

The Catholic Record

Price of Subscription—\$1.50 per annum. United States & Europe—\$2.00. Publisher and Proprietor, Thomas Coffey, LL. D. Editor, Rev. James T. Foley, R. A. Thomas Coffey, LL. D.

Associate Editors: Rev. F. J. O'Sullivan, R. F. Mackintosh. Advertisements for teachers, situations wanted, etc., 50 cents each insertion. Remittance to accompany the order.

Approved and recommended by Archbishop Rhoads and Bishops of the Apostolic Delegation to Canada, the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa and St. Boniface, the Bishops of London, Hamilton, Peterborough, and Oshesburg, N. Y., and the clergy throughout the Dominion.

The following agents are authorized to receive subscriptions and canvass for the CATHOLIC RECORD: Ontario agents: M. J. Hagan, Vincent S. Cox, and Miss Jessie Doyle, Resident agents: George B. Leveson, Minneapolis, Minn.; Mrs. W. M. Smith, Halifax; Miss Elsie Saunders, Sydney; Miss L. Hartgering, Windsor; E. R. Campbell, 234-236, Ave. West, Vancouver, B. C.; Miss Johnson, 311 Rochester st., Ottawa; Miss Rose McKenney, 148 D'Aiguillon street, Quebec; Mrs. George H. Smith, 238 St. Urbain street, Montreal; M. J. Marvin, Montreal, H. P. O'Toole, 127 Montague St., Quebec, Ont., and E. J. Murphy, Box 188, Sackville, N. B.

Editorial and advertising notices cannot be inserted except in the usual condensed form (not exceeding 50 words). Subscribers changing residence will please give their new address.

In St. John N. B., single copies may be procured from Mrs. M. A. McDevine, 242 Main Street, John J. Dwyer and The O'Neill Co., 100-102, 120 Broadway street.

In Sydney, N. S., single copies may be purchased at Murphy's Bookstore. In Montreal single copies may be purchased from J. Miller, 34 St. Catherine street, west.

LONDON, SATURDAY, JAN. 26, 1918

SECESSION

"Secession is a term used in political science to signify the withdrawal of a State from a Confederacy or composite State of which it had previously been a part; and the resumption of all powers formerly delegated by it to the Federal Government, and of its status as an independent State. To secede is a sovereign right; secession, therefore, is based on the theory that the sovereignty of the individual States forming a Confederacy or Federal Union has not been absorbed into a single new sovereignty."

The history of Europe furnishes many examples of secession or attempts to secede; the same history bears witness that such attempts are usually followed by war in which the seceding State is generally defeated. Peaceful secession is the rare exception to the rule; though an instance has occurred in our own time when Norway seceded from the union with Sweden and resumed her independence in 1905. During half the period of their independent existence secession, in theory and practice, played a dominant role in the history of the United States of America. Most of the original States, and many of the later ones, at some period when they considered their rights in danger, proclaimed the right of secession as inherent in their sovereignty. Each State, it was claimed, became sovereign on achieving its independence of England; the treaty of 1789 recognized them "as free, sovereign and independent States"; this sovereignty was recognized in the articles of confederation and not surrendered under the Constitution. The right to secede was not a dormant claim revived by the Southern States just previous to the Civil War; it was asserted frequently from the beginning; leaders in New England made threats of secession in 1790, 1796 and 1800-1815. How narrow and shortsighted were the New England secessionists may be seen from the fact that they were especially violent in 1803 on account of the purchase of Louisiana, and in 1811 on account of the proposed admission of Louisiana as a State, Separatist conspiracies in the West were frequent until 1812.

William Rawle, a noted commentator on the Constitution, declared in 1825 that the sovereign States might secede at will. It was not until the successful issue of the Civil War that the alleged right of secession together with State sovereignty was finally and forever abolished. The only survival in practice of the now abandoned theory of sovereign States is the anomalous extradition proceedings still necessary between the several States of the Union.

It is useful to recall the fact that the Fathers of the Canadian Confederation had before their eyes the tragic consequences of a weak central government in the United States of America and the extravagant claims of the constituent States. It was their desire in framing the Canadian Constitution to prevent any such eventuality in Canada. In the United States all powers not expressly delegated to the Federal Government were reserved to the individual States. In Canada this principle is reversed; all powers not expressly reserved to the provinces are reserved to the Federal authority. There can, of course, be no question of sovereignty powers with regard to any of the Canadian Provinces. Nor did the Dominion of Canada ever possess

or ever claim the status of a sovereign State; that could only be attained by severing British connection and establishing complete political independence. French Canada was a colony of France up to the time that France ceded it to England. Neither before nor after the Cession did Quebec enjoy or claim anything more than the status of a colony.

The Francoeur resolution to discuss the question of the withdrawal of Quebec from Confederation (at this writing not yet debated) has therefore an interest merely academic so far as the right or power of Quebec to secede from the Dominion is concerned. It may furnish the occasion for some fervid rhetoric; but even were it to mark the beginning of an agitation which should develop into a movement supported by the great majority of the population of the Province and by its leading public men it would still be a case not unprecedented in the political history of Canada.

During the first quarter of a century after Confederation Nova Scotian politics may be summed up in three words, "Secession" and "Better Terms." In extension it must be remembered that although Confederation was adopted by the Nova Scotia Legislative Assembly the people who were not consulted took the first opportunity of voicing their hostility to the scheme. In the first Dominion elections the only Confederate (as those in favor of Confederation were called) was Dr. (afterwards Sir Charles) Tupper; Joseph Howe headed the balance of the Nova Scotian representation—seventeen bitter anti-Confederates. In the local House of thirty-eight members elected about the same time thirty seven were opposed to Confederation. Sir John A. Macdonald and Sir George E. Cartier went to Halifax and succeeded in placating the leaders of the party of disruption to the extent at least of convincing them that secession was hopeless and that the only practical policy was to make the best of a bad bargain. To the great majority of Canadians, born since 1867, all this may seem like ancient history; but to Nova Scotians it long remained a living tradition.

On May 10, 1886, the Honorable W. S. Fielding moved a series of resolutions contrasting the condition of Nova Scotia before and after Confederation. They declared that "Nova Scotia, previous to the Union, had the lowest tariff and was, notwithstanding, in the best financial condition of any of the Provinces entering the Union" and that now "the commercial as well as the financial condition of Nova Scotia is in an unsatisfactory and depressed condition." One of the resolutions stated that "the objections which were urged against the terms of Union at first apply with still greater force now than in the first year of the Union." The remedy proposed was Maritime union—the peaceful detachment of the three Atlantic Provinces from the Dominion. If Maritime Union is not possible the Government of Nova Scotia "deems it absolutely necessary" to "ask permission from the Imperial Parliament to withdraw from the Union with Canada and return to the status of a Province of Great Britain, with full control over all fiscal laws and tariff regulations within the Province, such as prevailed previous to Confederation."

The final resolution reads: "That this House thus declares its opinion and belief, in order that candidates for the suffrages of the people at the approaching elections may be enabled to place this vital and important question of separation from Canada before them for decision at the polls."

This was the clear-cut issue of the election and Fielding was returned to power with an overwhelming majority. Nova Scotia had given him an unmistakable mandate to take the Province out of Confederation. But Fielding did nothing on his return to office in 1887 other than to pass more resolutions declaring further action impossible for the reason that in the Dominion elections held the same year the Conservatives had been returned to power! His political opponents accused Fielding of insincerity in appealing to local prejudices for mere party advantage. But Nova Scotia obtained "better terms" in the shape of an increased federal subsidy; and Mr. Fielding retained power until, in 1896, he entered the Federal Government as Minister of Finance, a position which he held until the Liberal defeat in 1911. He was the author of the preferential tariff in favor of Great

Britain, and in many other ways the former Secessionist Leader has become a pronounced Canadian Imperialist. With the Quebec Legislature debating secession W. S. Fielding's political career is interesting and perhaps instructive. It may indicate the lines along which our political history may repeat itself; as a deterrent example of the futility of secessionist agitation it has its drawbacks. At the least it should serve to keep certain of our self-righteous patriots from seeing "the Vatican" behind the Francoeur resolution. Fielding is a Baptist. And Nova Scotia is eighty per cent. Protestant.

PUBLIC PEACE NEGOTIATIONS

In times of peace the conduct of international affairs through the usual channels of diplomacy was accepted as a matter of course. Few indeed were they who gave any consideration to the matter. Appalled by the horrors of the world-war people began to ask themselves if democracy is not a sham if a very few men can decide such tremendous issues with practically no reference to the will of the peoples concerned. There could be only one outcome; secret diplomacy was doomed to disappear, for in spite of anomalies and defects our civilization is democratic. Since the publication of the Pope's Peace Note the discussion has been almost uninterrupted. The appeal to historic prejudice had the expected effect for a time but it soon petered out. The demand grew more and more insistent that issues be defined in language understood of the people. Call them War Aims or Peace Terms the discussion now going on is a recognition of this fact, and marks at the same time the passing of secret diplomacy.

Lloyd George prefaced his speech by saying that he not merely used the declared War aims of the Labor party but discussed "in detail with Labor Leaders the meaning and intention of that declaration." He mentioned many others, representative of parties and opinions, with whom he had consulted. And he said:

"The days of the treaty of Vienna are long past. We can no longer submit the future of European civilization to the arbitrary decisions of a few negotiators, trying to secure by chicanery or persuasion the interests of this or that dynasty or nation."

And President Wilson in his great speech three days later was equally explicit and more emphatic:

"It will be our wish and purpose that the processes of peace, when they are begun, shall be absolutely open, and that they shall involve and permit henceforth no secret understandings of any kind. The day of conquest and aggrandizement is gone by; so also is the day of secret covenants entered into in the interest of particular Governments and likely at some unlooked for moment to upset the peace of the world. It is this happy fact, now clear to the view of every public man whose thoughts do not still linger in an age that is dead and gone, which makes it possible for every nation whose purposes are consistent with justice and the peace of the world to avow now or at any other time the objects it has in view."

This great revolutionary fact in the conduct of international affairs must be borne in mind if we would grasp the full significance of recent public pronouncements. Let us put aside for the moment the obfuscating influence of a press which has peculiar ideas of patriotism and consider some indisputable facts. Distinct and enormous concessions have been made by both sides. Count Czernin on Christmas day "speaking," as Lloyd George was at pains to recognize, "on behalf of Austria-Hungary and her Allies" made a vastly important contribution to the public discussions of peace terms. In referring to it the British Premier said:

"We are told that it is not the intention of the Central Powers to appropriate forcibly any occupied territories, or to rob of its independence any nation which has lost its political independence during the War."

True, he finds fault with Count Czernin's vagueness, and says: "We must know what it meant." It was quite in order to ask the enemy spokesman to be more explicit, definite, concrete. But the fact remains that the Premier of Austria-Hungary and the Premier of Great Britain are publicly discussing with each other the terms of peace. It was probably because of the reiterated declaration of our press that the constituent nationalities of the Dual Monarchy must be freed from the tyrannical domination of the "ramshackle Empire" that the Austrian Premier was chosen as spokesman of the Central Powers; and Lloyd

George distinctly repudiates the press war aims in regard to Austria-Hungary:

"Similarly, though we agree with President Wilson that a break-up of Austria-Hungary is no part of our war aims, we feel that unless genuine self-government is granted to those Austro-Hungarian nationalities who have long desired it, it is impossible to hope for a removal of those causes of unrest in that part of Europe which have so long threatened the general peace."

Three days later President Wilson, far from desiring the destruction of the Austrian Empire, expresses the wish to see its "place among the nations safeguarded and assured."

"The peoples of Austria-Hungary, whose place among the nations we wish to see safeguarded and assured, should be accorded the freest opportunity of autonomous development."

Irishmen will not quarrel with Lloyd George's "genuine self-government on true democratic principles" nor with the President's "freest opportunity for autonomous development" as a condition for international good-will toward the Austrian Empire; they would like to see an even more extended application of that principle.

Both Lloyd George and Mr. Wilson himself disclaim all desire or intention of interfering in the internal government of Germany thus clearing up a wrong interpretation of the President's reference to responsible government in a former speech.

Count Czernin was "clear and definite," as Lloyd George pointed out in his reply, with regard to the restoration of German colonies, and the British Premier very materially modified the press policy on this point:

"With regard to the German colonies, I have repeatedly declared that they are held at the disposal of a conference whose decision must have primary regard to the wishes and interests of the native inhabitants of such colonies. None of these territories are inhabited by Europeans. The governing consideration, therefore, must be that the inhabitants should be placed under the control of an administration acceptable to themselves, one of whose main purposes will be to prevent their exploitation for the benefit of European capitalists or Governments."

Irishmen, again, will read with emotion the solicitude of the British Premier for self-determination of the natives of tropical Africa:

"The natives live in their various tribal organizations under chiefs and councils who are competent to consult and speak for their tribes and members, and thus to represent their wishes and interests in regard to their disposal. The general principle of national self-determination is, therefore, as applicable in their cases as in those of the occupied European territories."

And the President in terms, here as elsewhere, curiously similar:

"A free, open-minded, and absolutely impartial adjustment of all colonial claims, based upon a strict observance of the principle that in determining all such questions of sovereignty the interests of the populations concerned must have equal weight with the equitable claims of the Government whose title is to be determined."

To Turkey Lloyd George makes the specific concession that Constantinople remain the capital of the Ottoman Empire; the passage of straits to be free under international control. President Wilson in almost the same words offers the same terms to Turkey. Both the British Premier and the American President refrain from demanding independence but urge security and autonomy for the nationalities now subject to Turkish rule.

upon the seas, outside territorial waters, alike in peace and in war, except as the seas may be closed in whole or in part by international action for the enforcement of international covenants."

Mr. Lloyd George subsequently said in the House of Commons that he and President Wilson "without previous consultation" had laid down substantially the same program. The exigencies of public diplomacy doubtless has its exigencies; but whether or not the phrase "without previous consultation" is thus to be explained, the British Prime Minister maintained an eloquent silence on the foremost condition of the world's peace; he made no suggestion of repudiating Mr. Wilson's clear-cut condition.

With those who will not see the significance of all this, argument is futile. As a matter of fact the world's democracies are participating in the diplomacy which is "proceeding frankly and in the world's view" to secure the world's peace.

Of course we have made imperative demands as well as enormous concessions. The press has emphasized the demands and minimized or ignored the concessions. It goes without saying that we are not suing for peace, and must be prepared to go on until the enemy agrees to such terms as will secure a peace just, honorable and permanent.

HERESY IN CONNEMARA

"How did you like that book?" we said to one of the members of our library as she handed back "Dark Rosaleen." "Very well," she replied, "but I think it was disgraceful the way those people treated that poor Protestant boy." She referred to the incident in which Hector McTavish, the son of Alexander McTavish, the only Orangeman in Connemara, fleeing from the wrath of his father who is about to be whipped because he refuses to keep away from the Burkes who might be making him turn Papist, crosses with some fishermen to the island of Aran, where he is refused hospitality when it is revealed that he is a Protestant by his objecting to make the sign of the cross. We admit that it was unreasonable to blame the child for not doing what he was taught not to do. But why, we may ask, did those simple people whose hospitality is proverbial seem to sin against that virtue in this circumstance? Because the undimmed eye of their lively and untarnished faith perceived what a terrible plague heresy is. That there were in some parts of the country people who were heretics, who actually denied the real presence of Our Lord in the Blessed Eucharist, ridiculed the Rosary, and scoffed at devotion to Mary and the Saints, they knew from reports that had filtered in from the outside world, but this was the first time that they had come in contact with a concrete specimen, and it is not surprising that they were shocked.

We would not condemn a family for refusing to harbor a child, even a homeless waif, who had smallpox. The fact that he was not responsible for having contracted the disease would not be sufficient to warrant them taking him into the bosom of the family. Now heresy is a worse disease than smallpox, and moreover it is contagious. The reason why we of this generation are inclined to criticize the rigor with which heresy was dealt with by the civil authorities in the days of Catholic Christendom is not that we are more humane than our forbears of that time, but that we have ceased to realize the danger, the insidiousness, and the sinfulness of heresy. Well may it be said of it:

(Heresy) is a monster of such frightful mien That to be hated needs but to be seen; But seen too oft, familiar with its face, We first endure, then pity, then embrace.

Obstinate formal heresy, that is the heresy of those who, "through pride, human respect, or worldly motives," persist in refusing to confess Christ before men by submitting to the teachings of His Church, is a most grievous sin; because it destroys faith, that virtue that is the foundation of all justification, because it aims at tearing asunder the seamless robe of Christ, the unity of His Church, and because unlike other sins it is transmitted to generations yet unborn.

Another feature that manifests the ungodliness of heresy is that almost invariably it has attacked that great mystery of love, the Incarnation. From Arius who denied the

Divinity of Christ, and Nestorius who denied the Divine Maternity of His Blessed Mother, down to the heretics of the sixteenth century who repudiated the power of the priesthood over the real body of Christ in the Mass and the Eucharist, which perpetuate the Incarnation, and its power over the mystical body in the sacrament of Penance and the granting of Indulgences, which is the application of the merits of Christ's passion and death to the souls of men, all seem to have aimed their bitter thrusts at that mystery which is the revelation of God's love. No wonder that Our Lord was so severe in His condemnation of heresy, and that the gentle apostle of charity, St. John, should have referred to heretics as seducers and dissolvers of Christ, and bade the faithful not to receive them into their houses or to say to them, God speed you!

Two great forces have contributed to the perpetuating of heresy. The first is the prejudice that is fostered in the minds of children by all the impressions left upon the plastic tablets of their young hearts by what they hear in their homes and churches. Many of these are really sincere and heresy is not imputed to them as a fault; but, nevertheless, they are deprived of the great boon of membership in the body of the Church by their unwillingness to even discuss the Catholic claims. The other cause of the persistence of heresy is the fostering support of governments or rulers. Those heresies that were not supported by the civil power soon passed away. Modern Protestantism, which is but the revival of old heresies, endures because it is upheld by the State and because its followers enjoy the State's bounty. It is the realization of this fact that makes patriotism the highest form of religion among many of our separated brethren.

Living, as the majority of our readers do, in the midst of those who are alien to our faith, we must of necessity mingle with them in social and civic life. We should be charitable to them and pray for them; but we should never allow our admiration for their natural good qualities or our affection for any of them to blind us to the danger of the terrible curse of heresy. Above all we should not take them into our homes by making them members of the family with the hope of curing the malady, for as we cannot read hearts we are unable to tell whether in a certain instance it is, humanly speaking, curable or not, and we run the danger of contracting the disease ourselves.

Memory recalls one who had reached that stage in which she not only endured but pitied and embraced if not heresy at least a heretic by becoming his wife. He was so noble, so courteous, so refined, and so much more considerate of her feelings than the Catholic boys of her acquaintance that she was sure that her life would be happy with him. A year later she was stunned, crushed to the earth, frozen to her very heart's core by his cold, deliberate, brutal refusal to comply with his sacred promise or to even consider her dearest wish. It was a revelation to her, but it was no revelation to those who know heresy; for it is essentially cruel.

THE GLEANER

NOTES AND COMMENTS

A LAMPOON on the ruling powers in Germany issues from Harvard University. It takes the form of a "Recipe for German Kultur," and reads as follows: "Take a bit of Turkey and roll it in crumpled cathedrals. When this is sizzling well add a lot of wild oats, drop in large quantities of poached property and scrambled retreats. Break an oath in it and stir with cold steel. Add enough blood to give the proper thickness, turn on the gas and heat the whole red hot with liquid fire. When it is done, garnish with cracked hearts and drop bombs on, and you will have a dish fit for William and other Hungry people." The irony of it all is that Germany has its own full share of "cracked hearts" and is paying on its own thresholds in blood and tears the price of its rulers' ambition.

SOME CANADIAN papers have given much prominence to certain utterances of the London Morning Post, and of one Joseph McCabe, an apostate priest, on "The Vatican and the War." The Toronto Telegram has, characteristically, been to the fore in the matter, putting forward the unseemly vapors of McCabe with full editorial endorsement, and taking refuge behind them from, quite

evidently, sheer inability to speak for itself. Cardinal Bourne has effectually disposed of the Morning Post, but the Canadian daily papers which had space enough and to spare for the Post's innuendoes had none at all for the Cardinal's reply. "Twas ever thus!

AS TO McCabe—he is simply an expriest of the old fashioned sort which decent people had begun to think had ceased to be fashionable. He posed for a time as an "escaped monk," also as a "man of letters," and a "philosopher." He even found access to some of the big reviews from which the very nature of his screeds, and his record, should have excluded him. Even conviction in an English court, of crimes against morality, and a term of imprisonment, however, failed to affect this and while he had dropped out of sight for a time the instigators of the present campaign against the Holy Father found in him a fit instrument for their purpose, and he has been exploited and advertised anew. His latest publication, "The Pope's Favorite," reviewed by one periodical as "a vivid description of life in Rome" is by its very title sufficiently stamped as a libel of the most infamous sort which decent people will instinctively avoid.

WHILE PEOPLE generally in England have been loyally adhering to the Food Controller's regulations, it has remained for one of the fashionable set to earn unenviable distinction in the matter of sheer waste of precious war material. A taxi-driver was recently fined £50 for driving from London into Huntingdonshire with a dead dog as his passenger. The dog proved to have been the property of Lady Anderson, who stepped forward and paid the fine. This disposed of the matter so far as the authorities were concerned but, says the Westminster Gazette, "the public will not so easily forget this amazing example of the length to which the worship of the dog can be carried." Father Bernard Vaughan's denunciation of this very evil is irresistibly recalled to mind by the incident.

THAT THOMAS JEFFERSON is the real founder of democracy in the United States is generally conceded. He has also the distinction of being the author of the Declaration of Independence. But for Jefferson the autocratic elements in the Revolution might have gained the ascendancy in the Republic in perpetuity, and militarism have become its character as a nation. Jefferson is sometimes blamed for being also the father of the elements of disunion in the Republic, and to have paved the way for the Civil War.

It is pleasant, however, in the present appalling world-crisis to be reminded that Jefferson foresaw that in friendship and alliance with Great Britain lay the nation's greatest security. "Great Britain," he said to President Monroe, on the occasion of the latter's signing of the celebrated Monroe Doctrine, "is the one nation which can do us the most harm of any one or of all the world, and with her on our side we need not fear the whole world. With her, then, we should most assiduously cherish a cordial friendship," and, he added, "nothing would tend more to knit our affection than by fighting one more side by side in the same cause." To-day is Jefferson's prophecy fulfilled before our eyes. The presence of a common enemy has effectually and, let us believe forever healed the breach of 1776.

THE ERECTION of wayside shrines in England has been cited as one of the effects produced from the sojourn of hundreds of thousands of British soldiers in France and the object lessons they have there had before their eyes. The ringing of the Angelus on the bells of many Protestant churches is another. The tones of these bells morning, noon and night, sounding across the fields in honor of the Incarnation, has, we are informed, become quite a common experience. May they not prestage the awakening on the part of the English nation from the long night of misconception and misunderstanding which the malice of wicked men brought down upon them three centuries and more ago!

AN APPEAL has been addressed to all Protestants of the Allied and neutral countries to save the historic Protestant cemetery in Rome, which is full of memories of distinguished