

The Catholic Record

Price of Subscription—\$1.00 per annum, United States & Europe—\$2.00

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

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

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

When subscribers ask for their mail at the post office it would be well for them to tell the clerk to give them their CATHOLIC RECORDS, as the part of delivery clerks who will sometimes look for letters only.

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

LETTERS OF RECOMMENDATION

Apostolic Delegation, Ottawa, Canada, June 19th, 1905.

Mr. Thomas Coffey—Since coming to Canada I have been a reader of your paper. I have noted with satisfaction that it is devoted to the interests of the Catholic Church.

My dear Sir—Since coming to Canada I have been a reader of your paper. I have noted with satisfaction that it is devoted to the interests of the Catholic Church.

Yours faithfully in Jesus Christ, D. FALCONE, Arch. of Latisia, Ap. Deleg.

UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA, Ottawa, Canada, March 7th, 1909.

Dear Sir:—For some time past I have read your admirable paper, the Catholic Record and congratulate you upon the manner in which it is published.

Yours faithfully in Jesus Christ, D. FALCONE, Arch. of Latisia, Ap. Deleg.

LONDON, SATURDAY, DECEMBER 30 1911

THE CANADIAN BAPTIST AND THE NE TEMERE

The tone of the discussion of the famous marriage decree is moderating somewhat. This is something for which all decent Canadians have reason to be grateful.

The Canadian Baptist of Dec. 7th has an article which, in spite of a rather funny assumption of magnanimity because Catholics enjoy equal rights with Protestants in Canada, is on the whole a temperate discussion of the difficulties and dangers looming up on the political horizon on account of the Ne Temere decree, or we should say on account of the Ne Temere agitation.

The editor expresses a belief that the Ne Temere decree has a bearing on the marriage law in Quebec, and desires to be set right if not correct. He is quite right. At least if the decision of Judge Landreau who declared null and invalid the Hobert marriage, is based on the right interpretation of the law. Other decisions have been given in the same sense; but again judgments have been handed down in a contrary sense.

Should the former be finally declared to be the proper interpretation of the civil law of Quebec, then in future the Ne Temere would render null and invalid civilly all marriages of Catholics contracted not only before Protestant ministers, but also before Catholic priests not duly authorized to marry the parties.

It is not our purpose at present, to refute anything which our Baptist contemporary may have said not to our liking, but we propose only to furnish some information with regard to matters of fact, since the Baptist has shown a desire to possess itself of the facts. This should precede discussion.

With regard to Germany the decree is in force there as it is in Canada, with an exception made for mixed marriages. The Baptist says: "We feel all the more free to take this ground because we ourselves are persuaded that mixed marriages are undesirable. We agree, therefore, with the Ne Temere decree in this object, which its introduction assures us it aims at."

We can assure our contemporary that it totally misapprehends the aim, the intent and the scope of the decree. It is intended to regulate the conditions under which Catholics may receive the sacrament of matrimony, and only afflicts Protestants incidentally in the infinitesimal number of Catholic marriages throughout the world in which one party is a Protestant. The decree, moreover, recognizes the marriage of two baptized Protestants as a sacramental marriage.

But where one of the parties is a Catholic, the marriage is, in the eyes of the Church, null and void unless it conforms to the provisions of the decree. This is the real difficulty, but we have treated this point before.

The Baptist says that this is not "a matter of principle or honor" with Catholics. Quite right; it is merely a matter of discipline. It is just as if the Province of Ontario passed a law restricting or increasing the number of persons that it would recognize as competent to receive and register the consent to marriage in this province. It could be repealed or amended.

The Baptist very rightly asks for an exemption for Canada in so far as mixed marriages are concerned. A similar modification of the Tametui decree of the council of Trent was actually granted as regards mixed marriages; but this is a solution which may not be so easy or so desirable as appears to our contemporary.

We should be opposed to mixed marriages even if the Church freely permitted them; because in this the most intimate union that can be on earth, a matter of such vital importance as religious belief and practice should not enter as a source of discord. When children come, instead of being an additional bond of union and common interest, they are often a cause of further discord, and heart burning. The children themselves suffer enormously at that plastic period when the authority of parents needs no divine command to enforce it.

When the little ones should be learning the elementary notions of right and wrong, when they should be learning to love and obey God and assimilating the elementary truths of religion, they are confronted with the ever present spectacle of the diversity of the religious beliefs and practices of their parents. Such children may be sometimes good Catholics, sometimes good Protestants, but often neither one nor the other; and the religious element, essential to the formation of character, and the basis of morality, either does not enter into their lives at all or but weakly and ineffectively as compared with those children whose parents are united in religion. Even if we place no higher value than this on religion, mixed marriages are greatly to be deplored.

Now, though this is not its aim, if the effect of the Ne Temere decree were to deter many from contracting mixed marriages, it would be a good thing for both Protestants and Catholics, and a good thing for future Canadian citizenship.

Be that as it may, when the decree is studied before being denounced, when its provisions and possible effects are discussed calmly and reasonably with only appeal to religious passion or prejudice, the difficulties and dangers which our Baptist contemporary foresees will be in a fair way of being solved or avoided.

THE CATHOLIC RECORD sends sincere congratulations to Right Rev. Mgr. Aylward on the attainment of his silver jubilee in the priesthood. The publisher of this paper, being on the ground, as it were, with the Monsignor ever since this happy day, has had opportunity of estimating at its true value his sterling worth. In every sense he has proved to be a true priest of God's Holy Church, and a true priest is an asset in a parish whose worth God alone can measure.

His heart has ever been in his vocation and while in spiritual affairs he has been a safe guide and a prudent counsellor, in matters pertaining to the temporalities of the Church he has been a man of rare wisdom and discrimination. It must have been a comfort and a pleasure to him to note with what unanimity Bishop, priests and people gathered about him to offer felicitations on the glad occasion of his silver jubilee. He deserved it all and may he for whom he has so faithfully striven guide him and guard him in the future and permit him to remain with us for length of years.

THE REV. G. OSBORNE TROOP "A few weeks ago we read in the Montreal Star an interview with the Rev. Mr. Troop on the marriage question, which appeared to us to be a regrettable, imprudent and inflammatory appeal to anti-Catholic prejudice. We commented on the matter calmly, temperately and argumentatively, and we did Mr. Troop the justice of citing word for word the passages on which we felt called upon to comment. Had it been the usual ranting of an ordinary "mountebank pulpiteer," (to quote Canon Ker), we should have passed it over. But the Rev. G. Osborne Troop is a prominent Anglican divine, a scholar and a gentleman. It was, then, with something of a shock that we saw his name in connection with what we considered one of the most intemperate and unfair pronouncements on this question, so prolific of imputation, unfair and demagogic treatment. Hence our reasoned remonstrance.

We have received the following letter from the rev. gentleman to which we very willingly give space, not only in justice to himself, but because it contains much that is quite incompatible with what we took to be the plain meaning of the Star interview. St. Martin's Church Rectory, Montreal, 13 Dec. 1911.

To the Editor of the CATHOLIC RECORD:—Sir:—Since you have honored my name with an editorial, I may doubtless rely upon your courtesy for the publication of this letter. It is of the greatest consequence that in discussing the Ne Temere Decree, Protestants and Roman Catholics should neither misrepresent nor misunderstand each other. Personally, for instance, I have the highest respect for the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Montreal, and profound admiration also for his remarkable courage as a moral reformer. With spiritually minded Roman Catholics, furthermore, I have every Christian sympathy, and nothing would ever lead me to interfere with their absolute freedom of conscience.

But you (in referring to me) go on to say: "The reverend gentleman is very much excited, and in his excess of patriotism forgets that, on occasion, we Britons are wont to boast of liberty of conscience. To prevent Catholics from obeying the Head of the Church is quite as intolerant and tyrannical as to compel Anglicans to become Presbyterians or Jews to become Anglicans."

Surely you do not seriously believe that any Protestant dreams of "pressing" Catholics from obeying the Head of the Church? Such an idea is impossible for us to entertain. What we do insist upon is, that no man, not even a Roman Catholic, should be compelled to obey the Pope against his will. We contend for absolute religious liberty. The Church may discipline its members, or even excommunicate them, but there is its power ceases.

We insist upon one Marriage Law for Canada, that shall protect all alike from ecclesiastical interference. We are equally as jealous of the rights of our Roman Catholic fellow-citizens as of our own. We ask for no special privileges for anyone, but British law for all.

Should the law and our conscience conflict, then we must, of course, "obey God rather than men," and be ready to suffer all the consequences. But British law leaves the conscience free. G. OSBORNE TROOP.

We are heartily in accord with Rev. Mr. Troop when he says that it is of the greatest consequence that Protestants and Catholics should sedulously avoid misrepresenting or misunderstanding each other in this discussion. We certainly did not misrepresent him, but apparently we misunderstood his meaning. We said he was excited, and believed it, as he himself said in the interview, "my blood boils." We are sorry that the copy of the Star containing the interview is not at hand, nor did we note the date. However, Mr. Troop finds no fault with the extracts we made from the Star article and we presume that he does not feel that separating them from the context is in any way unfair to him, as might easily be the case. In our desire to be absolutely fair with him we should publish the whole pronouncement now if it were at hand.

We quoted the following sentences as a sample of what we considered an imprudent appeal to Protestant prejudice: "Is the Bishop of Rome or the crown of Great Britain to be supreme in this Dominion of Canada?"

"The Roman Church may well take warning in time that the Reformation principle is certain to be established fully—that the Bishop of Rome hath no jurisdiction in the realm of England."

The Bishop of Rome is recognized by several millions of people in this Dominion of Canada to be supreme in spiritual matters, in which they concede no sort of supremacy or jurisdiction to the crown of Great Britain. The conditions under which matrimony or any other sacrament may be received pertains to the Pope and not to the King.

The Bishop of Rome hath spiritual jurisdiction in the realm of England and in the over sea Dominions. No one is compelled to admit it, or submit to it, but we are free to do so, and to recognize the Pope's decrees as binding in conscience. At the same time the principle that the Bishop of Rome hath no jurisdiction in the realm of England was established fully so far as cruel and unjust civil enactments could establish a principle which sought to control the individual conscience. The Reformation principle, as then understood, was being abandoned; we thought Rev. Mr. Troop wished to threaten its revival. We quite agree with Rev. Mr. Troop that "British law leaves the conscience free." We are grateful for British law and we glory in British freedom. We believe that British institutions are rooted deep in the Catholic ages of England, and that no Catholic born under the Union Jack is worthy of the freedom it guarantees if he be not heartily loyal to British institutions and ideals. But we said nothing about British law; we were criticizing the expressions of Rev. G. Osborne Troop, expressions which we thought completely at variance with British law and British ideals. To show how very much in accord we are with what Rev. Mr. Troop says in his letter, we quote from a former article, on this subject, in answer to another distinguished Anglican. On Oct. 14th we wrote: "Persons baptized into the Church come under the laws of the Church; but they are as free as air to leave the Church and affiliate with any sect or with none. But in the name of liberty and common sense, why shall not we Catholics be free to regard them as unfortunate brethren who have forfeited their rights as members of the Catholic Church? So long as they are satisfied with their position outside of the Church, Catholics will in no way interfere with their freedom, spiritual or temporal. But if they wish to return to the Church, they must conform to what the Church imposes as a condition of receiving them again into her membership. And that will never involve the breaking of the tie by which civil marriage binds them, but that tie will be implemented and sanctified."

But perhaps it is to the civil law of the Province of Quebec that Rev. Mr. Troop refers when he talks of compelling. If so, and the Church compels no one to obey her laws, then we repeat what we said in that connection: "If the Protestants of Quebec feel they have a grievance that could be remedied by changing or amending the marriage laws of the province, then it is

their business through their representatives (and Protestants always have full and fair representation in Quebec), to endeavor to have those laws changed or amended.

"One marriage law for Canada" is, in our opinion, dangerous and unnecessary, and in the opinion of the late Minister of Justice unconstitutional.

If the civil law of Quebec compels two Catholics to come before their own parish priest in order to contract a valid civil marriage, that is altogether a matter within the sphere of the legislature of Quebec, and we fail to see any grievance therein for Protestants to complain of, or any hardship for Catholics. The civil law of every province compels (in the same sense) every one desirous of contracting a marriage recognized by the civil law to come before some one of the few people authorized to act as official witnesses and to receive and register the consent to marriage.

We are very much pleased that Rev. G. Osborne Troop in his letter has taken the trouble to inform us that he holds no such extreme views as we believed on reading the interview in the Star.

When men like Rev. G. Osborne Troop insist on the importance of avoiding misrepresentation and misunderstanding, and when Catholics succeed in getting a sympathetic understanding of the real difficulties of honest Protestants over the Ne Temere decree, the discussion will be on a higher plane, and instead of being futile and dangerous will probably lead to better mutual understanding and possibly to amicable adjustment of the questions at issue.

A GENTLEMAN in New York named James O'Brien has written to the Times of that city to say that he not only believes in divorce but that he would like to see laws enacted which would give permission to people to marry at pleasure, separate at pleasure and marry again. First, we may say that we do not believe this person's name is James O'Brien. In the United States it has been the habit of some people to adopt Irish names for the reason that the Irish race has become such a power in the country. But if the gentleman's name is as stated we need not after all be surprised. There was another James O'Brien once upon a time in Irish history, a government informer, who ended up his life on the scaffold for murder, and once upon a time there was also a Judas. The New York James O'Brien must have graduated from a Public school on the bowery.

A DANGEROUS PREACHER A New York Unitarian preacher, Rev. John Hayes Holmes, has been giving vent to some vigorous thoughts which have brought him newspaper notoriety. That this was his aim few will doubt. Says the rev. gentleman: "If I had to choose I would rather be a criminal with blood upon my hands than be one of the leaders of the Steel Trust. With all due respect to the President of the States, it is not true that murder is always murder, and the McNamara brothers are not criminals in the ordinary sense of the word. Rather they are unselfish soldiers of a cause." These unselfish soldiers have confessed to deliberate murder of twenty-one innocent beings in a building at Los Angeles. In referring to the occurrence as he has done Rev. Mr. Holmes has placed himself outside the pale of good citizenship. With the unions and with the working men generally no one has any more sympathy than we have. In the declarations of the unions themselves, touching the McNamara case, they have admitted a well deserved rebuke to this unbalanced Unitarian divine. The heads of one of the principal international unions, in a signed statement given out in New York on the 20th, discuss the results of the McNamara case. "It cannot be denied," they say, "that labor in its organized and unorganized form has suffered temporarily, but it will rise again more powerful and determined, for its cause is just and its methods are correct. We condemn crime and violence whether in trade unions, in commercial enterprises or in newspapers." It cannot be denied that in the present condition workers have just cause for making complaint. True we have one law for all, but in its administration the guerrillas of the corporations—some wrong have the advantage because of unlimited resource. In illustration of this we have only to look at cases now pending before the courts where the Managers and Presidents of gigantic enterprises have been summoned for crooked business methods. Because of legal quibbling by talented lawyers punishment comes to them slowly if at all. They have the means to extend the litigation for years and carry it from one court to another, and in the long run, if found guilty, a fine may be inflicted which, although perhaps of considerable proportions, inflicts but minute injury on their well padded purses. Statesmen worthy the name should grapple with this question at once, and men of high estate who are

complimentary terms. Of course such subjects have not happened. But, suppose they did happen? The editor of the Orange organ in Toronto, the Weekly Maria Monk, would call the hosts of King Williams to arms.

NAT GOODWIN is one of the great actors of the day. Although he denies the story that he is to marry again, nevertheless a press despatch advises us that it is quite true. Mr. Goodwin has been married frequently in different parts of the United States, and a variety of women claim that they had at one time been Mrs. Nat Goodwin. Notwithstanding all this the actor still continues to draw crowded houses, proof that theatre goes, as a rule, in some of the cities of the United States, care not what manner of man an actor may be so long as he can act. Men like Mr. Goodwin have drawn discredit upon the stage, and the stage will suffer, at least in the minds of people who have regard for the fitness of things.

A SERMON TO MASONS Rev. Canon Howitt, of Hamilton, Ont., has not been ashamed to resurrect the story that Pius IX. was a Mason. He spoke of this in the course of a sermon to the Masonic lodges of Hamilton. Quite frequently this ridiculous canard has been denied by the very highest authority, but, notwithstanding, we may ever expect to see it brought forward once more on occasion by people who are not scrupulous about the truth. It deserves place with the chain prayer and the papal encyclical which was circulated in the United States in 1893 calling upon all Catholics to slaughter their Protestant neighbors. We would not like to accuse Canon Howitt of deliberately stating what was not true, but he should take some trouble to ascertain the facts before giving currency to the silly story about Pius IX. being a Mason. It would be strange indeed if the Pope would warn all the faithful against a society of which he was himself a member. Besides, the canon does know, or ought to know, that Masonry in Europe is almost wholly anti-Christian. While most of the Masons in this country may be very good citizens and affiliate with Christian churches, the organization is the same. A despatch from Mexico city, dated Sept. 16, tells us that an earthquake created a panic near that place. Hundreds rushed frantically to the Zocalo, where they ran aimlessly about or fell on their knees in prayer. This was watched by President Madero with apparent enjoyment, for he stood at a window in the National Palace laughing. President Madero is a prominent Mason. What does the Rev. Mr. Howitt think of his attitude towards those who would supplicate the Almighty in time of need?

NOTES AND COMMENTS The series of Advent sermons preached by Rev. Father Bernard Vaughan, S. J., in the Church of Our Lady of Lourdes, Toronto, has necessarily attracted much attention. It would not be Father Vaughan if he did not state old truths in a striking and individual way, or set the flowers of Catholic devotion in such a light as to attract the passer-by. It is these characteristics emanating from a strong and unique personality, and not any morbid desire for popularity, that have brought him of late years so prominently before the public and made his name a household word wherever the English language is spoken. And it is the very depth of the man's faith and his fearless exposure of shams and sophistries that have made him a mark for every illiberal vendor of the platitudes and inconsistencies of modern heresy. The very virulence of the attacks upon him personally and upon the faith that he professes, is the best proof that his shafts, uttered in unequivocal charity as they were, have nevertheless struck home and disturbed the consciences of a whole people. The "soullessness of Protestantism" (not the soullessness of the religion of individual Protestants) has passed into a byword, and those who must fiercely, in their mistaken zeal, denounce the phrase now, may live to acknowledge its truth and aptness.

A LITTLE STORY is told of the late Lady Herbert which is not without instruction in our surroundings here in Canada. As an Anglican she was accustomed to carry about with her when travelling an English King James Bible. On one occasion the book was lost and she went to a book-seller on the Continent and bought a copy of the Douay version. This to her surprise was preferred by Pope Pius the VI's letter commending the reading and study of the scriptures to the laity, and declaring that they contain "the abundant sources which ought to be left open to everyone to draw from them parity of doctrine and of morals, and to eradicate error." She had hitherto been possessed of the old Protestant notion that the Bible was a sealed book to Catholics. This was the first step in her enlightenment, and the second was through her companionship with a Cath-

olic girl on her return from a visit to the East. Conversing on religious subjects with her companion, Lady Herbert asked "if her confessor was very severe with her." "Oh, no!" was the reply; "he insists only on one thing—that I should read a passage from Scripture every day." In this manner was this valiant soul sent on the way which was to lead her to the full light of truth. And how easily might her experience be duplicated by others!

IN COMMENTING upon the Pontifical procession at the Vatican in connection with the recent consistory the Christian Guardian asks: "What means the three separate detachments of guards in a religious procession?" and follows it up with the sage remark that "with all her guards and cardinals Rome cannot hold her own." Evidently the Guardian has never heard of guards of honor! And it seems strange that if, as the Methodist organ would persuade itself, the power of the Pope is declining, we should be treated to such an eternal howl in Canada on the subject of "papal aggression"—a howl (the only word that fitly describes it) in which Methodist, too, takes the sole part. It is singular, too, that a church said to be so obviously on the decline should have the power of inspiring such a degree of terror as recent fulminations of Methodism and kindredisms would indicate. The Guardian had better hazard another guess.

SUCH METHODIST concern for the welfare of the Catholic Church and its presumed decline does not harmonize with what is transpiring within the see's own inner sanctum. It is all very well to get upon the house-top and shout blue ruin as regards the affairs of one's neighbors, but it is just as well in doing so to be sure of the stability of one's own. The recent "Ecumenical Conference" at Toronto was one long sweet song of jubilation. That was for the benefit of the general public, and it had the effect certainly of procuring an immense amount of free advertising for what was called "world-wide" Methodism. But listen to the dirge in the back yard, out of earshot of the great well-dressed throng. Bishop Barry of Buffalo opens the gate just wide enough to afford us a passing glimpse of the anxious faces within. Methodism, he tells us, "is at a standstill," and the contributing causes are not, he further asserts, persecution from without, or any organized attempt on the part of State or political party to rob it of its temporalities, but subtle attacks within its own ranks upon the Divinity of Christ, and upon the integrity of the sacred Scriptures.

THESE EVILS, then, with the ever increasing influence of unitarianism upon its rank and file, are the canker worms that are eating the very heart out of Methodism. So Bishop Barry told the Methodist Episcopal Conference in Chicago the other day. And that body, (one of the round dozen divisions in the sect), was well represented at the Toronto conference, and took a strong part in the great choros of exaltation. While that was for the public. Meanwhile "Rome," according to the same authority, so far from "falling to hold her own," threatens to engulf the Protestantism of Canada. Well may Father Vaughan counsel Protestants to look well to the affairs of their own households instead of wasting their substance upon vain and fruitless concern for the only Church in the world bearing within her the promises of Christ.

AND IS it really so well with Methodism in Italy? According to a Waldensian pastor of Poidmont, writing in the Semeur Vaudois of Lausanne, "for the last fifty years treasures of zeal and talent, an incredible sum of labors and money, have been spent on the evangelization of Italy without producing any great results." What is the reason given for this? To them, unsatisfactory state of things? Simply the old, ineradicable weakness of Protestantism, the incapacity for unity or cohesiveness. The weakness really lies deeper, but we are not concerned here to go beyond their own admissions. "In the city of Rome alone," says this Italian pastor, "side by side with the German and English congregations, there are a Waldensian church (the oldest form of Protestantism extant), a Methodist Episcopal, a Wesleyan Methodist, two Baptist churches depending upon two distinct societies, a group of Adventists and the little sect of Ludovico Conti"—a motley group illustrating very felicitously the essential unity of Protestantism.

THE WRITERS, says Rome, is pained that these various bodies fail to agree and nullify each others' efforts by a perpetual wrangling about ways and means. "Five or six rival churches at the gates of the Vatican!" he exclaims—"why this senseless folly?" And he fastens the blame chiefly upon that same American Methodist mission, which by its prodigal outpouring of dollars, its iniquitous alliance with the forces of atheism in Italy, and its debauchery of the children

of the most all rias enou prob thei and each pet; the ac to may hug ever only the M. Tor Cater maria boy un ble all eve cal the ev un al his to tel chm la m en qu M. the w a t on h f i f