

The Catholic Record

Price of Subscription—\$1.50 per annum. United States & Europe—75c.

Editor and Proprietor, Thomas Coffey, L.L.D.

Rev. James T. Foley, R. A. Thomas Coffey, L.L.D.

Rev. F. J. O'Sullivan, H. F. Mackintosh.

Advertisements for teachers, situations wanted or to accept such positions, sent to the publisher at the office.

Approved and recommended by Archbishops of Canada and the United States, the Bishops of Ontario, Quebec, and the Maritime Provinces, the Bishops of London, Hamilton, Peterborough, and Oshawa, N. Y., and the clergy throughout the Dominion.

The following agents are authorized to receive subscriptions and orders for the CATHOLIC RECORD:

General agents: M. J. Hagarty, Vincent B. Cox, and Miss Jessie Doyle, Resident agents: George B. Howland, Minneapolis, Minn.; Mrs. J. B. Smith, Halifax; Miss Bertha Saunders, Sydney; Miss L. Herlihy, Winnipeg; E. E. Metcalfe, 2205-8th ave. West, Vancouver, B. C.; Miss Johnson, 211 Rochester st., Ottawa; Miss Jean McKeown, 140 D'Almeida street, Quebec; Mrs. George E. Smith, 220 St. Urbain street, Montreal; M. J. Martin, Montreal, B. P. O. 100; 147 Montague St., Regina, Sask.; and E. J. Murray, Box 125, Saskatoon.

Obituary and marriage notices cannot be inserted except in the usual condensed form and must be paid for in advance.

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

In St. John N. B., single copies may be purchased from Mrs. M. A. Dwyer and The O'Neill Co., General, 109 Brantford street.

A Montreal single copy may be purchased from J. Milroy, 241 St. Catherine street, west.

LONDON, SATURDAY, JAN. 5, 1918

THE VATICAN, THE MORNING POST, AND THE POSTLETS

It is curious, but not very surprising to see the wide circulation in this country given to The Morning Post's recent virulent attack on our Holy Father the Pope. As a matter of fact The Morning Post might have been quoted at any time in the last quarter of a century to the effect that England was inevitably going to the "deminitive bow-wow's," unless she retraced her steps and accepted The Morning Post's interpretation of the British Constitution. It is reactionary, hide-bound, last-ditch Tory. When Democracy goes beyond sonorous and meaningless phrases it is anathema to The Morning Post. It has, of course, its clientele, a clientele hitherto powerful and influential; but whose future share in the control of public affairs is, to say the least, problematical. It is only fair to say that the majority of Englishmen hold the ravings of the Post at their true value.

Our esteemed contemporary, The Christian Guardian, quotes The Morning Post as its spiritual forbear before the era of higher criticism might have quoted Holy Scripture. After referring to the usual Protestant superstition about Austria it goes on:

"And The Post points out the peculiar and significant fact that in Italy, Ireland, Quebec and Australia, wherever the influence of the Vatican predominates there is open and secret hostility to the Allied cause."

For over two years the Italian armies did marvels, worked miracles, over an impossible terrain. Did the Guardian or the Post give the credit to the Vatican? After the rout from the Isonzo the Italian armies magnificently recovered their morale. They were short of munitions before that disaster occurred. Mountains of military supplies and thousands of guns had to be abandoned during the retreat. There is a dreadful lack of coal for factories and railroads; there is scarcity of food; and yet ill equipped as they must be, in comparison with the enemy almost naked handed, they are again putting up a fight which belies the predictions of military critics and compels the admiration of the world. Is the Vatican responsible for it all? It is a poor rule that won't work both ways. It is true that the press gave a passing, almost a grudging recognition of the great part that the hierarchy and "clericals" played in the restoration of the Italian morale; some papers even had a passing reference to Cardinal Mailli's eloquent and patriotic appeal which thrilled the soul of Italy. These references make us think of the publicity given to the Morning Post's savage attack on the Pope—they are so different. It is true that a small section of the Italian army on the Isonzo front appears to have been disaffected by socialist pacifist propaganda. Copies of The Avanti were found widely distributed amongst the soldiers in that section of the front. But The Avanti is not only a Socialist and Pacifist but a bitterly anti-clerical paper; and while almost all the forces of Italy, including the powerful influence of the Catholic Church, were engaged in rehabilitating the national morale—civil and military—the socialist anti-clerical Avanti remained irreconcilably Pacifist. There has not been a scrap of evidence adduced in support of the reckless accusation that "clerical" agitation was responsible in any degree for this Italian disaffec-

tion. Italy may fail. She is absolutely dependent on the coal and food and military supplies that must be brought to her despite the appalling insufficiency of shipping facilities. If she does fail—which God forbid—then in the midst of the calamity which her failure would mean to the world we may expect to hear ghoulish bigots whisper and gibber—the Vatican!

Does The Christian Guardian really think that the Vatican has had any influence one way or the other on recruiting in Quebec? Perhaps it does. One thing it ought to know is that in spite of the racialism which may have infected some of the clergy, the whole influence of the Catholic Church in Quebec will be exerted in favor of the harmonious enforcement of conscription, for it is now by the will of the people and the enactment of lawful authority the law of the land, which Catholics by the unequivocal teaching of the Church are in conscience bound to obey.

The Guardian approvingly quotes The Post to the effect that the Vatican predominates in Australia also. So be it. Let us then examine what the Vatican has done in Australia. In order to take a thoroughly detached view of the matter we shall quote the Globe of Dec. 26:

"With a population of only 5,000,000, 4,118,000 at close of 1906, the last available figures.—E. C. R., the Commonwealth has sent almost as many men overseas as Canada, and has in addition manned her navy and maintained a large home defence force. In all 5,000,000 Australians have volunteered, or one in ten of the population, compared with one in eighteen in Canada. If the Canadian Prime Minister's pledge of 5,000,000 men for the cause, given in January, 1916, had been fulfilled under the voluntary system there would have been little agitation in this country for conscription. Even in Canada agriculture and other essential industries have suffered from the shortage of labor, but the conditions in Australia must be much more onerous, and the majority of Australians should not be reproached if they object to further drafts on the manhood of the country by compulsory methods.

"It may abate Canadian pride to be told that we shall not have equalled Australia's achievement even when the Military Service Act has completed its work."

We have no statistics of the religious complexion of Australian enlistment, but we remember reading in an English paper, a couple of years ago, that the Australian casualty lists might easily be taken for those of Irish regiments, so predominant were the purely Irish names. Would the Guardian note this "peculiar and significant fact" where "the influence of the Vatican predominates"?

Here is another sentence of the Christian Guardian's Pharisee-Publican demonstration:

"And in Australia Archbishop Mannix openly denounces it (Conscription), while every one knows the story of Ireland."

Archbishop Mannix had just as much right to oppose conscription in Australia as Methodist ministers had to advocate it in Ontario. Neither in Canada nor Australia is conscription part of the fundamental law. It was a measure proposed to the people for their acceptance or rejection. The people exercised their undoubted right not less in rejecting it in Australia than in accepting it in Canada. The Vatican influenced Archbishop Mannix no more than it influenced Bishop Fallon.

The Guardian, as well as others, was probably misled by Premier Hughes' appeal on this issue to the soldiers, which contained a hysterical attack on Archbishop Mannix, an attack which soldiers as well as civilians seem to have resented. The Australian Premier is neurotic and dyspeptic; that is not his fault. But his eloquence seems to be largely affected by his physical condition; that is probably not his fault either. In England, a year or so ago, he worked himself into an oratorical frenzy of imperialism. Whether or not he moved the country to a realization of the changes which he considered urgently and immediately necessary in the internal economy of the Empire, he certainly captured the head-lines, front pages and leader writers of the newspapers. Some time later on General Smuts, a saner and much more virile colonial statesman, effectively punctured Premier Hughes' soap-bubble reputation as saviour of the Empire; and showed that we could worry along without radical changes until such time as the matter could be fully discussed and calmly considered. If Archbishop Mannix contributed to the rejection by the Australian people and soldiers of Premier Hughes and his military policy, it seems to us that he was but exercising the same civil

rights which were claimed and exercised by the Methodist ministers who contributed to the rejection of Laurier and his policy in Canada. The Vatican had as much to do with the one as with the other. It is astonishing how much we heard of the Premier's side of the Hughes-Mannix controversy, and how little of the Archbishop's. The extract from the Globe quoted above indicates many sound, economic and social grounds on which the Archbishop may have based his decision. Just to show that there is another side of which we heard nothing this little passage at arms will suffice: During the conscription campaign the Archbishop referred to the world conflict as "a trade war." A "trade war!" Forthwith Mr. Hughes, with characteristic lack of restraint, rung the changes on "trade war" and branded the man who could use such a false and misleading term as an enemy to the Allied cause and an enemy to recruiting in Australia. Whereupon the Archbishop effectively countered by quoting Mr. Hughes himself, who after his return from England publicly asserted that "This war is at bottom a war of economic domination of the world." No one saw the sinister influence of the Vatican in Premier Hughes' declaration; but it was at once apparent in the simpler formula of Archbishop Mannix.

"Every one," says The Guardian, "knows the story of Ireland." No, friend Guardian, some Methodists know only one side of the story. And the post went to the very root of the matter when he said: "A lie that is half truth is ever the blackest of lies." The enthusiastic co-operation of Ireland at the beginning of the War is almost forgotten—by some people. Every one knows or ought to know, the "stupidities and malignities" that metamorphosed Ireland, for they were openly acknowledged by British Prime Minister on the floor of the House of Commons. Not every one knows—but many know—the deliberate discouragement of Irish Nationalist enlistment on the part of those in charge of recruiting in Ireland; every one ought to know of the official document in the British War Office which proves this fact. A great many now know of the deliberate policy of the official and ascendancy class to outrage and exasperate Irish sentiment. Every one knows of the brutal executions of Pearse, Connolly and their associates in Ireland; and of the few months' imprisonment to which General De Wet was sentenced for the same offence in South Africa. Every one knows of the cold-blooded murders of Sheehy-Skeffington, McIntyre, Dickson, Coade and others. Every one knows how the stupid or malignant administration of Irish affairs revived the half dead memories of age-long persecutions, and made Bowen Colville, the typical of the spirit of the alien government maintained in Ireland in defiance of the rights of small nationalities while England was posing before the world as their champion. These and a hundred other things must be known before "everyone knows the story of Ireland." Decent Englishmen, decent English publicists, decent Britishers everywhere are ashamed of this side of the story of Ireland; and they have the grace to be silent regarding the other side unless they feel compelled to tell the whole truth. Decent Englishmen write in shams when they hear or read the slanderous half truths, the blackest of lies, given out as "the story of Ireland."

We are not ashamed of the story of Ireland, before the War or since. Irishmen have done more for the War than Canadians; much more than native Canadians. We are much less ashamed of the Irish rebel than we are of the Canadian clergyman who attempts to poison the wells of religious controversy even in war time.

We commend to the Guardian, and to others afflicted with its peculiar monomania, these reflections of a sane and learned Protestant, a Professor in a Scottish University:

"The German Empire is emphatically a Protestant Power. . . . Again, what is the real inspiration of modern German policy? Not tyranny for its own sake—that can be found without going to Berlin—but national egoism. Of all Powers the German Empire is the most narrowly nationalistic; of all Powers the Papacy is the most international. In the last century it was precisely for its alleged blindness to the claims of nationality that the Holy See was most fiercely attacked. The Papacy could only work in harmony with the German Empire by transforming the Catholic Church into a German Church. Only invincible ignorance or bad faith could attribute that intention to Benedict XV."

THE FARM AND THE WAR

In a letter from an old and esteemed subscriber of the CATHOLIC RECORD occurs this passage:

"I had two sons at the front, Willie and James. James is in the hospital wounded for the third time; he is a corporal. Willie is home with me these four months, but must go back next month; he is a sergeant-major. Don't you think the military heads in Canada should leave one or both of them here to work on the farm? I am sixty-six years old and about done."

We refrain from giving the name as it was not made clear whether the letter was intended for publication or not. This case of course does not come under the Military Service Act; but we think it is one which calls for relief. If it is impossible to hire a man to replace the sons, the father with or without the consent of the sons should place the whole matter before the Commanding Officer of the military district within which he resides, setting forth the facts of the case: the size of the farm, age and condition of health of the owner, dates at which sons enlisted, etc., etc. During the election campaign it was frequently stated that the enforced service of those who are fit and free to go, being engaged in no essential industry at home, would have the effect of relieving those who had already done their full duty. It would seem to be entirely in accord with the spirit and purpose of the Military Service Act if action were taken and relief given in this particular case.

Another old friend in a letter renewing his subscription writes:

"Life nowadays on the farm is so hurried and burdened with work that we have scarcely time to read any paper at all, but we have taken the CATHOLIC RECORD for such a great number of years that if we now quit it we would feel as if something had been taken out of our lives. And dear knows there is not much left to cheer us now for the Military Service Act is stripping some of the farms here by taking the last boy; with all the infirmities of old age on the father—unless the appeal court will give relief—he cannot 'carry on' and will have to quit in despair."

The appeal court will certainly give relief. The supreme court of appeal under the Military Service Act has handed down a reasoned decision to the effect that every one really engaged in farm work whether farmer's son or farm laborer must be exempted from military service by the very terms of the act. This decision will govern all future action by the local tribunals as well as appeals yet pending. The important thing is to have the facts properly established and substantiated. If the district appeal court has not acted in accordance with aforesaid decision appeal lies to the supreme tribunal—Mr. Justice Duff, Ottawa, Ont., who handed down the decision referred to above.

We know that local tribunals were governed for a time by a silly rule of thumb about the size of the farm. Any farmer knows that one farm of one hundred and fifty acres might give three men all the work they could do; and another farm of the same size might not be worth the time of one good man even if he got the farm for nothing. Neither farm production nor farm work can be measured by any such rule; it is all the more silly when there are no farmers on the tribunals. We feel quite safe, however, in assuring farmers that the Military Service Act, honestly and intelligently administered as we believe it will be, will not only "strip the farms by taking the last boy," but will exempt every man really engaged in productive work on the land.

The other day in Toronto, at the Fourth Annual Convention of the United Farmers of Ontario, Mr. E. H. Halbert, of Dufferin County, during the course of his presidential address, said:

"Dealing specifically with the call for increased food production, Mr. Halbert said that the farmers were expected to produce in order to avert famine but were given no guarantee against loss. Suppose, he said, manufacturers were told that the Empire depended on munitions, but at the same time were given no guarantee against loss, were given as their only help a lot of lectures and bulletins from officials who knew nothing of their business, how would they take to it? Yet, he said, 'that is the kind of dope that is handed out to farmers today.'"

"The first man called to Ottawa for consultation at the beginning" of the hog propaganda were newspaper men. When the United Farmers protested against being ignored the

12,000 members of this organization were told they were too small to be consulted."

That is plain talk; but it is the bed-rock truth, and production talkers had better get down to bed-rock as soon as possible.

Another delegate, Mr. W. G. Amos of Perth County, said:

"If truth, liberty and righteousness are to be preserved on the earth production of food must be increased. To this end we must have evidence that the powers that will make the best use of that which is produced. Further, was the farmer to be guaranteed against loss on production? He couldn't go on producing on the basis of patriotism alone. At least the manufacturer had not demonstrated how this could be done."

A full three months ago the CATHOLIC RECORD gave this practical advice on the all-important subject of bacon production:

There is only one effective way to ensure increased production in this line—the easiest to attain and the quickest in returns—and that is by fixing a minimum price for pork. The uncertainty as to the duration of the War, the clamor as to the high cost of living, the political activity of the consumer, all combine to make the farmer hesitant and distrustful as to the wisdom of increased production of swine. It is true that even after the War is over the food shortage will not disappear immediately. But the hundreds of thousands of farmers in Canada make up their minds each for himself on such matters. Is it reasonable to try to convince each one of them that the facts are as stated when, if true, the Government would run no risk whatever in fixing a minimum price?

If we do say it ourselves this was the only practical suggestion made in a discussion in which the entire press of Canada took part.

It is too late now to increase the production of bacon until next spring. Unless the measure we advise be adopted there will be no material increase even then.

LOYALTY

Bainrsfather, in one of his inimitable cartoons, represents a British Tory thus reproaching the Kaiser who is lying sick abed: "You certainly did muss up the name William." There is a word, a very sacred word, that has certainly been mussed up recently. It is the word loyalty. We might be performing a real service if we were to remove some of the incrustations that have marred its lustre, while being circulated so freely of late in Toronto and the University of Cobocock.

Bluff old Dr. Johnson declared it to be the last refuge of a scoundrel. But let that pass with what is past. Following the Standard Dictionary we may thus define it: Love and devotion to one's native land or land of adoption, obedience to its laws, a readiness to assist in any movement looking to its welfare, and a willingness to sacrifice even life itself in its defence. Now let us analyze this definition.

Loyalty consists first of all in love for and devotion to one's native land. But what is our native land? Lacordaire answers that question. "Our native land," says he, "is not its government. It is the soil that saw us born, the blood and the home of our forefathers, the love of our parents, the souvenirs of our childhood, our traditions, our laws, our morals, our liberties, our history and our religion." It will be seen from this that loyalty, like charity, imposes upon us a two-fold obligation looking to our duty to God and to our neighbor. No Christian can be truly loyal to his country who is not loyal to his God, for such a one will care nothing about its traditions, its morals or its religion. The first three commandments of the decalogue refer to our duties to God, while the last seven state our obligations to our neighbor. Now because our nearest neighbors are our parents, and because they hold an unique position in our regard, God has given us a special command to love, honor and obey them. In like manner we are bound by special duties to those neighbors that are nearer to us than others, to that circle of individuals, united by common ties and common interests, which we call the State. The citizens of that State are more closely related to us than other peoples; hence we owe them a greater degree of charity as individuals, likewise devotion and obedience to the corporate whole. The exercise of these virtues constitutes civic loyalty.

The loyal citizen will obey the laws of the State, not only those that are agreeable to him, but those also that impose an irksome burden. He will even obey laws that may seem to him unjust, so long as they do not conflict with faith and morals. He

does this from a motive of religion, knowing that he that resisteth authority resisteth the ordinance of God. Charity to his fellow man also prompts his obedience, for he realizes that the law is a safeguard for the individual and that there can be no order in the State if its laws are not obeyed. The loyalty of those who obey only such laws as suit them and show reverence for authority only when they consider it duly constituted, is of a counterfeit variety. When the reputable editors of Quebec announced that the people of that province would obey the Military Service Law, though enacted by what they considered to be a fraudulently elected government, they showed that they knew their theology and its application to civic duties, which, by the way, is more than could be said of many editors in other parts of the country.

Furthermore, loyalty demands that we assist in any movement looking to the good of the State. This does not necessarily mean that we must go with the crowd, vote with the crowd, and cheer with the crowd; for the voice of the crowd is not always the voice of God or of an enlightened conscience. It means that we must form our judgment as to what is in the best interests of the State and act accordingly, even though by so doing we may sacrifice popularity or suffer temporal loss.

The highest test of loyalty is to lay down one's life in defence of one's country. Life—that is the life of other people—is held so cheaply nowadays that many do not realize what a tremendous sacrifice this is, a sacrifice that no man should be called upon to make unless he do so of his own volition or in compliance with the mandate of an authority duly constituted and undoubtedly acting intra vires. The Government has committed this country to conscription. We are not doubting its authority nor are we questioning its wisdom. Conscription may be necessary, but if so it is a necessary evil.

THE GLEANER

NOTES AND COMMENTS

THE QUESTION of an Australian College in Rome which was vigorously discussed in the papers of that continent, some time ago, has been taken up in Rome itself and, as we learn from overseas exchanges, with good prospect of the project being realized at no distant date. It is pointed out that as Canada, the United States, and South America have each a national Seminary in the Eternal City, it is fitting and proper that far-awa Australia should no longer be deprived of that unquestioned advantage.

AMONG THE South American republics of which little is known in this northern hemisphere is Bolivia. The War which has changed many things has changed this also, and Bolivia herself has had much to do with the change. The national movement in the direction of industrial development, which had already set in before 1914, has necessarily been stimulated by the increasing restrictions upon imports which the submarine warfare of Germany has brought about. Hence the minute survey of her own resources and the determination to make herself less dependent upon imported goods by their utilization.

BOLIVIA is rich in tin, zinc, copper, antimony, tungsten and other minerals which enter so largely into present-day industrial activities. The export of tin ore has increased steadily since the War began, but for lack of transportation facilities and modern mining methods has not got beyond the initial stages as yet. The same may be said of zinc and copper. Bolivia possesses immense deposits of these minerals but their producing power up to the present has been limited by the inadequacy of the only railway which crosses the zone. The building of an electric line from La Paz to the Yungas provinces is the first step towards remedying this, and the spirit with which its construction has been pushed, and other lines projected speak eloquently for the new spirit which has taken hold of the Bolivian people.

BOLIVIA is immensely rich in agricultural possibilities also. Sugar cane grows luxuriantly and only capital is required for the establishment of refineries to place her among the richest sugar-producing countries in the world. The costliness of steam machinery, due to the enormous freight charges, is an obstacle, but

with the increasing utilization of the abundant water power available this may be overcome. The Government is making every effort to encourage initiative in this direction and evidently with much success. Bolivia has hitherto been overshadowed by her more powerful neighbors, but now that her possibilities are being manifested to her own people, she may be expected to rise to the full measure of her opportunities.

KEEPING TO the subject of Latin America, it may be instructive to glance again at the island of Cuba. It may be news to most Canadians that in the census of 1907, Cuba had no less than fourteen cities with a population over ten thousand. Of these Havana, with 297,159 overshadowed the others, but Santiago had 45,470; Matanzas, 36,009; and Cienfuegos 30,100. At the present time the estimated population of Havana is 400,000, and several of the other cities have grown in proportion. Santiago, for example, is now 55,000. This is the chief distributing point for the eastern end of the island, and stands second in the amount of goods entering her port, the total imports in 1916 being \$14,117,253. Matanzas is the great sugar exporting city, the total for 1916 being \$45,039,893. Cardenas, Cienfuegos, Camaguey and Pinar del Rio are all flourishing, even to the extent of rivaling many American and Canadian cities in rapidity of growth. It has been well said that Cuba is one of the richest spots on the earth's surface in the matter of fruitfulness. That the Cuban people intend to enter into their full heritage has now been demonstrated.

ON THE BATTLE LINE

PEACE PROPOSALS

The Germans are now seeking to utilize to the greatest advantage the instruments for disruption placed in their hands by unfaithful Russia. Petrograd, instead of Berlin, is used as the date line in the despatches containing the enemy's latest peace proposals to the Entente Allies, and the conditions laid down by Trotsky for cessation of hostilities between Russia and the Central powers are accepted by the latter as the basis for negotiations with their enemies. "No indemnities, no annexations," the slogan of the Hun since his first admission of defeat, is again heralded to London, Paris, Washington and Rome for favorable consideration. There is nothing new in the program as outlined by Count Czernin, the Austro-Hungarian Foreign Minister, at Brest Litovsk, except the astonishing assertion that Germany is the only member of the Quadruple Alliance possessing colonies, and that the native inhabitants of these have remained loyal to the Kaiser through all the unequal struggle with the Mistress of the Seas. It is really a waste of words to say that the position of the Entente Allies as regards war aims and peace terms is unaltered, and despatches from their Capitals contain emphatic reiteration of their unshakable purpose to obtain a lasting peace based upon a beaten and, therefore, repentant Germany.

THE RUSSIAN CIVIL WAR

News comes from Tokio of a clash between Chinese and Bolshevik troops at Harbin, Manchuria, in which the Russians were defeated and forced to surrender, their victors occupying the garrison of Harbin. A London Times cable from Petrograd states that the Bolsheviks and the Ukraine Rada show a desire to end hostilities, and thus prevent further bloodshed. It appears that the Trotsky forces are in great fear of General Kaledin, whose strength in Southern Russia is steadily increasing. Trotsky is busy in Petrograd trying to stir up animosity between the Russian people and the United States. Mr. Francis, the American Ambassador, has issued a general denial of the "incendiary allegations" made against him and his colleagues.

IN ITALY

The Allies on Wednesday triumphed in great aerial battle over the town of Treviso, sixteen miles north of Venice. Nearly half of a fleet of twenty-five Austro-German airplanes was destroyed, and many of their crews were killed or wounded. According to an Associated Press correspondent the big fleet of enemy fliers swept over the camp west of Treviso at 8 o'clock in the morning, flying low, and discharging machine guns. Considerable damage was done to the camp before the British and Italian airmen were able to engage the foe and drive him off. The machines were engaged at close quarters. Eight of the Teuton planes were brought down, six of them falling within the Italian lines. At 11 o'clock the raiders returned, and several more were brought down, two falling inside the Italian lines. The correspondent reports that one of the machines brought down was a Dreadnought. The War Office at Rome reports that along the whole front there were only artillery actions. Another dispatch tells of