

The Catholic Record

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

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

Advertisements for teachers, situations wanted, etc., are accepted on insertion. Remittance to accompany the order.

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

Messrs. Luke King, P. J. Neveu, E. J. Broderick, M. J. Haggarty, Mrs. W. E. Smith and Miss Sara Hanley are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transmit all other business for the Catholic Record. Agents for dist. of Niagara, Mrs. M. Reynolds.

Obituary and marriage notices cannot be inserted except in the usual condensed form. Each insertion 10 cents.

When subscribers ask for their paper 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.

LETTERS OF RECOMMENDATION.

Apocritic 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 recognizing the best interests of the country. Following these lines it has done a great deal of good for the welfare of religion and country, and it will do more and more, as its wholesome influence reaches every Catholic home. I therefore, earnestly recommend it to Catholic families. With my blessing on your work, and best wishes for its continued success, I am, Sir, very truly, Sir,

Yours very sincerely in Christ,

DONATUS, Arch. of Episcopi.

Apocritic Delegation.

UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA.

Ottawa, Canada, March 7th, 1900.

Mr. Thomas Coffey.

Dear Sir: For some time past I have read your

valuable paper, the Catholic Record, and congratulate you upon the manner in which it is published. The matter and form are both good, and a truly Catholic spirit pervades the whole. Therefore, with pleasure, I can recommend it to the faithful. Bless you and yours for your success, believe me to be true.

Yours faithfully in Jesus Christ,

ED. FALCONER, Arch. of Laramie.

Apocritic Delegation.

LONDON, SATURDAY, OCTOBER 28, 1911

JUDICIAL RECALL

Canadians are justly proud of the high

character, the integrity, and the impartiality of their judges; and this is evidenced not so much by the well-merited tributes occasionally paid to those who exercise judicial functions, as it is by the complete absence of fault-finding criticism of judicial decisions, while the imputation of unworthy motives to the bench is unheard of. We may attribute, in a large measure, this desirable condition of affairs to the fact that our judges enjoy absolute security in their positions of dignity and responsibility, and have, therefore, no temptation to cater to political influence or popular clamor.

Canadians have never looked with

favor on the American plan of filling

major important judicial positions by

popular election; and popular election

there means party candidates, which

subjects the judges so chosen to all the

political influences that sway the ordinary

politician. But the new departure of

the "recall" of judges seems to go

very much farther away from the

Canadian ideal. The proposal is that

one-fourth of the electors of any judicial

district may, by petition, demand a

special election for the recall of a judge

to private life. If he does not resign

within five days, the special election is

ordered. The ballot for the election

may contain a statement of not more

than 200 words setting forth the case

against the judge, and a reply of the

same length. Both houses of Congress

have just voted to admit the territory of

Arizona to statehood under a constitution

with the foregoing provision for

judicial recall.

Though the bill passed both houses

by very large majorities still some of

the ablest of American public men con-

demned the principle of judicial recall.

"The judge," said Senator Borah of

Idaho, "who seeks to locate the popular

side of a justifiable controversy is a

patry being." "It is," said the Senator,

"my deliberate and uncompromising

opinion that, without a free, untrammelled,

independent judiciary government of

the people, by the people, and for the

people, would be a delusion, a taunting,

tormenting delusion."

The senator laid stress on an important

truth which has its bearing in Canada

as well as in the States. "Though

the majority must rule, yet a government

which has no method for protecting the

rights of the minority, for it has rights,

is a despotic government, I do not care

whether you call it a monarchy, an aristocracy

or a republic."

President Taft vetoed the statehood

bill on account of the provision for the

recall of judges, a provision "so pernicious

in its effect, so destructive of independence

in the judiciary, so likely to subject

the rights of the individual to the

possible tyranny of a popular majority,"

that he must disapprove the constitution

which contains it.

Cardinal Gibbons in a recent sermon

thought the matter of sufficient importance

to express his strong disapprobation

of the principle.

For us in Canada the situation has its

lessons, one of which is that we should

jealously guard the independence of

our judges. There is just one possible

weakness in our system, and that is that

the government of the day naturally

selects the judges from the ranks of its

political friends and supporters. But

while the tenure of office is secure and

only candidates of high character

are appointed, there is little

ground for fear on that score.

There have been, however, some

what persistent attempts made to influence

the Government to promote

county judges to the High Court bench.

The Government has, wisely, we think,

always resisted such attempts; and we

consider that it would tend to expose

the judges in the lower courts to grave

temptation, or what would be almost as

bad, to grave suspicion, were they, in a

position to look for promotion by gaining

or retaining the favor of a political

party.

THE "ECUMENICAL" CONFERENCE AND HIGHER CRITICISM

We read that Biblical criticism was

under hot fire at the Ecumenical Methodist

Conference and emerged triumphantly

vindicated. The Rev. Dr. Tasker,

Principal of Handsworth College, Birmingham,

one of the champions of Higher Criticism,

has defined it thus: "All that higher criticism means is that you

follow the stream that comes down to

you a little higher up towards its

source."

Higher criticism is one of those

classic terms that may include the results

of competent scholarship with the

fibres of the uneducated and irreverent

scuffer. But it is something more

than a figure of speech, and "following

the stream a little higher up towards

its source" may be a pretty

figure of speech, but it is not illuminating.

Criticism that has unsettled the

faith of thousands in the inspiration of

the Bible needs something more for its

explanation to the man in the street,

not to speak of its "triumphant

vindication."

"I believe in criticism," said the Rev.

Dr. Carman, "but I take it that it is

improperly used when it brings shadowy

and cloudy problems or origins to baffle

the public mind." And Dr. Carman seems

to have a good deal of common sense

when he views the results of what is

known as higher criticism; but he says

he "believes in absolute intellectual

freedom," and likes to see it applied to

Holy Scriptures. So when Dr. Carman

sees that Genesis "stands against your

evolution," what right has he to find

fault with the vigorous dissenting "No,

no!" of his intellectually free brother

ministers?

One of them emphatically asserts that

"truth is not static—or fixed." "We

must live in the intellectual atmosphere

of our own time," says another. That

is, we suppose, we must be higher critics

and grasp the truth while it is true,

because another century or another generation

may have gone so far in its search for

"origins" that our present day

truths will have been relegated to the

limbo of superstitions of an unenlightened

age.

All this might be entertaining reading

did it not show that Methodism is

losing its hold on the fundamental

Christian truths. They exalted the

Bible to a place it was never intended

by God to occupy, to be the rule of faith

and to be its own interpreter. So that

in the face of the higher criticism which

discredits the Bible as divinely inspired,

they are helpless, even though, as Dr.

Leonard declared, "No two higher

critics agree."

Rev. Elias Cotterell broke the

thread of philosophic discussion with

rough eloquence. "During these sessions

there has been a great deal of discussion

on abstruse philosophical subjects,

but very little has been heard of the

real purpose of these conferences—the

organic union of Methodism."

"In the few years more of life allotted

to me, I shall leave higher criticism to

the higher critics and go on preaching

the simple story of the cross. I suggest

to the higher critics, 'Get to yourselves

and discuss these questions alone. Don't

interfere with our simple method of

saving souls. I say if you get us

tangled up what will we do?"

There must be many simple and sincere

souls who feel like Mr. Cotterell; but

hopelessly tangled in the system of

religion that in its ecumenical conference

gives greater evidence of irreconcilable

views of Holy Scripture, than of

devising any practical plan of union

amongst its own fragmentary

sects.

Wrangling teachers, self-appointed,

usurping the place of a priesthood,

they have declared to be unnecessary,

can never be the living voice of God's

Church.

For long the great majority of the

clergymen of the different sects have

been strenuously advocating the introduction

of religious teaching in the

public schools. Because of their many

and sharp and sometimes acrimonious

divisions this new departure will be

almost impossible of accomplishment.

In all movements of this kind, as in other

things, the ministers of the Baptist sect

seem to be desirous of grand stand play.

At a meeting of the Ministerial Association,

lately held in Hamilton, the Baptist

ministers opposed religious

teaching in the public schools, arguing

that even an atheist should be

given freedom of thought in an educational

institution. Some years ago the

Baptists in Toronto were very anxious

the churches should be taxed, and, as

an evidence of good faith, paid into the

city treasurer taxes on their property.

And so it is all along the line. Flying

the flag of heresy, these people are as

children in a rudderless boat on the

stormy ocean.

AN EXPLOSION

A Canadian press despatch tells us

that a bomb was exploded at last Saturday's

Ecumenical Conference in Toronto, when Rev. James Lewis of the

Wesleyan Methodist Church, of Cambridge, England, speaking on the Church

and Temperance, said "Indolence and

hypocrisy in the Church of England

maintained and sustained the liquor

traffic in that country, and a great

portion of its ministry was reaping

much financial benefit thereby." He

furthermore declared that "there were

many church people in England who refused

to assist at the elections to secure

better men on the ground of assumed

piety, and claimed that adequate laws

to suppress the liquor traffic in England

were prevented by the Anglican following

who occupied the majority of the

parliamentary, town council and magis-

tracy offices." This was a strong and

courageous declaration, and no one will

be found to question its absolute truth,

but as it casts reflection upon one of

the evangelical sects Rev. Mr. Lewis

was made to