. Boniface Hospital who refused to admit Mrs. Brewer to see her alleged husband was simply refusing admittance to a woman publicly known to be a questionable character, to say the least.

This goes to illustrate the customary action of some of our dailies. They take hold of the least pretext to drag the Catholic Church and her institutions in the mud. It is time that they realize Catholics will not tamely submit to such utrageous treatment.

Another feature of the occurrence was an interview with Rev. Father Comeau sent broadcast throughout the country. In regard to this interview the North-West Review speaks editori ally as follows:

The Winnipeg Tribune of last Saturday contains what seems to us on the face of it a very strange production, purporting to be an interview Father Comeau on the marriage laws. Evidently the rev. gentleman is not used to speaking for publication. What may sound plausible enough in the intimacy of private conversation may take on a very different aspect when committed to ink and cold type. Ac-cording to the publishd interview, Father Comeau supposes the case of man who was married to a Protestant is an old one put in clearer form, is due to Cardinal Logue, the primate of Ireland, and Cardinal Bourne, of Westminster, who are said to be opposed to Home Rule and wish to kill it. The