

The Catholic Record

Published Weekly at 256 and 420 Richmond Street, London, Ontario. Price of Subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

EDITOR: REV. GEORGE R. NORTHGRAVE, Author of "Mistakes of Modern Infidels."

THOMAS COFFEY, Publisher and Proprietor. Thomas Coffey, 155 Queen Street East, Toronto, Ont., is the proprietor of this paper. He is assisted by Messrs. J. J. Neven, E. G. Broderick and Miss Sarah Hanley.

Agents for Newfoundland, Mr. James Power of St. John's. Rates of Advertising—Ten cents per line each insertion, separate measurement.

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

Correspondence intended for publication, as well as that having reference to business, should be directed to the proprietor and sent to London not later than Monday morning.

Subscribers wishing to change their address should notify this office as soon as possible in order to insure the regular delivery of their paper.

Agents or collectors have no authority to stop your paper unless the amount due is paid. Matter intended for publication should be mailed in time to reach London not later than Monday morning.

Obituary and marriage notices sent by subscribers must be in a condensed form, to insure insertion.

When subscribers change their residence it is important that the old as well as the new address be sent us.

LETTERS OF RECOMMENDATION. Apostolic Delegation, Ottawa, June 13th, 1906. To the Editor of the Catholic Record, London, Ont.

My Dear Sir.—Since coming to Canada I have been a reader of your paper. I have noted with satisfaction and, above all, that it is imbued with a strong Catholic spirit.

It strongly defends Catholic principles and rights, and stands firmly by the teachings and authority of the Church, at the same time promoting 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 more Catholic homes.

I, therefore, earnestly recommend it to Catholic families. With my blessing on your work, and best wishes for its continued success.

Yours faithfully in Christ, DONATUS, Archbishop of Ephesus, Apostolic Delegate.

UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA, Ottawa, Canada, March 7th, 1906. To the Editor of the Catholic Record, London, Ont.

Dear Sir:—For some time past I have read your estimable paper, THE CATHOLIC RECORD, and congratulate you upon the manner in which it is published.

The matter and form are both good, and a very Catholic spirit pervades the whole. Therefore, with pleasure, I can recommend to the faithful.

Believing you and wishing you success. Believe me to remain, Yours faithfully in Jesus Christ, D. FALCONIO, Arch. of Larch. Apost. Deleg.

LONDON, SATURDAY, NOV. 17, 1906. A TEMPEST.

The Hon. Mr. Whitney, Premier of Ontario, is beginning to experience troublous days and perhaps sleepless nights. He says that a few weeks ago a Catholic newspaper published a list of a dozen Catholics in the county of Hastings who had been dismissed from public office, a like number of the brothers of Orange Lodges being duly installed in their places.

It now comes to pass that a correspondent of the Orange Sentinel blushes deep crimson on beholding the said Premier Whitney attending a Roman Catholic picnic. "Prominent Conservatives," the correspondent added, "stood aloof from him and there was a baker's dozen shook hands with him that day."

A touchingly sad picture! But the most desperate attack of all has been aimed at the Premier by the editor of the Sentinel itself, because the honorable gentleman dared appoint Dr. Coughlin, a Roman Catholic, in the broad light of day, and with malice aforethought, to the position of superintendent for the Institute for the Blind in Belleville. This complaint comes from an editor who preaches "civil and religious liberty, equal rights for all and special privileges for none."

He is, however, a worthy representative of a class whose lofty sentiments come only from the teeth outwards. It matters not that Dr. Coughlin is far above the average in ability and education—it matters not that he is a Canadian of the type that makes for Canada's honor and Canada's glory—it matters not that he is in every regard splendidly equipped for the position to which he has been called—there is a black spot on his character because he is a Romanist, and Mr. Whitney's crime, for crime it will be judged by Orangemen, in thus recognizing Romanism, will not be forgiven—in this world at least. There will be a ray of comfort for him, however, when he sums up the character of the Orange Sentinel and its editor. The man who would say that all the newspapers in Canada are conducted by gentlemen for gentlemen would not be strictly correct, and the man who would say, after reading the editorial page of the Orange Sentinel, that the statements therein contained are truthful, would be shunned by those who love truth.

The most preposterous statements concerning the Catholic Church are frequently found in this paper. A pity it is that the newspaper fraternity have to bear the odium thus cast upon the profession by a man who should take himself to some other avocation. But there is a method in the man's madness. The more he wields against Rome the pen dipped in gall—the more he misrepresents the Catholic Church and its system of government—the greater the volume of acclaim he will receive from those who nurse a phantom all the year round and engage in a carnival of bigotry on its birthday under the rays of a hot July sun; stalwart yeoman

smashing the drums and other yeoman plerching the air with the whistle of the sife, the speeches and the music and the sentiments of the throng giving us a striking proof that there is at times a vast expanse between theoretical and practical Christianity; and we are once more reminded in a very vivid fashion that these deluded people, while professing to be the champions of Protestantism, have for the most part but a very casual acquaintance with a Protestant place of worship.

An opportunity of displaying a broad minded statesmanship, which will bring to the province of Ontario peace and contentment and prosperity, is now given its Premier. Will he take advantage of it? We hope so. We are slow to accuse public men of acting on the narrow lines of creed prejudice, but we are forced to believe that, at least in some cases, one or more of his colleagues have been dragged into making a shuffle of offices so that the yellow may supplant the green. We would ask the Premier to make an investigation. The honor of his government is at stake. We hope the time will never come in our country when the custom will prevail that Protestants as such will be placed in office to supplant Catholics—and we hope the time will never come when the custom will prevail that Catholics as such will be placed in office to supplant Protestants.

In some places, we regret to say, Catholics have well grounded reason for the complaint that they are discriminated against because of their faith. Toronto and the influence which it exerts from it is much to blame for this. While the great Catholic city of Montreal frequently elects a Protestant mayor, Toronto has never yet bestowed that honor upon a Catholic, and the same discrimination is to be found regarding all other civic offices from the mayor to the policeman. In the Catholic centres of the country such unfairness is unknown. A large number of our non-Catholic neighbors in this Province of Ontario should make note of this condition of things and on the coming of the New Year turn over a new leaf. All Catholics want is fair play.

While the Premier continues to make appointments, either of Catholics or Protestants, of men of the stamp of Dr. Coughlin, he will be sure of the approval of all good citizens.

FRANCE'S ORDEAL. The latest despatches from Paris state that the Clemenceau Government finds that the determined attitude of the French clergy in reference to the threat of the government to take possession of all church property on Dec. 11, which will not be taken possession of by lay associations which set aside the authority of the Bishop and Pope, finds itself in the dilemma that the Catholic priests and people will not act upon its mandate to take orders from the government as regards how the Church is to be ruled, whereas the Pope has declared that the orders of the government are in direct opposition to the divinely instituted organization and constitution of the Church.

But it is now admitted that there is no French law enabling the government to deal with the situation. That is to say, under the laws of France the priests and people are acting under their right, and a new law will have to be enacted which will make the action, or rather the inaction of priests as a people, illegal, before the government will be able to act upon its threat, and this petty piece of legislation will now be passed by the government to empower it "to expel from France all persons who obey the behests of a foreign sovereign in contravention of the laws of France!"

This is to say that the French Republic must be authorized by law to deport all priests who will not constitute their parishes into independent schismatical churches.

A more diabolical attempt to force a schism on the Church was never attempted by the most despotic government which ever existed. Julian the Apostate made an attempt which was in some respects similar, but he failed. Bismarck's attempt to create a schism in Germany failed also, and we are quite satisfied that the apostate Clemenceau will fail.

This legislation cannot succeed in the light of the twentieth century, but its meanness will pass down on the pages of history as the most despicable attempt ever made by satan to injure the Church in any nation. We can only remark further on the plan that satan has outstained himself in conceiving such a project. But it cannot succeed, though if attempted to be carried out as threatened, it would undoubtedly create an unprecedented amount of trouble, and the rule of M. Clemenceau, who is being boomed as the wisest head in France, will become the laughing-stock of future generations.

One of the possibilities of this last move of the sans culottes of France is that there may arise out of the confusion a civil war of unprecedented bitterness.

THE CLASH OF THE LORDS AND COMMONS. It is but seldom that the House of Lords sets itself up to defy the Imperial House of Commons by voting down decisively an important Government measure; but on October 29th this unusual step was taken, when by a vote of 256 to 56, the Lords defeated the Government Education Bill in its most important and crucial clause, which has reference to the question of compulsory religious teaching in the public elementary schools. Under the bill, as it left the House of Commons, children were not compelled to attend school during the time devoted to religious instruction.

An amendment to this feature was proposed by Lord Henshawe, a Liberal, but was rejected by Earl Crewe on behalf of the government. The majority included the 2 Archbishops, 20 Bishops and almost the entire opposition party. All the peers who are members of the government also voted with the minority, with Lord Rosebery and a few Conservative Lords; but the rally of Conservatives against the bill has not been equalled by any since the defeat of Hon. W. P. Gladstone's Home Rule measure for Ireland in 1893, the vote being then 419 to 41.

What the result of this opposition to a measure on which the government were so determined will be, it is hard to foretell. Mr. Campbell Bannerman, we are told in a despatch, has already uttered a threat to the effect that an unruly majority in the Lords is now very easily overruled by the aid of that body of a number of more accommodating members, but we do not see that this is so easily done as the Premier is said to have asserted. Why was a second Chamber instituted at all, if it is to be threatened with practical extinction every time the wheel of the governmental machinery is clogged even for a moment?

But is the wish of the nation to be set at naught at the pleasure of the Lords? Well, perhaps not, but as we see the matter, the wish of the nation has not been made manifest as being in accord with Mr. Birrell's bill. The House of Lords was made one of the branches of Parliament, certainly with some purpose in view, and on the understanding that under certain circumstances it would be an efficacious check against insufficiently considered legislation, and legislation for which there is no mandate from the nation. We fully believe that there was no mandate from the nation for the present bill, and in the essential check put upon this piece of governmental legislation, the Lords were only carrying out the will of the people.

When the Irish Home Rule Bill was passed by the House of Commons in 1893, there was a mandate from the people, for the elections had just been held with the Home Rule Bill fully in sight, and so much so that it was almost the only issue before the people. Now notwithstanding the unprecedentedly large majority of Lords against that bill, it was indisputably an issue on which the people of the three kingdoms had pronounced in favor of the legislation which the Lords checked; and even so, it was only by superhuman efforts on the part of Lord Salisbury to muster his every supporter among the peers, that there was so large a majority against Home Rule.

But the case is quite different now. There was no special effort to make an irresistible vote against Mr. Birrell's bill in the House of Lords on this occasion. The vote may therefore be assumed to have arisen from a strong feeling in the country in favor of religious instruction in the schools, and which manifested itself spontaneously in the House of Lords.

It must be admitted that the recently passed educational bills of 1902 and 1903, which are to be repealed by the bill now before Parliament, were very thoroughly discussed ever since 1902, and were an issue at the recent elections. But they had sunk to be but a secondary issue in presence of the tariff issue which was convulsing the country during the last electoral campaign.

The voice of the people was heard during that campaign on the questions of preferential and protective tariffs, but not on education, and the Campbell-Bannerman Ministry cannot claim that the people have rendered a verdict in favor of godless education, the more especially as three fifths of the children of England have been attending the voluntary religious schools, even if we set aside the people of Ireland and Scotland, who are almost unanimous in favor of religious teaching.

Mr. Campbell-Bannerman, as we believe, has made the mistake of his life in setting at defiance the will of the people in his effort at establishing

a godless system of education. He does this to please the Non-conformists who supported him at the last election; but he has not thus pleased his party to any very great extent. The Laborites declared boldly, at a recent conference which discussed the Education Bill, that this bill is the establishment and endowment of non-conformity in the schools. The Non-conformists deny this to be the case, but the majority of the people of England, Ireland and Scotland are not to be hoodwinked on the matter, and it will not be long before they will declare themselves plainly against the establishment of a Non-conformist system of education to take the place of the free system which has existed under the law, at all events since 1870. We believe the Government will have to retreat from its position on the basis of a Non-conformist system of education which it so thoughtlessly adopted.

THE INFIDEL GOVERNMENT OF FRANCE. It is now known that M. Clemenceau's new French Cabinet contains men of different parties to the number of twelve, having different political views, but all agreed upon the persecution of the Church, so that we may take it for granted that they will carry out their threat to confiscate the Church property in December, if they dare. M. Briand has already been quoted in our columns as having spoken most blasphemously of our Blessed Lord Jesus Christ. We know, therefore, what is to be expected from him. He announced only a few weeks ago:

"We have hunted Jesus Christ out of the schools, out of the universities, out of the hospitals and the asylums, nay even out of prisons and mad houses. It now remains for us to hunt Him out of the government of France."

Besides M. Briand, who belongs to the Independent Socialist party, there is M. Vivian of the same party, whose views are similar. There are six Radicals, and one Democratic Socialist, M. Caillaux; M. Piequart, (a General who befriended M. Dreyfus when the latter was condemned for treason.) Gen. Piequart is not a member of the Chamber of Deputies, but we have no doubt he can find a seat if it be required that he should have one. These are all confirmed enemies of the Catholic Church, but not any the less enemies of Christianity in any form. The wonder is that the Protestant press can find consolation in the fact that a government entertaining such views have assumed the control of a Christian nation. But the Protestant press as far back as we can remember has always been willing to cheer on any who hate the Pope, even though they hate all Christianity just as heartily.

But here it may be asked, why should the Church oppose the election of a lay body, say of trustees or church-wardens, for the rule of each parish? We answer:

1st. That this is not the character of the body which Christ appointed to rule His Church. He did not tell the Apostles to go to those localities whither they were called by the people there, to teach the doctrines which these people chose to be taught. He Himself chose the Apostles to exercise the powers which He had received from His heavenly Father. They taught accordingly, as we find from the whole tenor of the New Testament, thus: "All power is given to me in heaven and on earth. Go ye, therefore, and 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, and behold, I am with you all days even to the consummation of the world. (St. Matt. xxviii. 18, 20.)"

It appears, therefore, that they received neither the doctrine itself, nor the jurisdiction to teach in any particular locality from the people, or the government, but from Jesus Christ Himself Who has all power from His Father.

We learn the same from St. John xv. 16 xvi. The Apostles did not choose Christ: "But I have chosen you, and have appointed you that you should go and should bring forth fruit, and your fruit should remain. . . . It is expedient for you that I go, for if I go not, the Paraclete will not come to you. . . . But when He, the Spirit of truth shall come, He will teach you all truth.

"And he said to them again: Peace be to you, as the Father hath sent me, I also send you. . . . He breathed on them and He said to them: Receive ye the Holy Ghost. Whose sins you shall forgive they are forgiven them, and whose sins you shall retain, they are retained." (xx. 21, 23.)

In his Epistle to the Ephesians, St. Paul speaks not of the pastors of the Church as having assumed the office of themselves, but as receiving it from Jesus Who "gave them to be apostles and some prophets, and others evangelists, and others pastors and teachers,

for the perfection of the saints, for the work of the ministry." (Eph. iv. 11-12.) Timothy and Titus were appointed and ordained by the imposition of St. Paul's hands to rule the Churches of Ephesus and Crete with large authority over the territory adjoining, and he gives these full authority to rule these churches effectually.

In fine, we might quote many other passages to the same effect showing that the authority does not come to pastors and teachers by election by the congregation or choice of the government but by ordination of the apostles. The churches increased in number daily through the zeal of the apostles and apostolic men, and those whom they selected and ordained, for on them it devolved to "ordain priests in every city," and even Bishops, whom the Holy Ghost placed over their respective flocks to rule the Church of God." (Acts xiv. 23: xx. 28, Titus 15.)

Here are reasons enough why the Pope and the French Bishops cannot govern the Church according to the plans laid down by M. Combes and Clemenceau, and we might quote much more to the same effect.

FORMS OF GOVERNMENT AND THE CATHOLIC CHURCH. The Countess of Warwick, in an introduction which she has written for a pamphlet on "The Municipality from the workers' point of view," et al. at England is destined to become socialistic. She says:

"The country is sick and tired of the old order, and is beginning to see in Socialism its only hope. Nothing can now prevent the change. That it should come peacefully is our wish, or we should not enter so enthusiastically into electioneering; but whether slowly or rapidly, peacefully or otherwise, come it must."

Times have indeed greatly changed since Richard Neville, Earl of Warwick, boasted that he could make and unmake kings, and the boast was not without truth. That the head of that noble house should have become so democratic as even to permit his countess to canvass at elections in favor of the democratic party and to acknowledge the sovereignty of the people is a wonderful change even in so long a time as four and a quarter centuries.

As yet, the Socialists of England have not reached the extreme views which prevail among those who are called by this name on the European continent, and who in France and Germany are really Anarchists, but even this extreme may be reached soon enough by the English Socialists who have developed such enormous strength in the last English elections as we could scarcely have believed would ever be the case for a descendant of the aristocratic houses of Salisbury and Warwick, which is to say of Cecil and Neville together.

If there is any power on earth which will stay the people of England, France and Germany from plunging into the bloody excesses of the French Jacobins of 1793 and 1871 it is the Catholic Church, the only Church which can speak with divine authority.

We have reached that curious stage in Canada where the people are really courageous enough to be democratic and are yet thoroughly loyal to a dynasty whose beginning goes back at least two thousand years, but we have not fallen into the degradation of French sans-culottism or English Jack Cadism—and may it be long before this depth may be reached either by the people of Canada or of England.

The Catholic Church alone can speak with authority, maintaining the moral boundary line between legitimate democracy and the Russian autocracy of tyranny. "Bout forms of Government let fools contest." This a principle which the Catholic Church can wisely admit in the sense that she can admit the lawfulness of either the Republic or the monarchical form of government, provided it is administered in accordance with the laws of God. It is a falsehood which no one believes the conscienceless Premier M. Combes ever dared to state publicly as if it were a truth, that the Catholic Church is so tied to monarchy that she must necessarily plot for the overthrow of a Republic whether in France or elsewhere.

There is no government existing at the present moment with which the Catholic Church is more in harmony than that of the United States, which is probably the most ideal of existing Republics. But she can never be anarchistic, or socialistic of the European bloody type. The Catholic Church and Catholic principles uphold any form of government which is well administered, recognizing to the fullest extent the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood and the rights of Man, whether he be prince or peasant.

It is not surprising, however, that even in the face of Leo XIII's earnest advice to Frenchmen to give their complete support to the French Republic, it was not followed by all Catholics,

or perhaps even by a majority of the Catholics of France. It is a necessity of human nature that there should be wide differences of opinion between men, especially on political subjects, and it was the case that when the Catholics of France saw that the pretended Republic of France, more treacherously than any other form of government ever did, encroached upon the rights of individual men, it was the most natural thing in the world that many of them should despise that falsely named Republic more than almost any other monarchy ever did which ever existed, encroached upon the inalienable rights of man which it is the business of a Republic, more than any other form of government, to uphold, inasmuch as it is the very first principle which a Republic is founded upon in theory that all men should have their individual rights respected. But even in spite of all the insults which the present French Government has heaped on Pope Pius X. the Holy Father has declared most recently that he is a true friend of France, in spite of the quarrel which the French government has forced upon him.

Should the forecast of the Countess of Warwick prove to be correct, the Catholic Church and the Church authorities will be equally willing to uphold whatever form of government the people of England will wish to submit to, as she upholds the present form of government; which is that by which the people of England at the present moment prefer to be governed; and there is at this day no class of the English people and those of England's colonies more loyal than the Catholics of the British Empire.

A GOOD MOVEMENT. We congratulate the good wish priest of Thorold, Rev. Father Sullivan, on the splendid success which has attended his efforts to establish a Young Men's Club in that town. From time to time we have made reference to the need of such clubs in many centres where the Catholic population is considerable. We know by experience that it is a very easy task to set afoot such an organization, but it requires earnestness, perseverance and ability on the part of its promoters to keep the ship in trim. A Young Men's Club, having for its object the moral and mental development of its members, as well as the bringing of them into close touch with the Church and the priest, will be the means of producing untold good in the community. It has been the custom in some places to introduce a description of entertainments which are, to say the least, very questionable. We may say, in all truth, that we never yet knew a case where a young man's mental and moral qualities were improved by learning and studying the adjuncts of the bar-room—billiards, pool, cards, etc. We need not mention the even more objectionable features of young men's societies, such as dancing and boxing. Many of those who are approaching, and many of those who have gone beyond the middle stage of life, have a fondness for one or more of these modes of whiling away a few spare hours; but, when the end comes, where is the man who will be able to say: "These hours have strengthened that equipment which I require for forging for myself an honored place in the country." The time is lost, lost forever.

On the other hand, let us take as an example the last meeting of the Catholic Young Men's Club of Thorold. Mr. Thos. F. Battle, barrister, of Niagara Falls, delivered a lecture on that occasion and the lecture was accompanied by a programme of music by local artists. We have read a synopsis of this young man's lecture and the question comes to our mind: "Why have we not a number of Thos. F. Battles in other places?" It is in a large degree because many of our young men have spent the heyday of their lives in pursuing ideals which have become for them, as their manhood matures, not objects of pride and profit, but sources of remorse. They lost their grip on the battle of life because they would not take thought and study its serious side when youth was with them. Here is an extract, bright and practical, from the lecture of Mr. Battle:

"Nothing was so important as our relationship towards our fellowmen and the standard of that citizenship could not be raised too high. It behooves all to consider carefully their duties to the state. It was a common practice, and unfortunately it has been much in evidence lately, to see men who in all other respects were men of honor, adopt quite a wrong conception of their duties to the state when entering into public life. Canada was a young country, on the threshold of a glorious future, unfettered by the dying traditions of privileged classes, and with the past histories of all other countries to guide them in their onward march. Students of political economy would tell them, however, that when countries were prosperous it was the time above all others when national and civic immorality, which so often accompanies prosperity, creeps in. Newspapers

daily show that the same thing is going on in this country. The standard of citizenship is being lowered, and the result is that the young men of this country are being trained for a life of crime and immorality. It is the duty of every citizen to stand up for the principles of justice and morality, and to see that the young men of this country are not being trained for a life of crime and immorality. It is the duty of every citizen to stand up for the principles of justice and morality, and to see that the young men of this country are not being trained for a life of crime and immorality.

It is the duty of every citizen to stand up for the principles of justice and morality, and to see that the young men of this country are not being trained for a life of crime and immorality. It is the duty of every citizen to stand up for the principles of justice and morality, and to see that the young men of this country are not being trained for a life of crime and immorality.

It is the duty of every citizen to stand up for the principles of justice and morality, and to see that the young men of this country are not being trained for a life of crime and immorality. It is the duty of every citizen to stand up for the principles of justice and morality, and to see that the young men of this country are not being trained for a life of crime and immorality.

It is the duty of every citizen to stand up for the principles of justice and morality, and to see that the young men of this country are not being trained for a life of crime and immorality. It is the duty of every citizen to stand up for the principles of justice and morality, and to see that the young men of this country are not being trained for a life of crime and immorality.

It is the duty of every citizen to stand up for the principles of justice and morality, and to see that the young men of this country are not being trained for a life of crime and immorality. It is the duty of every citizen to stand up for the principles of justice and morality, and to see that the young men of this country are not being trained for a life of crime and immorality.

It is the duty of every citizen to stand up for the principles of justice and morality, and to see that the young men of this country are not being trained for a life of crime and immorality. It is the duty of every citizen to stand up for the principles of justice and morality, and to see that the young men of this country are not being trained for a life of crime and immorality.

It is the duty of every citizen to stand up for the principles of justice and morality, and to see that the young men of this country are not being trained for a life of crime and immorality. It is the duty of every citizen to stand up for the principles of justice and morality, and to see that the young men of this country are not being trained for a life of crime and immorality.

It is the duty of every citizen to stand up for the principles of justice and morality, and to see that the young men of this country are not being trained for a life of crime and immorality. It is the duty of every citizen to stand up for the principles of justice and morality, and to see that the young men of this country are not being trained for a life of crime and immorality.

It is the duty of every citizen to stand up for the principles of justice and morality, and to see that the young men of this country are not being trained for a life of crime and immorality. It is the duty of every citizen to stand up for the principles of justice and morality, and to see that the young men of this country are not being trained for a life of crime and immorality.