

The Catholic Record

Price of Subscription—\$1.50 per annum.
United States & Europe—\$2.00.

THOS. COFFEY, L.L.D., Editor and Publisher

Advertisements for teachers, situations wanted, etc., 50 cents each insertion. Remittance to accompany the order.

Approved and recommended by the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa and St. Boniface, and Bishops of London, Hamilton, Peterborough, and Ogdensburg, N. Y., and the clergy throughout the Dominion.

Messrs. Luke King, F. J. Neven, E. J. Broderick, M. J. Hagarty, Mrs. W. E. Smith and Miss Sara Hanley and Miss O. Heringer are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and accept all other business for the CATHOLIC RECORD.

Obituary and marriage notices cannot be inserted except in the usual condensed form. Each insertion 50 cents.

When subscribers ask for their mail at the post office it would be well were they to tell the clerk to give them their CATHOLIC RECORD. We have information of carelessness 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.

In St. John, N. B., single copies may be purchased from Mrs. M. A. McGuire, 240 Main street.

LETTERS OF RECOMMENDATION
Apostolic Delegation.
Ottawa, June 13th, 1905.

Mr. Thomas Coffey.

My Dear Sir:—Since coming to Canada I have been a reader of your paper. I have noted with satisfaction that it is directed with intelligence and ability, and, above all, that it is imbued with a strong Catholic spirit. It strenuously defends Catholic principles and rights, and stands firmly by the teaching and authority of the Church, at the same time, it is not without a certain amount of common sense and moderation. I therefore, earnestly recommend it to Catholic families. With my kindest regards to your work, and best wishes for its continued success, I am, Sir, very faithfully, in Jesus Christ, Yours very sincerely in Christ,

Donatus, Archbishop of Ephesus.
Apostolic Delegate.

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

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. I am sure that it is both good and true, and that it is a credit to the Catholic press. I am, Sir, very faithfully, in Jesus Christ, Yours very sincerely in Christ,

Donatus, Archbishop of Ephesus.
Apostolic Delegate.

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

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. I am sure that it is both good and true, and that it is a credit to the Catholic press. I am, Sir, very faithfully, in Jesus Christ, Yours very sincerely in Christ,

Donatus, Archbishop of Ephesus.
Apostolic Delegate.

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

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. I am sure that it is both good and true, and that it is a credit to the Catholic press. I am, Sir, very faithfully, in Jesus Christ, Yours very sincerely in Christ,

Donatus, Archbishop of Ephesus.
Apostolic Delegate.

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

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. I am sure that it is both good and true, and that it is a credit to the Catholic press. I am, Sir, very faithfully, in Jesus Christ, Yours very sincerely in Christ,

Donatus, Archbishop of Ephesus.
Apostolic Delegate.

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

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. I am sure that it is both good and true, and that it is a credit to the Catholic press. I am, Sir, very faithfully, in Jesus Christ, Yours very sincerely in Christ,

Donatus, Archbishop of Ephesus.
Apostolic Delegate.

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

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. I am sure that it is both good and true, and that it is a credit to the Catholic press. I am, Sir, very faithfully, in Jesus Christ, Yours very sincerely in Christ,

Donatus, Archbishop of Ephesus.
Apostolic Delegate.

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

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. I am sure that it is both good and true, and that it is a credit to the Catholic press. I am, Sir, very faithfully, in Jesus Christ, Yours very sincerely in Christ,

Donatus, Archbishop of Ephesus.
Apostolic Delegate.

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

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. I am sure that it is both good and true, and that it is a credit to the Catholic press. I am, Sir, very faithfully, in Jesus Christ, Yours very sincerely in Christ,

Donatus, Archbishop of Ephesus.
Apostolic Delegate.

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

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. I am sure that it is both good and true, and that it is a credit to the Catholic press. I am, Sir, very faithfully, in Jesus Christ, Yours very sincerely in Christ,

Donatus, Archbishop of Ephesus.
Apostolic Delegate.

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

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. I am sure that it is both good and true, and that it is a credit to the Catholic press. I am, Sir, very faithfully, in Jesus Christ, Yours very sincerely in Christ,

Donatus, Archbishop of Ephesus.
Apostolic Delegate.

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

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. I am sure that it is both good and true, and that it is a credit to the Catholic press. I am, Sir, very faithfully, in Jesus Christ, Yours very sincerely in Christ,

Donatus, Archbishop of Ephesus.
Apostolic Delegate.

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

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. I am sure that it is both good and true, and that it is a credit to the Catholic press. I am, Sir, very faithfully, in Jesus Christ, Yours very sincerely in Christ,

Donatus, Archbishop of Ephesus.
Apostolic Delegate.

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

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. I am sure that it is both good and true, and that it is a credit to the Catholic press. I am, Sir, very faithfully, in Jesus Christ, Yours very sincerely in Christ,

Donatus, Archbishop of Ephesus.
Apostolic Delegate.

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

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. I am sure that it is both good and true, and that it is a credit to the Catholic press. I am, Sir, very faithfully, in Jesus Christ, Yours very sincerely in Christ,

Donatus, Archbishop of Ephesus.
Apostolic Delegate.

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

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. I am sure that it is both good and true, and that it is a credit to the Catholic press. I am, Sir, very faithfully, in Jesus Christ, Yours very sincerely in Christ,

Donatus, Archbishop of Ephesus.
Apostolic Delegate.

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

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. I am sure that it is both good and true, and that it is a credit to the Catholic press. I am, Sir, very faithfully, in Jesus Christ, Yours very sincerely in Christ,

Donatus, Archbishop of Ephesus.
Apostolic Delegate.

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

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. I am sure that it is both good and true, and that it is a credit to the Catholic press. I am, Sir, very faithfully, in Jesus Christ, Yours very sincerely in Christ,

Donatus, Archbishop of Ephesus.
Apostolic Delegate.

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

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. I am sure that it is both good and true, and that it is a credit to the Catholic press. I am, Sir, very faithfully, in Jesus Christ, Yours very sincerely in Christ,

Donatus, Archbishop of Ephesus.
Apostolic Delegate.

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

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. I am sure that it is both good and true, and that it is a credit to the Catholic press. I am, Sir, very faithfully, in Jesus Christ, Yours very sincerely in Christ,

Donatus, Archbishop of Ephesus.
Apostolic Delegate.

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

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. I am sure that it is both good and true, and that it is a credit to the Catholic press. I am, Sir, very faithfully, in Jesus Christ, Yours very sincerely in Christ,

Donatus, Archbishop of Ephesus.
Apostolic Delegate.

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

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. I am sure that it is both good and true, and that it is a credit to the Catholic press. I am, Sir, very faithfully, in Jesus Christ, Yours very sincerely in Christ,

Donatus, Archbishop of Ephesus.
Apostolic Delegate.

The process is necessarily a slow one but it gives ground to work upon, and should lead to development along other lines.

THAT THE process would of necessity be slow, follows, as pointed out by America's contributor, from the fact that the money paid out in a lump sum for the land would be returned only in instalments, and until these make up another lump sum there is no possibility of buying more land. He says: "It must be remembered that, in the case of a Catholic colony, the payment of instalments is likely to be more irregular than in that of a land company. Those buying of the latter know that if they do not pay instalments promptly they will be turned out; and there are some land companies that look forward with satisfaction to the additional profits arising from this procedure. The Catholic colonists know that for them this danger is remote, and human nature is human nature." This is always a contingency to be reckoned with, and it has not been omitted from the Archbishop's well thought out and far reaching project. What he asks therefore and makes an essential part of his design is that Catholics of means, in his own diocese or beyond it, should have a part in it by advancing the necessary funds to put the work on a firm basis from the start, and to render possible its extension without undue delay to every section of the Province.

BUT, as all Catholic immigrants are not agriculturists, the Archbishop's scheme does not end there. Tradesmen, too, have to be provided for, and with the work of European emigration societies in mind, he has set on foot a kindred work for them, and with a view to giving practical and immediate effect to its operations, has brought from England a priest of experience, Father Mostyn, whom he has placed at the head of it. When a Catholic reaches Quebec or Montreal, he is to be met by agents of the Archbishop, who will protect him from undesirable influences, give him all necessary information about the country and his prospects, and see him on his way to the West armed with the address of the priest in charge of immigration work at the point where he proposes to settle. It then depends upon local Catholic societies to aid him in procuring employment.

THESE are great and generous projects and speak volumes for the apostolic zeal and largeness of mind of the new Archbishop of Toronto. That the work in the coast Province, which we have endeavored to outline, will not, because of his withdrawal from Vancouver, be allowed to lag or drop out of sight, we are assured by the care bestowed upon its foundation. And it is the work not of one diocese alone, but of the entire Church in Canada. Projects along similar lines have been taken in hand in other Western dioceses, and at the First Plenary Council of Quebec an impetus was given to the extension of God's Kingdom which is having its effect in the remotest sections of the country. Is it too much to hope that the laity will uphold the hands of their Bishops, and by their generous cooperation make possible the carrying out of so splendid and inspiring a work?

WHAT CAN be done by effective Catholic organization was made evident by the late elections in Belgium. Like other European countries, the little Kingdom has had to deal with the anti-Christian conspiracy of Socialism and secret societies. These forces made themselves manifest during the campaign, and loudly boasted that they would put an end to what they called "Catholic domination." That meant, of course, that if they had their way, they would make such a spectacle of their country as might cause men and angels to weep. Belgium would be another Portugal, and true liberty would be at an end.

THE BITTERNESS and violence of their attacks upon the Church could not have been surpassed in either France or Portugal. Attempts were made to stir up the vilest passions by pouring contempt and ridicule upon the clergy, and when mere abuse failed, recourse was had to unreasoning strikes and to rioting. But thanks to the splendid Catholic organization, these means failed of their purpose. The Catholic ministry was sustained by an increased majority, and Socialism, for the time being at least (effectually and forever let us hope) has had to hide its head in Belgium—under Catholic auspices the most prosperous country in Europe at this hour.

A CORRESPONDENT has called our attention to an article in the Toronto Sunday World of July 8th, entitled "Battle of the Boyne: why was it fought?" and purporting to be written by "an Irish Roman Catholic." In the person of one F. Hugh O'Donnell, this precious individual would have us believe that the Catholics of Ireland would have consulted their own best interests had they sided with William

of Orange; that that much exploited "hero" represented the cause of liberty and progress; and that all the subsequent evils from which Ireland has suffered are traceable to their failure to recognize this patent fact.

THIS LAST is the only true assertion of the lot. No fact stands out more conspicuously in the history of Ireland for the last three hundred years than that had her children chosen to be false to their God, their subsequent history would have been happier—happier, that is, from a material point of view. They would not have had to endure the long years of bitter penury and persecution which have been theirs. They would not have seen their women outraged, their old people turned out on the highway to die, their priests hunted like wild beasts, and their own manhood ground out of them almost by the cruellest and most relentless persecution of which history has any record. All this would have been spared them had they cravenly turned their backs upon the Mother Church who had borne them, just as in the last great famine, betrayal of their faith would have raised to their parched lips the pittance of soup their starving stomachs craved.

THIS "IRISH Roman Catholic" spoke truer than he knew when he blurted out this sentiment. But, for the rest, his diatribe, as every enlightened Catholic knows, and as every true historian vouches for, is a tissue of craven falsehoods. To impute, as he does, to the clergy of Ireland, wilful betrayal of their people, is to place himself outside the pale of sane discussion. He may attribute to King James all the vices and the failings of the Bourbons and the Stuarts; he may lay to the charge of the Jesuits all the tyranny which found a nemesis in the French Revolution; but that does not touch the question at issue at all. The one fact remains that to Catholic Irishmen, the triumph of William at the Boyne spelt the death of "liberty" in Ireland. No student of history, no Irishman—certainly no "Irish Roman Catholic" with a reputation to lose, could conceive any other thought. To this affirmation let historians like Lecky, statesmen like Gladstone, and the Liberator O'Connell bear immortal witness.

AS TO King James we have no brief to defend his weakness or his follies. His was a great opportunity, and by unwise precipitancy he let it pass him by. Catholics, certainly, whether of Great Britain or of Ireland, have the least reason to thank him for this failure on his part. It has been the fashion with "historians" of the F. Hugh O'Donnell type to charge him with tyranny and absolutism. They have been able to see in James only a will to oppress Protestants. An historian of truer insight will recognize that James lost his crown not because he sought to oppress anybody, but rather that his one aim was to restore to the Catholics of the three kingdoms those elementary rights of freemen of which they had been deprived since the days of good Queen Mary. But, of course, James was a tyrant—King William, his betrayer and the instigator of the massacre of Glencoe, and of the cruellest persecution of the Catholics of Ireland (not to speak of the innumerable lesser meannesses and betrayals of which he was notoriously guilty) is the "hero" of the lodges and of F. Hugh O'Donnell. We can out of sheer pity concede to the "brethren" their exaltation over the Battle of the Boyne, but for a craven like this masquerading "Irish Roman Catholic," whoever and whatever he may be, we have only contempt and abhorrence.

AMENDING THE LAW OF GOD

THE decision of the House of Lords on the Bannister case, to which allusion has already been made, is producing an effect in England very similar to that of the famous Gorham case of sixty years ago, which was the occasion of Cardinal Manning and many others leaving Anglicanism to join the Catholic Church.

Rev. G. C. Gorham, a clergyman of the Established Church, belonged to that party which disbelieved in sacramental grace, and repudiated altogether the sacramental system; and in the matter of Church government recognized the civil authority as supreme in things spiritual.

On being appointed to a living in the diocese of Exeter, Bishop Philpotts, finding after an examination as to his orthodoxy that Gorham denied baptismal regeneration, refused to sanction the appointment. The Church courts upheld the bishop. Mr. Gorham then appealed to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, where the case was decided in his favor and against the bishop. This of course brought home to many devout Anglicans the fact that the civil authority is the final court of appeal in matters of faith. And what was still worse, this civil court decided that an Anglican Bishop had no right to exclude a clergyman who denied a fundamental article of the creed.

Now Royal supremacy is as old as Henry VIII; but a concrete case of such a flagrant character was bound to make the question one of immediate and vital interest. Manning and other leading Anglicans soon found that the Anglican position was untenable from the beginning.

History repeats itself. The Gorham case has really lost none of its significance; but it belongs to the dim past, while the Bannister decision is present and insistent.

To understand the significance of the recent judgment, and why "devout men and women in tens of thousands" are so perturbed over it, we must read the canon law of the Church of England. Canon 99 (1903).

"No person shall marry within the degrees prohibited by the laws of God, and expressed in a table set forth by authority in the year of our Lord 1603. And all marriages so made and contracted shall be judged incestuous and unlawful, and consequently shall be dissolved as void from the beginning, and the parties so married shall by course of law be separated. And the aforesaid table shall be in every church set up at the charge of the parish."

This table, which is appended to the Book of Common Prayer, includes marriage with a deceased wife's sister amongst those prohibited by the laws of God. But in 1907 Parliament legalized such marriages. Bannister married his deceased wife's sister, and his vicar, Rev. Mr. Thompson, refused to admit the Bannisters to Communion. The final court of appeal, the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, decided the case in favor of the Bannisters.

Two very grave consequences of this decision must be very perplexing to Anglicans. One is very clearly set forth by Lord Halifax in a letter to the Times:

"If then in consequence of the passing of that act—the act of 1907—a clergyman has lost his right to repel persons contracting such marriages from Communion, it is impossible to deny that what determines in this case the right to Communion is not the law and teaching of the Church which is over-ruled by an Act of Parliament, but the law of the State."

But there is another and even more serious consequence involved.

The Church of England has for three hundred years taught that such marriages are prohibited by the laws of God. Evidently it will be necessary to revise Canon 99 and issue a new table setting forth the changes necessitated by the fact that the laws of God have been amended by Act of Parliament.

The Secretary of the English Church Union writes:

"The two Archbishops are being looked to say the necessary word of vindication of the honor of the Church. Devout men and women in tens of thousands are now waiting."

The Archbishop of Canterbury, as we have seen, declines to commit himself one way or the other. He rebukes the "rough and ready conclusions" of some writers on the subject, announces himself as "one of the stoutest opponents of the Act of 1907," deprecates the exaggerated importance given to a marriage legally valid but "ecclesiastically irregular" and on the whole carefully avoids saying "the necessary word of vindication of the honor of the Church."

The written law of his Church still teaches that such marriages are prohibited by the laws of God, that they are void from the beginning, and incestuous. The living voice of the Primate, in a pitiful attempt to reconcile these contradictions, says that such marriages are "ecclesiastically irregular" but legally valid.

ENTRANCE TO HIGH SCHOOLS

THE results of the entrance examination which have just been announced show once more how favorably the Separate schools compare with the Public schools.

The entrance examination not only admits the successful candidates to the High School course, but what is more important, it is an evidence that the work of the elementary schools has been done with a fair amount of thoroughness. It is in no sense a special examination for those who desire to enter upon High School work; it is merely a fair and reasonable test of the elementary work done in the primary school. Hence it is an examination that should be taken by all primary school pupils who complete their course, as it affords parents, friends and ratepayers the fairest, most impartial, and most adequate test available of the efficiency of the primary school.

In drawing conclusions, however, from a comparison of results some important considerations, which are often overlooked, should be taken into account.

One is the age of the entrance candidates. If a class, the average age of which is twelve, is as successful as another class, the average age is fifteen, it is evident that the latter has taken three years longer than the former to do the same work. We have known schools to boast of the success shown by the results of the entrance examination when the candidates were old enough to be writing on Matriculation.

Again, not only the whole senior fourth class of every school should write on the entrance examination if

this is to be a fair test of relative efficiency; but the senior fourth class should, in every well-conducted school, be a fair proportion of the whole number of pupils in the school. That proportion should be about one-sixth. That is, if a school contain 100 pupils the entrance class should be 16 or 17; if 600 pupils attend the school, 100 should be in the entrance class. We take it that six years should, as a rule, suffice for the primary school work. Where the work is finely spun out, where the grades are so multiplied as to require eight years, or even longer, it will generally be found that a much smaller proportion complete the primary course; while the small pace forced on the brighter pupils does them an irreparable injury, not alone in the time lost, but in the habits of mental indolence and lack of application thus fostered.

It would be extremely interesting if statistics would enable us to compare results taking into account the average age of the candidates, and the percentage of the whole school attendance in the entrance class. We venture the opinion that such complete statistics, necessary for full and fair comparison of the results of the examination, would reflect still greater credit on the faithful and efficient service of our Separate school teachers.

THE CANADIAN NAVY

It is a matter of regret that the general lines along which Canada should move in the construction of a navy, or of otherwise contributing to the naval defence of the Empire, could not have been agreed upon by all parties. To make this question an issue in party politics, though regrettable, is inevitable if any serious matter of principle is involved.

Since the Premier has laid it down as fundamental that any policy decided on by the government shall be submitted to the people for their approval, it behooves the electors to give some study to the question on which they will be called to pass final judgment.

The late government proceeded to establish and develop a Canadian navy substantially along the lines of the Canadian militia, that is with complete Canadian control; participation in British wars would depend on the will of Parliament just as in the case of our militia in the Boer war.

The policy of the present government is not yet clearly defined; but one very important pronouncement has been made, namely, that Canada must have some effective voice in determining the issues touching peace or war before committing herself to any permanent policy of participation in the naval defence of the Empire.

This seems to be identical with Sir Joseph Ward's proposal last year at the Imperial Conference:

"I think I am further right in expressing the opinion that as the years go on, the voice of the great democracies in the over sea Dominions will not be stopped from advocating that where they are expected, and rightly so, to share in the responsibilities of the tributes that may ensue connected with any war affecting the stability of the British Empire, they are entitled, as a matter of right, not as a matter of appeal, to have some say, even although that may be in a minority, upon some properly constituted body that is going to decide the question of whether there is going to be peace or war."

To this proposal there was a chorus of dissent from Canada, Australia, South Africa, Newfoundland and Great Britain as represented by their respective premiers. The substance of all that was said is included in Mr. Asquith's comments:

"For what does Sir Joseph Ward's proposal come to? I might describe the effect of it without going into details in a couple of sentences. It would impair the voice of the great democracies in the over sea Dominions will not be stopped from advocating that where they are expected, and rightly so, to share in the responsibilities of the tributes that may ensue connected with any war affecting the stability of the British Empire, they are entitled, as a matter of right, not as a matter of appeal, to have some say, even although that may be in a minority, upon some properly constituted body that is going to decide the question of whether there is going to be peace or war."

To this proposal there was a chorus of dissent from Canada, Australia, South Africa, Newfoundland and Great Britain as represented by their respective premiers. The substance of all that was said is included in Mr. Asquith's comments:

"For what does Sir Joseph Ward's proposal come to? I might describe the effect of it without going into details in a couple of sentences. It would impair the voice of the great democracies in the over sea Dominions will not be stopped from advocating that where they are expected, and rightly so, to share in the responsibilities of the tributes that may ensue connected with any war affecting the stability of the British Empire, they are entitled, as a matter of right, not as a matter of appeal, to have some say, even although that may be in a minority, upon some properly constituted body that is going to decide the question of whether there is going to be peace or war."

To this proposal there was a chorus of dissent from Canada, Australia, South Africa, Newfoundland and Great Britain as represented by their respective premiers. The substance of all that was said is included in Mr. Asquith's comments:</