

The Catholic Record

Price of subscription—\$5.00 per annum.
United States and Europe—\$5.00.

Publisher & Proprietor, Thomas Coffey, Ltd.,
100 St. James St., Toronto, Ont.

Editors: Rev. James T. Foley, B. A.,
Thomas Coffey, Ltd., 100 St. James St., Toronto, Ont.

Associate Editor—H. F. Mackintosh,
Manager—Robert M. Burns.

Address business letters to the Manager.
Classified Advertising 15 cents per line.

Residence must accompany the order.
Where Catholic Record Box address is required
send 10 cents to prepay expense of postage
upon replies.

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

The Editor cannot be held responsible for
unsolicited manuscripts. Every endeavor will
be made to return rejected contributions when
stamped addressed envelopes are enclosed.

The Catholic Record has been approved and
recommended by Archbishop Falconio and
Bishop O'Reilly, and is a recognized authority
in the Catholic Church in Canada, the United
States, and throughout the world.

In St. John, N. B., single copies may be
purchased from Mrs. M. A. McGuire, 210 Main
St. and John J. Dwyer.

In Sydney, N. S., single copies may be
purchased at Murphy's Bookstore.

In Montreal single copies may be purchased
from J. Milloy, 241 St. Catherine St. West.

In Ottawa, Ont., single copies may be purchased
from J. W. O'Brien, 141 Nicholas St.

The following agents are authorized to
receive subscriptions and orders for The
Catholic Record:

General Agents—M. J. Hagarty, Stephen V.
J. Jones, George J. Groulx, Joseph J. Groulx,
Miss B. J. Groulx, Sydney; E. R. Costello,
Miss B. J. Groulx, Vancouver, B. C.; R.
Chamberlain, Miss B. J. Groulx, Montreal;
Smith, 2265 Avenue St. Louis, Montreal; Mrs.
Edward McKee, 221 Martin Ave., Kinross,
Winnipeg, Man.; John P. O'Farrell, 10
Aberdeen St., Quebec City, and Miss Margaret E.
McKinnon, Quebec, Sask.

LONDON, SATURDAY, JULY 1, 1922

ST. MICHAEL'S AND THE UNIVERSITY

St. Michael's College, Toronto, became one of the federated Arts Colleges in the University of Toronto in 1910. The articles of agreement are in substance these:

1. All Catholic students in Arts may register at St. Michael's, whether male or female, and pay their tuition fees (\$40 each per year) to St. Michael's or to the Convent Colleges which female students attend, and which are, for University purposes, considered part of St. Michael's.

2. The supreme disciplinary body of the University is called the Caput, consisting of the President and the heads of Colleges and Faculties. The President of St. Michael's is a member. The Catholic institutions have their own rules of discipline, which are not subject to the Caput.

3. The highest educational governing body of the University is the Senate. The President of St. Michael's and four other members nominated by St. Michael's have seats in the Senate.

4. All Professors and Lecturers of St. Michael's are members of the Council of the Faculty of Arts, which prepares for the Senate proposals affecting curricula and examinations.

5. St. Michael's has exclusive jurisdiction in three subjects, namely, Philosophy, History and Religious Knowledge. Its own Professors may not only teach these, but also set the papers, conduct the examinations, and value the results, without interference on the part of the University, though these results count in determining degrees.

6. St. Michael's has exclusive jurisdiction in the appointment of its Professors, who then become *ipso facto* members of the University staff.

7. St. Michael's has the right to teach, and does teach, other subjects, such as English, Latin, Greek, French, German and Oriental languages; but in these the students undergo examinations in common with the students of other colleges. All the colleges agree on the questions to be set and divide among themselves the reading of the papers.

It is interesting to note the growth of St. Michael's since 1910. In the following list only those registered in Arts at St. Michael's are numbered:

1910	37
1911	49
1912	88
1913	86
1914	114
1915	119
1916	140
1917	178
1918	166
1919	167
1920	186
1921	206
1922	242

There have been irregularities in the growth, caused by the War and the high cost of living; but an increase from 37 to 242 in twelve years shows how the demand for higher education is growing among the Catholics of Ontario. There are Universities also in Kingston, Ottawa and London, and in these the number of Catholic students shows a similar growth of demand for higher education.

SCHOOL TAXES

The essential claim of the Separate schools of Ontario in regard to taxes is very simple. It is nothing more than the claim that the Assessment Act of Ontario should give effect to section 14 of the Separate School Act of 1863, Section 14 gives to every Separate school supporter the right to be "exempted from the payment of all rates imposed for the support of Common Schools." It says that such supporter of Separate schools "shall be" so exempted; but the obligation expressed by the words "shall be" is the obligation of the Legislature, and this obligation can be performed only through the Assessment Act. It is an obligation which cannot be performed once for all, because the forms of property are continually changing. A given property may belong to an individual today, and to a joint-stock commercial company next month, and to a public utility company or commission the following month, and to the people of a Province or of the Dominion next year. Separate school supporters are involved in all these forms of ownership; but so far the Assessment Act has only exempted individual Separate school supporters. The Legislature did indeed allow the directors of private companies to divide school taxes on the basis of the religion of shareholders; but the directors may legally divide or refuse to divide at their discretion, and in the great majority of cases they simply ignore the power which the Assessment Act gives them in this matter. Now, this matter of exemption is not permissive in the Separate School Act. The right to become a Separate school supporter is permissive; but once a man elects to become a supporter, his right to exemption from taxation for the support of other schools is no longer permissive. This right then becomes mandatory upon the Legislature in regard to all property owned by such supporter, whether as individual owner or tenant or shareholder or citizen. The words of the Act of 1863 are: "A supporter of a Separate school . . . shall be exempted from the payment of all rates imposed for the support of Common Schools." This is a clear legal and constitutional duty imposed on the Legislature of Ontario, and this duty the Legislature of Ontario has failed to perform. Separate school supporters are not exempted from payment of taxes for the support of Public Schools. They pay such taxes, and are forced by the Assessment Act to pay such taxes, through many companies and as part owners of the National Railways and other public utilities which are assessed for the support of schools. We claim the exemption made mandatory by the Act of 1863.

A DASTARDLY CRIME

The cause of Ireland has received a criminal jolt by the murder of General Wilson in London. Ireland does not need, and cannot afford to use, assassination as a weapon. Nor did Ireland use it in this case. No nation should be held responsible for the excesses of individual and fanatical extremists. Speaking in the name of his country in reference to this crime, Arthur Griffith said:

"It is a fundamental principle of civilized government that the assassination of political opponents cannot be justified or condoned. General Wilson's political views were opposed to those of the vast majority of his countrymen. Nevertheless I know that vast majority to be unanimous in condemning and deploring this anarchistic deed."

The Chief of Staff of the Irish Republican army emphatically declares that the assassination of General Wilson was not the work of that organization.

In spite of these declarations, the prospect of peace in Ireland is made far more uncertain than it was by this shock to the civilized world and by the angry passions which such a crime excites and sustains.

DEATH OF REV. FATHER F. SEMANDE, C. S. B.

Father Semande, C. S. B., assistant pastor of Assumption Church, Sandwich, Ont., died suddenly June 21st.

Father Semande had just said the seven o'clock Mass and was making his Thanksgiving when he died.

For some time Father Semande had been troubled with attacks of

the heart, and while his death was not wholly a surprise, news of his death came as a distinct shock to his conferees.

Father Semande was born in Loiselville in 1855. He was educated at Assumption College and ordained a priest, June 10th, 1881. With the exception of one year spent in Owen Sound as assistant pastor, he lived his priestly life in his native county.

For many years he was professor at Assumption College. In 1903 he was appointed pastor of the Church of the Assumption at Sandwich, where he served for fourteen years. He was then transferred to Amherstburg and at the end of six years he was appointed bursar of the College at Sandwich. His appointment to the assistant pastorate at Assumption Church followed.

Father Semande was a man of kindly heart, and many an old student of Assumption College will deeply regret his sudden death.

Funeral services were held Friday morning at Assumption Church, where the Right Rev. Monsignor O'Connor, Vicar-General of London Diocese, celebrated the Requiem Mass. May his soul rest in peace.

DOCTRINE

In the recent conference of the Northern Baptists of the United States, held at Indianapolis, the question whether there should be a formal creed to which the members should subscribe was voted down by an overwhelming majority. The Fundamentalists who called upon William Jennings Bryan for aid proposed that the Baptist Church should insist upon its members accepting certain doctrines and the literal interpretation of the whole Bible. The Evangelists or Radical party defeated the Fundamentalists and carried their resolution which was to the effect that the New Testament was the sole rule of faith and that there was no need of any formal creed.

The argument of the Evangelists was that any formal creed interfered with liberty of conscience and besides it was opposed to the well-established democracy of the Baptist Church. In other words they argued that a man must be allowed to interpret the New Testament for himself, and no matter what beliefs he arrived at from his reading, he must be allowed membership.

The fight between the two factions was waged so fiercely that there was danger of a permanent split and the world would be made the richer by a new sect, added to the already innumerable ones now in existence, all of which owe their being to private interpretation of the Bible.

However, this is the same old story, which started when Luther rejected the authority of the true Church, and stated that faith alone was sufficient for salvation. The Bible as the sole rule of faith, together with its private interpretation, has been the rock on which Protestantism has split into innumerable sects, each sect rejecting one after another the doctrines which Christ taught, until at the present time, all doctrines are denied as essential for salvation.

What a sad spectacle, but at the same time what an inevitable one! When Protestantism revolted against the authority of the Church, it set itself adrift without a guiding hand and it has been drifting ever since. The result is that anyone, who cares, can see, confusion and negation. One by one the great truths of religion have been denied. What Protestant denomination formally believes in or dares to teach, the doctrine of the Trinity? What Protestant denomination maintains as essential to membership belief in the Divinity of Christ? What Protestant denomination requires before admission or after a declaration in the doctrine of the Virgin birth of Christ? What Protestant denomination requires any member to subscribe to any belief whatsoever? This may be democracy in religion but it is not Christianity. Salvation by faith alone is no longer taught or believed. Good works, under the name of service, is now the only means of gaining the Kingdom of God, if indeed, there is such a thing, which many doubt. How Luther and the other reformers must be turning in their graves to see such a reversal of their basic principle.

Extremes are always wrong. Good works without faith is dead and faith without good works is

dead. Both faith and good works are necessary for salvation. This has been the teaching of the Catholic Church through the ages. The poor and the afflicted have always brought forth sympathy from the Church. She, long before the reformers began their work, always stood as a protectress to the weak against the tyrannical oppression of the powerful. The orphans and the aged were looked after. The hungry were fed and the naked clothed.

Besides good works, however, the Catholic Church has always carried out the Divine Commission, which is to teach all nations whatever our Saviour commanded. To anyone who reads the Scriptures it is quite evident that our Saviour taught doctrine, which He laid down as necessary for salvation. "Unless a man be born again of water and the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of Heaven." "Go you, therefore, teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." Surely if words mean anything we have here a clear cut doctrine in regard to the necessity of Baptism. Other passages of Holy Scripture could be quoted, which teach directly and by immediate inference doctrines which are necessary to be believed if we are to be followers of Christ. Our Saviour did teach doctrine and in order that it might be taught without addition or subtraction, He founded His Church and promised to send the Holy Ghost who would abide with her forever. Furthermore, to preserve uncorrupted the faith which He taught, and to guard against false teachers and false doctrines He said: "Whosoever will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as the heathen and the publican."

The Church has not only a right but an obligation to teach what Jesus Christ taught. To her alone was given this authority and she alone without fear of error can teach both in matters of doctrine and morals what is necessary for salvation.

To be a follower of Christ we must not only do good but we must also have faith. But what must we believe? Surely not what we ourselves choose. We must believe all that Christ taught and this does not in any way take away our liberty of conscience. There cannot be any real conflict between what our conscience dictates and what Christ commanded to be believed. And if there is an apparent conflict, if there is difficulty in reconciling the teaching of Christ with reason, the blame for this must be placed upon the fallible intellect of man, not upon the infallible Divine Teacher.

The rejection of one doctrine soon leads to the rejection of another and the outcome is the rejection of all. The confusion of Protestantism has brought about such a result. It has never spoken with authority and without authority there can be no religion. The Catholic Church on the other hand has always maintained her right to speak authoritatively on matters of faith and morals. By doing so, she has offended at times the rich and powerful, the poor and the weak, but not once through craven fear or hope of power has she swerved one dot from the Divine Command "I have commanded you." Neither threats nor bribes nor loss of members could ever make her false to her sacred trust, for the Holy Ghost was and is and will be with her until the end of time.

The Manchester Guardian for May 31 has this to say in regard to the religion of the "man in the street," who is not by any means an uncommon specimen: "The Pharisee of today is the modern self-complacent 'man in the street,' who has no use for the Christian religion—a thing for babes and weaklings, not for 'the full-blooded male animal' like himself." Thought he despises. "For goodness sake do not confuse me with theories about the miraculous birth and apostolic succession, and such like things." As if a man should declare that he never could understand the first proposition of Euclid and then rebuke men of science for presuming to discuss problems of space and time. Decency should prevent his expecting other men to be of equal intellectual dullness. Finally the writer concludes: "The special fault of the Pharisee was self-satisfaction."

Religion was popular, and he believed that he had it to perfection. Today religion is out of favor, and the modern Pharisee believes he is the right sort of full-blooded, manly man because he slights it. I think we have carried adulation of the man in the street far enough. What I want is a Church which will say: This is the gospel as I understand it. Take it or leave it."

If the writer of the foregoing extract, and all who are seeking the truth, were to take the trouble to examine the claims of the Catholic Church, they will find One Church which not only says "This is the Gospel as I understand it," but adds "and it must be believed exactly as I preach it because I am infallible and he who does not hear me, does not hear Him who sent me, namely Jesus Christ, the Saviour of Mankind."

GERMANY AND ENGLAND

By THE OBSERVER

The Manchester Guardian, one of the leading papers of England, publishes an account by Rev. Harold Auson of a visit made by "a small party of Oxford men," recently, to Germany. The Guardian publishes Rev. Mr. Auson's remarks under the heading, "Germany under the Revolution," and the sub-heading, "Renewed fellowship with England desired."

There is in this report food for serious thought for Canadians. Whatever England may see in Germany, her present position, and her future prospects, to arouse in them a desire to be friendly, forgetful and forgiving, the people of Canada, I suppose, will not be very easily convinced that it is good politics, good diplomacy, or good sense, to begin so soon to cuddle and comfort the Hun. It may, from some English points of view, be good business; but, unless it is taken for granted that anything that is good for England or English trade or commerce is necessarily good for Canada, the business soundness of the proposed entente is likely to seem doubtful enough to the Canadian people; the more so that it is, apparently, to be based on business considerations, and to have all the limitations that narrow an understanding between business rivals.

Needless to say, there are people in Canada, people of influence too, who take, and eagerly take, the view that whatever international line-up English politicians may happen to take is good enough for us; that being colonialists we have nothing to say about such matters; and that when a Premier of England shall announce an alliance with Germany, it will become at once our duty to forget all that took place between August 1914 and November 1918.

However, let us look for a moment at Rev. Mr. Auson's report of the Englishmen's visit to Germany.

They found the new republican rulers of Germany to be "conscientious men." They found no one who wanted the Kaiser or his son back; but they found a strong opinion that monarchy, in some form, was necessary to Germany.

Now, here is an interesting paragraph:

"The more thoughtful elements in Germany complain bitterly of the ostracism to which they are exposed in western Europe. There is an extremely warm feeling of good-will toward England, and a great desire for closer social and intellectual fellowship."

To say nothing about financial fellowship! Well, it is very civil and polite of the Germans to say so; but we hope the people of England will not strain themselves in a hurried rush to believe it. There are a good many people in Canada who will refuse to believe it at all; but then, to be sure, Canada has neither so much to fear from the rivalry of German manufactures; nor any dread of a too powerful France. The historic bogey of Europe, "the Balance of Power," loses something of its terrors in stretching its shadow across the Atlantic.

"At the time of the Armistice the words of President Wilson had inspired Germany with an immense hope for the future of the world. In the words of Professor Deissman an apocalyptic, almost a Messianic hope, spread like fire through Germany. There was a tremendous belief in the coming of a reign of peace and prosperity. The German Republic was founded on the belief that this hope was to be im-

mediately realized. The peace of Versailles has been a profound disappointment, and the subsequent conduct of the French and the weakness of England in regard to French claims have continually sapped the strength of the idealistic movement in Germany."

This sounds altogether too bad; and men who were disposed to think rather badly of the German people for a few years may find themselves deeply moved at this pathetic relation of disappointed ideals—unless they are cold-blooded enough to think; and to analyse a little this touching complaint.

We are asked to conceive that Foch and Haig and Pershing did more than beat the Germans; that they converted them to certain ideals as to the future of the world. We suppose no one will care to deny that Foch and Haig and Pershing were the missionaries who effected this striking conversion. For, we suppose it may be taken for granted that had the Germans defeated Foch and Haig and Pershing the Germans would have found their old ideals good enough for them; and that they would have continued to have full confidence that "kultur" was the only thing necessary to assure to the world a future of which any world might be proud.

We are, then, to consider the astonishing effects of those last few rounds of the guns; to consider what a vast distance the German mind went forward, while the German feet were slowly and reluctantly walking the last few miles back towards Berlin.

Germany, it seems, was inspired, —and by Mr. Wilson, to say nothing of General Pershing,—with "an immense hope for the future of the world." "Immense" is right, I suppose. Whenever Germany hopes she hopes immensely. When she hoped to make her Kaiser Emperor of the world, she hoped on an immense scale; and when she suddenly,—say, between the middle of October and the middle of November, 1918,—made a quick change to another sort of hope, she preserved still the immensity of the mental operation.

She has not restricted the bounds of her hopes since then, so far as I can see. She has been hoping to separate England and France; and she seems to be having some success in that.

Says Mr. Auson:

"We discussed with many eminent men the question of war guilt. There can, I think, be no doubt at all that the vast majority of the Germans honestly believe that the War was brought about by Tsarist Russia. They allowed that Russia did not want the War at that time, but that Russia, and especially the Grand Duke Nicholas Nikolaievitch and Isvolsky, was quite determined to crush Germany ultimately. They believe also that Poincaré desired the War. Under pressure, they were willing to grant that there was a Prussian party, headed by Tirpitz who also wanted the War, but I think there can be no doubt as to the honest belief in the minds of honest and sincere German people—however mistaken we may think them to be—that the War was forced upon them by the Pan-Slavist party that ruled over the Tsar."

Now, it is a pity that the missionaries, Foch, Haig and Pershing, had only partial success in the conversion of the German people. It is too bad that, when those last rounds of the artillery and those last charges of infantry (in which Canadians took part) were changing the German mind from one sort of "immense hope" to another sort, something could not have been done to add another ray to the light that was being carried to it by our guns and on our bayonet points, by which it might have been enabled to see that Germany made the War, and that Russia and the Pan-Slavs did not.

There is more of Mr. Auson's report.

I shall refer to it again.

NOTES AND COMMENTS

THE RECENT death of Mgr. Duchesne removes one of the most scholarly men of the time. He was an historian and archaeologist of the first order, and devoted practically his whole life of seventy-eight years to the study of historical problems. Like Dr. Dollinger, he made the first years of Christianity his especial study, but unlike the latter, and some others who might be named, he knew how to submit to lawful authority when the very wideness of his researches

led him on one occasion to conclusions not entirely in harmony with Catholic teaching. When his "Ancient History of the Church" was condemned at Rome, he like a true disciple immediately submitted to the decree, and in deference thereto withheld the last volume from publication. He, therefore, enjoyed the entire confidence of the Holy See, and alike by his piety and erudition won the homage and regard of all who knew him. His passing, therefore, is a distinct loss to Catholic letters.

THE LONG hoped-for return of Scotland to the unity of the Church, frequently referred to in these columns, is feelingly dwelt upon in the congratulatory address of the Scots Bishop to His Holiness, Pius XI., on occasion of his accession, and in the Pope's response thereto. "It has been the glory of the Church in Scotland through the centuries," reads the address, "that it has ever nourished a peculiar attachment to the Roman Pontiffs, so that it was known as the 'Special daughter of the Apostolic See,' as was noted by Leo XIII. of happy memory, when he issued in 1878 the Bull, *Ecce Supremo Apostolatus apice* by which he restored to Scotland its ancient Hierarchy. Alas! since the sixteenth century the great majority of our fellow-countrymen have been unfaithful to their glorious heritage, but even at the worst some remained faithful, and now the Church in this country is yearly growing in numbers and importance, and Scotland is slowly returning to its ancient faith and obedience."

THAT THE cause in Scotland should strongly appeal to a Pontiff of Leo XIII's historical temper and wide sympathies was to be expected. "Separated as we are by distance," reads his reply, "the charity of Christ binds you closely to Us and, as We often think with joy of your laborious ministry, so We are filled with the desire for those of your nation whom the force of calamitous circumstances still holds apart from the embrace of their mother, the Church. Would that even as We rejoice in the faith and piety of Our brethren and children it might be given to Us to rejoice also in the speedy return of these others. Of the happy attainment of this end your letter inspires Us with hope, and rejoicing in this We, with all affection in the Lord, bestow upon you, etc., the Apostolic Blessing."

THE POPE'S reference to the "laborious ministry" of the Catholic clergy of Scotland is a reminder of the fact that in no part of the Lord's Vineyard has the labor of the missionary been more consistently severe than in Scotland for the past four hundred years. Readers of Gordon's "Scotchchronicon," of Father Forbes-Leith's three volumes of missionary memoirs, or of any other authentic account of the period will not need that the truth of this assertion be unduly impressed upon them. The visitor to that country of hills and locks may find it hard to realize that so fair a land could so long have harbored the most repellent and oppressive of heresies, but it does not require any very extended study of its annals to have this brought vividly home to one's conscience.

REPRESSIVE AS Calvinism was of every species of natural liberty and of all that was beautiful and elevating in the natural order, it bore with special malignance upon the Ancient Faith and its scattered adherents. Hence it was that for a period far exceeding the kindred one in England, Catholics worshipped and their priests ministered at the risk of liberty and life. And having regard to the physical conditions of the country and the scattered character and poverty for the most part of the Catholic population, the labor of caring for them remains still a task for those only who are strongly fortified with the spirit of fortitude and self-renunciation. Of this fact Pius XI. is fully apprised, hence we know that his words of commendation and encouragement are not merely formal but spoken from the heart.

The man who gives his life for principle has done more for his kind than he who discovers a new metal or names a new gas; for the great motors of the race are moral not intellectual, and their force lies ready to the use of the poorest and the weakest of us all.—James Russell Lowell.