

The Catholic Record

"Christianus mihi nomen est Catholicus vero Cognomen."—(Christian is my Name, but Catholic my Surname)—St. Paclan, 4th Century.

VOLUME XXXIV.

LONDON, ONTARIO, SATURDAY, JULY 6, 1912

1759

TO A MOTHER

It was while he was in Indianapolis, in December, 1874, that one of the heaviest sorrows of his life fell upon Joseph O'Connor. He was preparing to return to Rochester in anticipation of a joyous family reunion in the Christmas holidays; and his Indianapolis friends had arranged for a banquet in his honor, when intelligence came of the sudden death of his mother. The close sympathy, companionship and understanding that had existed between them made the loss doubly severe, and gave to him a singularly tender feeling for all that had been hers—her faith and her ideals, her friends and the customs of her household. Years afterward he wrote of her in these tender lines:

HER HANDS

Sometimes I sit and try to trace
In memory's records dim and faint,
The features of my mother's face,
With the calm look of gentle grace
That marked our household's quiet saint.

The innocence of her blue eyes,
The winning smile about her lips,
Child-simple and yet woman-wise,
Her shining hair, her modest guise,
All come in turn; each fades and slips.

I try to fix them, but in vain;
They waver, and yet will not fuse,
How'er imagination strain
To form the face that it would feign—
Till on a sudden, as I muse

There comes a thought of her dear hands,
All wrinkled, tanned and labor-worn—
And there the simple woman stands,
To meet her duty's hard demands,
Among the children she has borne!

No work nor written word remains,
Nor picture worthy to approve;
But read in knotted joints and veins,
And tenuous strong, and honest stains,
The tale of service and of love!

O hands of ministry that wrought
In constant care, through weal and woe,
Nor rest by crib or coffin caught,
This pang is mine—I never thought
To kiss your fingers long ago!

LLOYD GEORGE AGAIN

ANOTHER CHARACTERISTIC SPEECH ON THE "CHURCH ESTABLISHMENT"

"If you carried Disestablishment and Disendowment to morrow, there would not be a service less in this land, there would not be a prayer the less, there would not be a Song of Praise the less. The only thing that would happen would be that in the rural districts the landowners would have to do what tenant farmers of the neighborhood would have to do. They would have to maintain their own religious services."

The above was one of the most striking passages of a rousing speech by the Chancellor of the Exchequer at a great demonstration at Swansea in favor of Disestablishment. Over fifty special trains brought contingents from all parts of the country, numbering between twenty and thirty thousand people. Mr. Lloyd George was given a wildly enthusiastic reception by the Convention held in the Albert Hall, which he acknowledged by declaring, "I have come here with my colleagues in the Government to say that we also mean business. (Cheers.) We mean to fit it through. They were all there, he went on, to demand the right to manage their own spiritual affairs in their native land, without interference from either Canterbury or Westminster. (Cheers.) The State had no right to touch the Art of the Covenant. The connection of the State with religion he considered to be an injury to the spiritual life of the country. They won an election two years ago on the cry, "The will of the people must prevail." In what, he asked, should it prevail more than in what concerned the people most—their spiritual affairs?"

When their opponents talked about the endowments, they asked to whom did they belong, for whose benefit were they given? They all agreed that they were trust funds, and the most extreme Tory did not maintain that the property belonged to a trustee. But for whose benefit was the trust imposed? Was it imposed for the benefit of the parson? "You might as well say," he added, "that the poor rate was imposed for the benefit of the relieving officer. (Laughter and cheers.) You might as well say that the insurance contributions are levied for the benefit of the doctors. (Loud laughter.) Not merely Conservatives, but even some Liberals said: 'You must be generous.' Generous, said the Chancellor, had nothing to do with it. There was no such commandment as 'Thou shalt steal provided thou art generous with the owner.' What difference was there in robbing a parson and robbing a people?"

TIMID POLITICIANS

The people, he contended, were getting too hazy in the application of their principles, and many politicians also were afraid of their principles. There were gigantic problems waiting settlement, and Parliament was afraid. Now he was at home he meant to talk freshly. Let them look at the land question. Up to the present they had dealt with it as if they were handling a hedgehog.

If in this country we were as timid in business as we are in politics, then instead of having the greatest international trade in the world, we should have been nothing to-day but a coal yard for the German Empire. The situation to-day needs courage.

Mr. Lloyd George went on to say that they had been called robbers. (Laughter.) He would reply to them by saying

that the honour of the Nonconformist parson was as precious as that of the proudest baron in the land. (Cheers.) As long as these charges were made against the Welsh people—sacrilege, robbery, theft, and greed—they would press the charges home.

"Vessels consecrated in the sanctuary are still on their sideboards. The most dedicated to the altar stock their larders to-day—there are thousands of them. The richest land in England and Wales, which is consecrated to the service of God and His poor, they have got to-day." (Hear, hear.)

Go to a primrose League meeting, look at the platform—one-third of them are probably people who have got Church land. The very primroses which adorn their buttocks were plucked from land consecrated to the service of the altar, and they have the effrontery to charge us, when we ask that money which belongs to the poor ought to be returned—they have the effrontery to say we are robbing God. These people, the Chancellor proceeded, were raising wider issues than they knew when they challenged the right of the people of Wales to reconsider the application of the trust property of the people. But that was not the only trust in land which had been betrayed in South Wales. They had had three farms where he was paid in rents and taxes, and the men of South Wales jeopardized their lives to pay those exactions, and when they came up into the sunshine again to seek rest and recreation they were met with disease and degradation. The men for whom they worked grudged them every inch of sun-space of breathing ground. That was a trust that would be looked into. (Cheers.)

LANDLORDS' TYRANNY
They claimed a right to it—who gave it them? It was not in the Law, nor in the Prophets. (Laughter.) In the lonely thinly populated districts of Wales they could deprive a man of his livelihood for his opinions. What king could do that? They could exile a man from the home of his fathers. They had done it. From his own home at Criccieth he would see three farms where he remembered their Nonconformist owners being turned adrift because they dared to go for religious equality. There was no monarchy in the world, not even in Russia, could do that.

"I am not afraid of their intimidation in Wales," the Chancellor exclaimed, with emphasis; "but still there is their power. Who gave it to them? They can consign a man, not for weeks, but for a lifetime, to live as they do, in rural districts, as well as in great towns, in miserable dens, the crevices of which are seething with disease and death."

"I will tell you what is the matter with this country. There is one limited monarchy here, and that is the one that is called the State. They hold an absolute, autocratic sway. Who gave it to them—this trust and property? We mean to examine the conditions of it. (Cheers.) It is a fight full of hope for the Democracy." (Cheers.)

"We are asking nothing unreasonable; we are asking nothing we are not fit for. We are not a nation of pirates seeking pillage. (Laughter.)

"We seek but our own. The counties which originated this movement and the counties which have sustained it are the counties which have presented white gloves to Judges. The religious denominations that demand it and support it to-day are the denominations which contribute less to the statistics of crime in this country than any religious denominations in Christendom, not even excepting the Church of England. (Cheers.)

"We are not a nation of Athelsteds encompassing the downfall of Christianity. Nonconformity is covering the land with altars to the Most High." (Cheers.)

"These are the people," the Chancellor concluded, "who for forty years have stood at the bar of the Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland with this humble petition that throughout their native land, from the banks of the Severn to the rugged shores of the Irish Sea, from the misty parts of Arfon to the rich valleys of Glamorgan, they should be freed from the bondage of the State, and that the inheritance of the poor shall be restored unto them." (Loud cheers.)

Victoria Park was the scene of a great public demonstration in the afternoon, and two huge processions marched along to assemble round six platforms, from one of which Mr. Lloyd George again addressed the multitude.

MODERN RELIGIOUS CONDITIONS
Hamilton Spectator
To the Editor: What is the state of the Church? No other question comes up with so much persistence at the annual conventions of the churches than this—What is the state of the Church? It is or ought to be a question of paramount importance, and yet its treatment is not marked by an undue degree of candor, or even strict honesty. Some one, or some committee, is authorized to draw up a report which is immediately afterward buried with due ecclesiastical solemnities, and it never again sees the light of day. The same process is gone through year after year—flamboyant speeches are made, full of religious fervor, which are apparently the usual obsequies of the annual report on the "State of the Church." The spiritual declension *pari passu* proceeds unchecked. The Hon. Mr. Blake as what every thoughtful Christian must see, brought the matter before his own synod, but there isn't the least reason to believe that the synod of the diocese of Toronto did more with any greater degree of alacrity than any of the other conventions that have had the subject before them. The gentleman who seconded the resolution proposed by Mr. Blake said that he had heard a derisive laugh during the course of Mr. Blake's speech, but this was manifestly

a mistake, for as the Rev. Mr. Thompson said, a body of Anglican churchmen "do not do things like that."

But suppose for a moment that the synod of the diocese of Toronto, or any other ruling body, took action—what could it do? Let us say, for example, that a resolution is passed ordering family worship in every church home in the diocese—who is going to obey it as of necessity? Nobody. There is no such thing in existence to-day among Protestant laymen of any denomination as "discipline." We acknowledge no higher authority than our own personal pleasure or whim—very often it is whim. This condition of things is painfully apparent in almost every direction, but its most conspicuous manifestation is seen in the views that obtain in the matter of public worship, and more particularly so among the male members of the churches.

"In the church's field of battle, in the bivouac of life, you will find the average Christian represented by his wife."

Few professing Protestants to-day feel any personal obligation in the matter of worship—if it is convenient they will probably go to church, but if not convenient they will stay at home—they generally stay at home. In a few exceptional cases where the personal equation has an undue prominence, men go to church; not necessarily to worship, but for the pleasure obtained by hearing a favorite preacher or listening to a popular singer, and the singer is, as a rule, a very much greater attraction than the average preacher. Now, what is the net result of this state of religious or so-called religious life? The answer is ready to hand—wide-spread declension from anything and everything like spiritual life among the churches.

But again the prevailing atrophy is marked by some strong and misleading features and perhaps none more extraordinary than the fact that the churches are obsessed by a spirit of humanitarian activity. To cater to the stomach is a greater moment than to save the soul, and we are confronted to-day by large and expensive church organizations whose "year books" furnish the record of their humanitarian activity and their neglect of the eternal background of the incarnation by turning the teaching of the gospel into the mere humanitarian interest of improving the material condition of society.

Let it be further noted that the churches have in too many instances become caterers to amuse the people, and that, too, on the absurd plea that the more you amuse them the greater are the chances of winning them for the life everlasting. In other cases the churches have become competitors with the music halls, and it is quite within the domain of fact to say that Christ has been sold and sung out of many of the churches; in a word, that the whole trend of modern church life is to eliminate all sense of "bearing the cross" and to transform the plain teaching of the gospel into an absolutely new thing, unlike the teaching of Christ as a "high tea" to the fast of Ramadan. When we question the volume of the sacred law on existing conditions we find them mutatis mutandis, paralleled in Jewish history. For example, when we turn to the Book of Isaiah we find ourselves in an epoch of prosperity and religious activity—much so indeed, that not content with the prescribed ritual they made additions in every department and multiplied their prayers to an extraordinary extent, and yet there was an entire absence of all spiritual life among the people.

The necessary limitations of space will not permit of a reference in length to the conditions that justify, and if it were possible to more than justify all that the Hon. Mr. Blake has said, and a great deal more that he has never said.

In the forefront of all must be placed the rapid and alarming disintegration of the family life which we see on every side. No more striking or suggestive example can be quoted than that of Imperial Rome. "The Roman empire," said one, "seemed to have in itself the promise of eternal endurance. Its colossal strength bade defiance to all adverse external forces. But there was an inner weakness revealed, for example in the mordant pages of Juvenal, which grew space. In the atrophy of home life lay the final secret of the decline and fall of the great empire, which had its root in the once strong simplicity in the homes of its citizens." Surely this is a lesson for us. Luxury and pleasure brought Rome's illustrious history to an end, and we may take warning, for these are not the factors that contribute to national or individual greatness. In the early days, when the Canadian "fathers of the hamlet" lived and toiled, the Bible, with the Book of Common Prayer, was read and valued above all things, and stimulated by its teachings, they maintained a strenuous fight against an unfavorable environment; but they were strong in the faith that brings salvation, and they conquered the wilderness, that blossoms to-day like the rose. But what of their descendants, only a few generations removed? By many of them the Bible and Book of Common Prayer are neither valued nor read, but instead of this wholesome and energizing food, their literary pabulum are the "hunks that the swine did eat"—infidel and salacious food from the garbage troughs of Europe and the yellow journals of this continent. Need we feel surprised then, that we are growing on this continent, a race of men and women who fear not God and regard not man; or, that we find boys and girls barely out of tuck and pinafore posing as full fledged disciples of Paine and Voltaire, and that there prevails an all round relaxed sense of honor and morals? Parents have abdicated their God-appointed function of training their children, and as a sort of sop to such remnants of conscience as

they possess, they have turned the responsibility over to the Sunday school, which helps to perpetuate the delusion that the children are getting trained in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. The ignorance of God's word in the modern Sunday school is simply appalling. Surely Mr. Blake was performing a sacred and highly praiseworthy duty in sounding a note of alarm; to be sure, it may be a voice in the wilderness, but it is one that is much needed. The Bishop of Ely said recently that the great need of the church was not the removal of intellectual difficulties, but the advent of a spiritual revival. A spiritual parallel appears to have seized upon the modern pulpit, and without a living message it peters away at matters pertaining to the academy, or in controversies over the dry bones of forgotten theological disputes.

ROBERT KER,
Canon of Christ's Church Cathedral,
Hamilton,
St. Catharines, June 17, 1912.

ACTS OF THE HOLY SEE

S. CONGREGATION OF RITES

CIRCULAR LETTER TO THE MOST REV. ORDINARIES OF PLACES CONCERNING THE DIOCESAN PROPER OF THE OFFICES

Most Illustrious and Reverend Lord and Brother—As our Most Holy Lord Pope Pius X. is greatly solicitous for the reform of the Roman Breviary he carried out perfectly, it will be worth while to examine also the historical lessons proper to each diocese. Hence your Lordship will be doing something very grateful to the Supreme Pontiff by providing diligently that in the diocese with a view to consult together and carefully examining the historical lessons to which I have referred, comparing them with the old codices, where these exist, or with approved tradition. Should they find that these stories have degenerated from the evidence of the codices and of solid tradition to a form other than their original one, let them use every means to restore the true narrative. All efforts are to be carried out deliberately so that there may be no lack of that diligence which should be employed in searching for codices, in comparing their various readings, and in observing the true tradition. In truth there is no need for hurry, for we think that a period of at least thirty years will be necessary to complete happily the reform of the Breviary.

Meanwhile when the work in your diocese has been accomplished your Lordship will kindly take care to have sent to this Congregation of Rites, noting that if any addition or omission or change has been made in the historical lessons a brief and lucid account be given of the reasons which have contributed to this.

In making this known to your Lordship by special command of the Supreme Pontiff I heartily wish long life to your Lordship.

Rome, May 15 1912.
Your Lordship's most devoted Brother,
FR. S. CARD. MARTINELLI, Prefect,
PETERUS LA FONTAINE, Episc. Chryso-
stien, Secretary.

THE MADONNA IN THE KIRK

By the Rev. Henry G. Graham, M. A.

What will stand out as the most notable event, after the Church Union debates, in the meetings of the General Assembly of the Scottish Established Church in Edinburgh is its decision to allow the Madonna and Child to remain surrounding the font in St. Cuthbert's Church. This decision marks an immense even a revolutionary change in the attitude of Presbyterians towards statues and images in churches. Here are life-sized, bronze figures of our Lady and the Divine Infant, making, along with the font, a towering group of 10 feet in height, set up in his kirk by a minister and his kirk-session (i. e., a body of laymen assisting him in working the parish), and now sanctioned by the supreme Church Court in face of an agitation against it—and all this in Calvinistic Scotland. The case, which has caused widespread interest, evidently deserves a little attention from Catholics.

The whole structure is a gift from a loyal member of St. Cuthbert's congregation in memory of his deceased wife. Together they had visited Bruges, where they had seen this group. The lady had indicated her special admiration of it as the emblem of maternity, and when she died her husband thought that there could be no more fitting memorial of her than this particular group. The group was unanimously accepted by the minister and session. This in itself seems to us, as it also did to the Committee of Inquiry, a remarkable thing: that a huge figure of our Lady, an exact copy of that which forms the centerpiece of a veredas in the Church of Notre Dame at Bruges, the work of Michael Angelo, should have been accepted by Presbyterians authorities as a suitable ornament for their church, heedless of the serious controversy it was bound to provoke. Perhaps they did not know what it was at the time. It was represented merely as a symbol of motherhood. It is devoted to be devout of the usual con- ventions associated with the figure of the Blessed Virgin, and the Child is large. Some said that between £1,000 and £2,000 had been already spent on it before the kirk session were consulted, and it would be difficult to decline it after that.

Pastor Jacob Primmer, the Scottish Keskut, however, got his eye upon it, and stirred up an agitation; and after the inferior Courts had refused his petition ordering its removal, he appealed to the General Assembly. This body last year appointed a Committee to inquire a report, and three weeks ago they presented their report, at the same time proposing a deliverance on the case, which eventually became the finding of the House after a full-dress debate. They found (1) that the font was introduced into the church without any idolatrous intent (surely the possibility of adoring font is a quaint idea); (2) the bronze group by which it is surmounted is not, and is not likely to become, an object of idolatrous adoration; and therefore (3) in the whole circumstances it is unnecessary for the Assembly to take any action with reference to this particular matter. But with regard to the general question they added a rider, enjoining that "caution be exercised in the introduction to churches, even for decorative purposes, of sculptural representations of sacred persons or things, which may be deemed to be specially associated with the creature worship or other errors of the Church of Rome." Strange to say, these last words evoked a vigorous protest from several ministers; and in particular from the Rev. Mr. Ireland, of Coatbridge, who spoke so strongly that he was asked if he was pleading in defence of Catholicism. He replied that "while he was not representing the Catholic Church in the house, he was not there to be asked to endorse misrepresentations of that Church. The bulwarks and protections against creature worship and idolatry were far more conspicuous in the Catholic Catechism than in the (Presbyterian) Shorter Catechism; and personally he did not think much of those forefathers of theirs who had given them the current opinions of Catholicism." The Rev. Dr. Gordon Murray and Professor Cowan, both of Aberdeen (their names deserve to be recorded) also protested against the rider, saying that "neither the Pope nor the General Council had definitely asserted that they ought to worship the Virgin, and they should refrain from associating the true doctrine of the Catholic Church with creature worship." The objectionable words were therefore deleted, and the phrase altered to read "specially associated with doctrines not accepted by the Church of Scotland." The desire here shown to avoid misrepresentation of Catholic faith and practice is one of the most pleasing features of the whole affair, and is a sign of growing enlightenment and fairness.

Some very wise and sound things were said by several speakers who supported the committee's deliverance. Dr. McAdam Muir, for example, of Glasgow cathedral, who moved its adoption on the ground that the image was not idolatrous and therefore not illegal, could not see there was anything inherently more sacred in glass than in bronze. "Throughout the country they would find groups like this on stained glass windows, including figures of the Virgin and Child; and if it was not idolatrous to have such representation in glass, how could it be idolatrous and illegal to have the representation in bronze?" Dr. Muir is logical, and obviously he could never be a Holy Orthodox Eastern. "If," he said, "they were a group, what about statues and busts to honored clergymen or honored elders and benefactors of the church?" and he earnestly implored the Assembly not to be guilty of that "superstition of avoiding superstition," of which Lord Bacon had spoken. "It is true that their forefathers would probably have objected to this group being placed in St. Cuthbert's—(applause)—but they would have objected to its being placed anywhere else; and if they wanted to follow their forefathers closely and exactly, they must proclaim a crusade against every such group, not only in their own churches, but in every other churches of the land and in every dwelling-house throughout the land."

On the other side, of course, fierce objection was taken to the group, and no fewer than four motions were submitted demanding its withdrawal on one condition or another. The keener of the iconoclasts was the Rev. Professor Curtis, of Aberdeen. He urged many arguments against it. The image had been introduced in a precipitate manner. Fatherhood had as much title to be represented at a font as motherhood. Many of the congregation were opposed to it (one member had written to the papers saying that nine-tenths of the congregation would be glad to see it removed). The figures were ugly and structurally absurd. "The font appeared as a mere base of the stately. Even as one drew near it was more like a water-trough for horses than a font for baptizing children. It was disproportionate to its purpose. A few drops of water were to be sprinkled from it on the child's face, and it was 10 feet high, and the figure decorating it was life-size, and, with all of that, the figure was there for admiration." Another horrible thing about it—"which touched him by its very roots of his nature"—was that it had a personal portrait in the front. There was a grave danger of stereotyping in the mind of children and simple folks unworthy conceptions of sacred persons, and Michael Angelo was an artist whose conceptions it was very unsafe to copy in their churches. On all grounds, therefore, he pressed for the instant removal of "a Roman Catholic symbol so notorious, associated as it had been for centuries with the gravest doctrinal error and devotional abuse," and calculated to lead to serious division and disastrous controversy in regard to similar ventures elsewhere.

Some contended that to retain the figures would scandalize the weaker brethren, and in particular would spoil the chances of union with the Free Kirk of the Highlands. Others, again, said that this was a matter of national inter-

est, that by legislating for St. Cuthbert's they were legislating for the whole country, and that if they licensed this figure they would make it impossible effectively to discipline any similar figures. The Assembly was profoundly divided on the whole subject, but the upshot was, as we have stated, that the group and font are to be left alone, the final vote being 146, as against 67 and 53 votes cast respectively for two contrary motions.

The significance of this decision cannot well be overrated; it shows what a wonderful change has come over Presbyterian sentiment, and how far they have travelled away from the old, narrow, fastidious ideas of church worship and furnishings. Here are immense figures of Jesus and Mary dominating the whole interior of one of their kirks in Edinburgh, the city of Knox and the citadel of Presbyterianism to the satisfaction, it is said, of almost the entire congregation. A generation ago such a group either would never have been accepted, or, if accepted, would have been straightaway thrown out. The Presbyterians are now permitted by supreme ecclesiastical authority to set up the very image that Knox and the "rascal multitude" tore down and smashed in bits. To anyone acquainted with the history of the Scotch Kirk, it is intense anti-Roman character, its tradition of bald and barren meeting-houses, and its jealousy of even the slightest approach to the introduction of sacred images, the action of the Assembly must appear truly marvellous. It points also to a growing appreciation of the value of aesthetic help in the worship of God, and the appropriateness of external representations of sacred persons and things. Moreover, the moral influence of the example of such a large and influential congregation as St. Cuthbert's will be very great throughout the Kirk; what they can do, others will claim to do. The same remark applies to the authorization of the "altar" in the King's parish church at Crathie. Altogether, a notable triumph has been won by our Lady. She has gained a footing once more in the church dedicated to St. Cuthbert, and an epoch-making advance in the right direction has been registered.—London Tablet.

REPREHENSIBLE WORK
The editor of the Congregationalist (Boston), a Protestant weekly, dealing with the moral influence exerted by the churches, pays this tribute to the work the Catholic Church is doing in moulding the lives of non-English speaking immigrants: "Not long ago a certain hater of Roman Catholicism in a factory town said that if he could have his way he would close the Catholic Church, whose hundreds of Poles and Slovaks worshipped in his factory. 'Then you would have hell in six months.' We have here a very striking testimony as to the nature of the beneficent work done by the Catholic Church among recently arrived non-English speaking Catholics who are rapidly becoming a very important element in our large cities and factory towns. Cardinal Farley has been quoted as saying that he has under his spiritual jurisdiction Catholics speaking twenty-three different languages. New York, so far as languages are concerned, has become a veritable Babel. Among the Catholics of the various nationalities within the archdiocese of New York there is a spiritual bond of union which they all recognize."

The same is true of every Catholic diocese within the United States in which newly arrived Catholic immigrants have made their homes. From the moment they set foot on American soil they find here something they had known in their native land. The arms of their spiritual mother are as lovingly stretched out to embrace them in the New World as ever they were in the old. Under the roof of a Catholic church they feel themselves perfectly at home. Everything else may have a strange aspect for them, but the altar and the priest offering the holy sacrifice of the Mass are familiar sights—touching reminders of the past.

The bigot of whom the editor of the Congregationalist speaks would deprive the newly arrived immigrants of the consolation they derive from these reminders and would not have their hard lives of labor softened by a single gleam of spiritual cheer. He would in other words, have those Poles and Slovaks reduced to mere beasts of burden whose chief end in life would be the seeking of the means of keeping body and soul together. That would be the most efficient way of recruiting the ranks of Socialism and Anarchy. "You would have hell in six months" was the graphic manner in which was described what would follow from depriving the non-English speaking Catholics of that New England factory town of the spiritual benefits they derive from Catholic services. This may be an exaggerated statement, but it has a nucleus of truth which it would be well not to lose sight of.

Sever the ties that bind our non-English speaking Catholic immigrants to the Catholic Church, and you send them adrift on the ocean of life rudderless and compassless. It would be well for those who would be proselytizers in the ranks of the Protestant sects, who are pouring out money like water to bestow some thought upon the consequences of undermining the loyalty of newly arrived immigrants to the Church that is their spiritual guide. These would-be proselytizers are engaged in a work which they hope will strengthen Protestantism. That is not what they are doing. They are making attempts to diminish the moral influence of the Catholic Church which, in the coming years, will be sorely needed to check the progress of destructive forces that, if not curbed, would involve our political and social institutions in one common ruin.—N. Y. Freeman's Journal.

CATHOLIC NOTES

Dr. Max Pam, a well-known Jewish-American Lawyer of Chicago, has founded five scholarships in the Catholic University at Washington, for the study of the Social Sciences.

At the request of Archbishop Christi, of Portland, Ore., the Paulists will shortly make a foundation in that city, where they will look after the needs of the Italians.

Father Prendergast, S. J., of Jamaica, last year received into the Church 522 converts and baptized 2,626 babies. The Catholics of Jamaica number 20,000, in a Protestant population of 837,000.—Catholic Missions.

The new Master of the Rolls in Ireland is the Right, Hon. Charles Andrew O'Connor, who is the thirty-fifth to hold that office since the Union. Mr. O'Connor is fifty-six, a native of Dublin, and an ex-Senior Moderator of Trinity.

In accordance with a time-honored custom among the Catholic journalists of Belgium, this month has seen the annual delegation of the Belgian knights of the pen visiting Rome to greet the head of the Church and tender him the proceeds of the collections made by the papers they represent.

A bronze tablet was unveiled at the custom house, New York, on the afternoon of Decoration day to mark the spot where, so far as historic documents prove, Mass was first said in New York City. The tablet was affixed to the western wall of the main entrance of the custom house.

On June 4 the Paulist choir of St. Mary's Church, Chicago, singing in the Consistorial Hall in the Vatican. The Holy Father was on his throne and was so carried away by the quality of the American voices that he called the maestros of the Roman choirs and said to them: "Here is the standard of singing. These Americans sing like angels."

After many years of shameful neglect by Catholics, the late Dr. Brownson is soon to be commemorated by memorials at Stockbridge, Vermont, where he was born, and at Elizabeth, N. J., where he lived for some time. But if Catholics were to buy and read his works, they would be paying to his memory a still greater honor.

The Hon. Mary Petre, whose claim to the ancient Barony of Furnival, dating from 1295, which has been in abeyance since 1702, has been favorably reported by the English House of Lords, and King George will call out of abeyance the nearly seven hundred year old Barony, and she will rank in her own right as Baroness Furnival. She is a Catholic.

The Poles may have their faults, but they have magnificent faith. When in 1905, Russia finally granted certain reforms to Poland, one province wholly inhabited by Polish Catholics had not a priest or a Bishop for sixty years, and when, at last, a Bishop did make his visitation, men of ninety years of age received the sacrament of confirmation.

The Vicariate Apostolic of Brownsville in the United States is raised to the status of a diocese with the title of Corpus Christi; by the other a new diocese, Kearney, has been formed from part of the territory of the diocese of Omaha. Shortly we may expect to read that the two new ecclesiastical provinces have been formed in the United States.

Rev. W. Scott Hill, late curate of St. Matthew's Anglican Church, Burnley, England, was received into the Catholic Church recently by the Very Rev. Dr. Poock, the rector of St. Bede's College, Manchester, and was confirmed by the Bishop of Salford, Right Rev. Dr. Casartelli. His bishop, passing college, Mr. Scott Hill will shortly proceed to Oscott College, Birmingham.

Since the Countess of Roslyn, who was, before her marriage to the actor, Miss Robinson of New York—embraced the Catholic faith, she has been spending much of her spare time in Ireland. She has rented a mansion at Clontarf, in the suburbs of Dublin, a neighborhood with which she has a gratifying her passion for fishing. She is a neighbor of Lady Decies. Her mother-in-law, the Dowager Countess, is also a convert.

The German emperor, who is now at Corfu, the other day witnessed a Catholic procession there. The emperor and his daughter were standing on the balcony of their villa. Kaiser Wilhelm bare-headed, when the bishop, passing at the end of the display, passed to lift his hand in the sign of the cross blessing the emperor and his daughter, while his majesty bowed his head with appreciation.

The colored population has increased so rapidly in that section of Harlem, New York city, in which is located the Church of St. Mark the Evangelist, that its religious needs have been called to the attention of Mother Katharine Drexel of the Sisters of the Blessed Sacrament, who, after consultation with Rev. William Stewart, rector of St. Mark's, has decided with the consent of Cardinal Farley, to open a school in the vicinity in September.

At Dalziel, Scotland, a Miss Marshall, a school teacher, became a convert to the true faith. Almost immediately the Public School Board deprived her of her position and a means of support. Commenting on the board's action, the Scotsman says: "The whole circumstances of the case are discreditable to the School Board concerned, while they throw upon Protestantism a stigma of intolerance and narrow-mindedness which Protestants will sincerely regret. If the incident had occurred in a Roman Catholic country, with the role of the religions reversed, one can fancy the outcry that the Protestant part of the population would make. We should be told once more of the bigotry and persecution of the Roman Catholic Church. The country would ring with denunciation."

THE LANCASTER BILL

FULL TEXT OF THE OPINION OF MR. JUSTICE ANGLIN OF THE SUPREME COURT

We are pleased to be enabled to give in this week's issue, a portion, and will continue next week, the opinion handed down by that learned jurist, Mr. Justice Anglin, one of the Supreme Court Judges, regarding the Lancaster Bill and certain questions concerning marriage.

I have already stated my concurrence in the reasons assigned by Mr. Justice Davies for answering the first question submitted in the negative. I am, however, unable to agree in his reasons and conclusions in regard to question No. 2 and must therefore express my own view upon it.

Since the majority of the Judges of this Court are of the opinion that the Dominion Parliament does not possess jurisdiction to legislate in respect of the subject matter of Question No. 2, it is difficult to perceive how an answer to it can be useful either to Parliament or to the Governor General in Council. It concerns the interpretation of a common law which is a matter within the exclusive jurisdiction of the provincial legislatures. I find it almost impossible to believe that it was expected that in the event of this Court answering questions Nos. 1 and 3 in the negative it should proceed to answer this second question which would thus have become purely academic.

I think we might well have acted upon the suggestion presented by the Deputy of the Minister of Justice, when, towards the close of the argument, he said: "If your Lordships conclude therefore that there is jurisdiction, I submit that on no consideration which has been or could be suggested should your Lordships, fall to advise upon every point that has been placed before you. On the other hand, if it be determined that there is no jurisdiction to enact the Bill a different situation is before your Lordships."

"It appears on the reading of this submission that there is in effect one issue, and that it is divided into clauses having regard to what might follow from the different views which the Court might entertain, it is quite open and proper for the Court no doubt to submit that in view of the opinions which are handed in upon certain parts of the argument, it is unnecessary to say, in the view of the court, to answer the rest. And if the Government upon that submission, entertain a different view, I presume the Government would communicate that to the Court for further consideration."

"The Court, in its superior knowledge of the constitution and the working of the law, may upon the consideration of these questions see reasons instead of answering categorically to submit points for the consideration of the Government with regard to the matter. That is the situation here. I submit that the matter is in your Lordships' hands here as one interrogation arising out of the public legislation and the introduction of this Bill."

"Mr. Justice Duff: If the substance of No. 1 and No. 3 is answered in the negative—assuming that the substantial question which is to be found in these two questions is answered in the negative?"

"Mr. Nowcome: If that be the purpose of your Lordship's question I concur immediately that it is a case in which it would be proper for your Lordships if you so consider to submit an inquiry to the Government or to submit any suggestion which your Lordships within the limitation of the Lord Chancellor's judgment may deem proper."

Moreover, Counsel representing the Province of Quebec have stated to us the view of the Government of that Province (the legislation of which can alone be affected) that, while in the event of the reply to either of the 3rd questions being in whole or in part in the affirmative, this second question might properly be answered, a reply should not be given to it if the other questions should be answered wholly in the negative.

They insisted that an expression of opinion by this court upon the law of Quebec, whatever answer should be given to the second question, especially if it should not be unanimous, and if the Privy Council should as seems not improbable, decline to deal with this part of the reference, must have a disturbing effect, inasmuch as it would cast doubt upon the status of many married persons in that province and upon the rights of a still larger number of persons in regard to property. They have also called our attention to the fact that there is at present pending in the Superior Court at Montreal in Review a case *inter partes* in which the very point covered by clause (a) of the second question is presented for judicial determination. They further stated that no case has ever come before the courts of the Province of Quebec in which the validity of such marriages as are dealt with by clause (b) of the second question has been challenged.

In delivering the judgment of the Privy Council in the recent case of the Attorney General for the Province of Ontario, et al., v. the Attorney General for the Dominion of Canada, known as the Companies' Reference, the Lord Chancellor after alluding to the refusal by Lord Herschell when delivering the opinion of the Judicial Committee in the Fisheries Case (1898, A. C. 700-717) that no case has ever come before the courts of the Province of Quebec in which the validity of such marriages as are dealt with by clause (b) of the second question has been challenged. In delivering the judgment of the Privy Council in the recent case of the Attorney General for the Province of Ontario, et al., v. the Attorney General for the Dominion of Canada, known as the Companies' Reference, the Lord Chancellor after alluding to the refusal by Lord Herschell when delivering the opinion of the Judicial Committee in the Fisheries Case (1898, A. C. 700-717) that no case has ever come before the courts of the Province of Quebec in which the validity of such marriages as are dealt with by clause (b) of the second question has been challenged.

ently proper that before proceeding to deal with the second question we should respectfully represent to the Governor General in Council the undesirability in our opinion of our answering it since the view of the majority of the judges of this court is that the Parliament of Canada is entirely without jurisdiction to legislate in the direction suggested; and that we should proceed to reply to that question only upon being officially informed that it is the wish and the intention of the Governor General in Council that it should be answered notwithstanding the negative reply made to the other questions propounded.

But a majority of my learned brothers have reached the conclusion that we should answer the second question without making any such representation. In deference to their views I proceed to express my opinion upon it.

Being charged to define and declare the Civil Law of the Province of Quebec upon this question, to the best of my ability, it is, in my opinion, our duty as judicial officers of a Canadian Civil Tribunal to consider and to give effect to the ecclesiastical law, whether of the Catholic or of any other church, so far, but so far only, as it is found to be incorporated in the Common (Civil) Law or as the legislature has seen fit to recognize and adopt it and to give civil efficacy to it. We are in no wise concerned with the propriety or the impropriety, the desirability, or the undesirability, of whatever course the legislature has in this regard seen fit to pursue in the exercise of its discretion, which, within the ambit of the jurisdiction committed to it by the Imperial Parliament is, for all judges of civil courts in this country, supreme.

I desire to call attention to the fact that we have no evidence before us of the law of the Catholic Church bearing upon the questions submitted, other than what is furnished by the documents which have been admitted, and are printed in the Joint Appendix. Except in so far as it is admitted, that law would require to be proved as any other matter of fact. I necessarily proceed upon the assumption that the admitted documents state it as fully as is necessary for the disposition of the questions submitted.

The Civil Code of Lower Canada became law in 1866—the year preceding Confederation. The Legislature which enacted it had complete jurisdiction over the subject of marriage in the then Province of Canada. The Fifth Title of the Civil Code deals with marriage. The first chapter of that Title treats of "Of the qualities and conditions necessary for contracting marriage (Des qualités et conditions requises pour pouvoir contracter mariage); the second 'Of the formalities relating to the Solemnization of Marriage'; the third 'Of Opposition to Marriage'; the fourth 'Of actions for annulling marriages'."

In the first chapter are grouped a number of articles enumerating various impediments which render persons incapable of validly contracting marriage and stating several conditions precedent to the non-observance of which, when applicable, invalidates marriage (vide Arts. 148-155 C.C.).

The last article of the first chapter, No. 127, reads as follows: "127. The other impediments recognized according to the different religious persuasions, as resulting from relationship or affinity or from other causes, remain subject to the rules hitherto followed in the different churches and religious communities."

"The right likewise of granting dispensations from such impediments, appertains, as heretofore, to those who have hitherto enjoyed it."

Inasmuch as the relationship and affinity which are referred to in Art. 127 are not restricted to impediments *ejusdem generis* with consanguinity and affinity. That would be to deny any effect to the words "other causes."

The other causes are therefore necessarily impediments of another kind, and according to the different religious persuasions—presumably of the parties. Confining the enquiry to the particular subject matter before us, our attention has been directed to a decree of the Council of Trent which, subject to a modification to be presently noted, admittedly was in force in, and is recognized as binding by, the Catholic Church in Lower Canada in 1866. That decree contains the following paragraph: "Qui alter quam praesente parochi, vel alio sacerdote de ipsius parochi sine ordinari licentia, et duobus vel tribus testibus matrimonium contraxerit, nullo modo irritus et inane, sed in matrimonium prout est praesentibus irritus facit et annullat."

In the translation furnished to us in the Joint Appendix this passage is thus rendered: "With regard to those who marry otherwise than in the presence of the parish priest, or of the priest who has his permission or that of the Ordinary, and in the presence of two or three witnesses; the Holy Council renders such persons wholly incapable of contracting marriage in that way, and declares the marriages thus contracted null and void as, by the present decree, it dissolves and annuls them."

Upon that assumption it is argued that this cannot be one of the "other impediments" referred to in an article which is found in a chapter devoted to impediments and conditions that affect the capacity of the parties to the marriage; that the "other impediments" covered by article 127 must, under the rule *analogia iuris*, be of that character. While this contention would have much force if the assumption on which it is based were unimpeachable, it will be observed that the Tridentine Decree purports not merely to prescribe "the presence of the parish priest or of the priest who has his permission or that of the Ordinary" as a condition of the validity of the marriage, but that it purports to affect directly the capacity of the parties themselves by declaring them to be "omnino inhabiles"—wholly incapable of thus contracting marriage in the manner prescribed by article 127 C. C. deals with "impediments recognized according to the different religious persuasions"—"empêchements admis d'après les différentes croyances religieuses." In order to give full effect to these words, it seems to me incontrovertible that we must recognize as a condition of the validity of the marriage defined by a religious body as possessing the character which that body declares it to have and as producing the effects which that body ascribes to it.

When it is declared by the Catholic Church that Catholics are incapable of contracting marriage except in the presence of the parish priest or of the priest who has his permission or that of the Ordinary, the expressed intention of the Church is to attach a personal incapacity to the parties. If the impediment thus created is to be accepted as it is "recognized by the religious persuasion" and as "subject to the rules of the church," it follows that it is properly included under Art. 127 C. C. as an impediment which affects the capacity of Catholics to contract marriage.

By the Benedictine Declaration, originally published in 1741, for "those places subject to the sway of the Allied Powers in Belgium" and the town of Maastricht, and subsequently extended to the Church of Canada and Quebec, as appears by the replies given by the Holy Council of the Propaganda under Clement XIII, in the year 1764, to the Vicars of the Diocese of Quebec, and published in 1835 by Mgr. Ballaragon, Administrator of that Diocese, it is provided that:—

"In regard to those marriages which . . . are contracted without the form established by the Council of Trent, by Catholics with heretics, whereas a Catholic man marry a heretic woman or a Catholic woman marry a heretic man, if perchance a marriage of this kind be actually contracted there where in the Tridentine form has not been observed, or in the future (which may God avert) should happen to be contracted, His Holiness declares that such a marriage is to be deemed valid and lawful, under pretext of the said form not having been observed, enter upon a new marriage while the other person is still alive."

Marriage between a Catholic and a non-Catholic was, therefore, exempted by the Benedictine Declaration from the operation of the Decree of the Council of Trent and the impediment which would otherwise have affected at least the Catholic party to such a marriage was thus removed.

Such, according to the documents submitted to us, was the law of the Catholic Church in the Province of Quebec when the Civil Code of Lower Canada was enacted. It was conceded at bar by Counsel instructed by the Dominion Government to support an affirmative answer to the second question that the presence of the word "hitherto" in Article 127 precludes the inclusion within it of impediments created by decrees of any religious body and that, in the absence of other recognition by the legislature, the recent Papal Decree known as *Ne Temere* does not affect the civil validity of marriages contracted in that province. Although its meaning would perhaps have been clearer had the word "hitherto" preceded the word "recognized" I think that Article 127 fairly read may be given the construction which Mr. Mignault put upon it and which he stated has been universally taken to be correct.

By Art. 156 C. C. it is provided that "156. Every marriage which has not been contracted openly, nor solemnized before a competent officer, may be contested by the parties themselves and by all those who have an existing and actual interest, saving the right of the court to decide according to the circumstances."

Having regard to the terms of the Act providing for the codification of the Laws of Lower Canada, which directs the Commissioners in every case to express the existing law and where they should think proper to suggest an amendment, to indicate the same as a suggestion, and to the report of the codifiers which, upon a question as to the purpose of such a provision as that contained in Art. 156, must, in view of their instructions, be entitled to very great weight, Symes v. Cuvillier, L. R. 5 A. C. 138, 158, there can be no doubt that this article was intended to express the existing law as to the consequence of clandestinity in the solemnization of marriage. As a guide to its interpretation, we are referred by the codifiers to Pothier on Marriage, Nos. 361, 363 and 451. The authority of Pothier as an exponent of the Civil Law of France, which prevailed in Lower Canada prior to 1866, as I shall presently have occasion to show, is so conclusive that other reference seems unnecessary.

In No. 361, Pothier declares that the penalty of parties who have had their marriage celebrated by an incompetent priest is the nullity of their marriage. In No. 363, he adds that the nullity of marriages celebrated by an incompetent priest is not merely relative but is absolute and can be cured only by a new celebration of marriage by the curé of the parties or with his permission or that of the bishop. He refers to certain cases, in which after public and long continued cohabitation, the courts have re-

fused to hear parties who sought to have their marriage avoided on the pretext that they had been celebrated by an incompetent priest. The explanation of the judgments in these cases is not, he adds, that the priest who had celebrated an incompetent priest can ever be valid, or that the vic who attaches to it can be purged by any lapse of time, but that having regard to the circumstances of the cases the applicants were unworthy of being heard and that it should be presumed that the law had been observed and that the priest who had celebrated the marriage had received the permission of the curé. He further says in No. 363 that:—

"The celebration of marriage in the face of the church by the proper curé is not a matter of pure form; it is an obligation which our laws impose on parties who wish to contract marriage, from which the parties subject to it cannot withdraw themselves."

The intention having been to reproduce the existing law, we find in this text of Pothier the explanation of the purpose and extent of the discretion which the concluding words of Art. 156 reserved to the Courts. No doubt it was the intention of the law to reserve to the Courts the power to declare the marriage null and void if it was not solemnized before a competent officer, which is declared in the same terms and may be asserted by the same class of persons as is provided in the case of the nullity of incestuous marriages. (Vide Art. 152).

It is as a matter of course to be noted that the marriage of Catholics otherwise than in accordance with its requirements created by the Tridentine Decree should, because the Decree so defines its operation as to affect the capacity of Catholics to contract marriage for the purpose of its inclusion within Art. 127 C. C., it nevertheless has to do directly with the solemnization of marriage, and the right to impose or to remove it as a condition of the civil validity of marriage rests exclusively with the provincial legislatures for the reasons stated by Mr. Justice Davies in dealing with the first question.

A careful analysis of other provisions of the Civil Code in the light of the history of the Civil Law of Lower Canada leads to the same conclusion independently of any recognition or adoption of the law of the Catholic Church in regard to marriage. This aspect of the question is fully considered by Mr. Justice Jette in Laramee v. Evans, 25 L. C. Jurist, 261, and by Mr. Justice Lemieux in the case of the Curé of Riverview, in Durocher v. Degre, Q. B., 20 S. C. 456, 471. I shall not do more than outline my views upon it.

By Art. 40 of the Ordinance of Blois (1579) provision was made for the publication of banns, the public celebration of marriage and the registration of the same—the whole subject to the penalties decreed by the Church Councils.

By Art. 12 of the Edict of Henry IV. (1606) it was ordained that marriages not entered into and celebrated in the Church and with the form and solemnity required by the canon laws, should be declared void by the ecclesiastical judges.

By the declaration of Louis XIII. (1639) which directed that the Ordinance of Blois should be strictly observed and interpreted if it was ordained that proclamation of banns should be made by the curé of each parish and that at the celebration of the marriage four trustworthy witnesses should assist, besides the curé, who shall receive the consent of the parties and shall join them in marriage according to the form practised in the Church. All priests were expressly forbidden to celebrate any marriage except between their true and ordinary parishioners without the written permission of the curé of the parties or of the diocesan bishop; and it was further ordained that a good and faithful register should be kept of the marriages as well as of the publication of banns, or of dispensations and permissions which should have been granted. Pothier in his Treatise on Marriage says:—

"It is necessary for the validity of a marriage not only that it shall be celebrated in the face of the Church but also that the priest who has celebrated it shall be competent (No. 354). The priest competent is the curé of the party. The curé of the parties is the curé of the place where they have their ordinary residence No. (355). Every other priest who has not the permission either of the bishop or of the curé of the parties is incompetent to celebrate it. This is what results from the declaration of 1639 which, after having ordained that the curé must receive the consent of the parties adds: 'All priests are forbidden to marry other persons than their true parishioners without the written permission of the curé of the parties or of the bishop. (No. 360). The presence of the curé is required for the validity of marriages, not merely as a passive presence. It is an act and a ministrations of the curé, who must receive the consent of the parties and give the nuptial benediction. That results from the terms of the Declaration of 1639 where it is said that the curé will receive the consent of the parties and shall join them in marriage following the form practised in the Church. (No. 350)."

See the opinion of Mr. Justice Willes advising the House of Lords in *Beamish v. Beamish*, 2 House of Lords O. pp. 317-324. Enacted before the establishment of the Superior Council in Canada in 1663, the Ordinance of Blois, the edict of Henry IV, and the declaration of Louis XIII, were each *proprio vigore* in force in Quebec prior to and at the time of the Conquest.

By subsequent ordinances of the French Kings, notably that of April, 1667, and of April 1736, further provi-

sion was made for the keeping of registers in all parish churches and for their form and the entries to be made therein.

While there has been some controversy as to the effect of the Articles of Capitulation of the Cities of Quebec and Montreal and of the Treaty of Paris (1763) upon the foregoing laws, the great weight of authority supports the view that they remained in force after the Cession of Canada to Great Britain. See *Stuart v. Bowman* (1831) 2 L. C. Rep. 369; *Wilcox v. Wilcox* (1857) S. L. C. Jur., 1, 7, 27.

The Anglican Church was not introduced into Canada as an established church. The exclusive authority of Catholic parish priests to celebrate marriage would, however, be held not to extend to the new Protestant inhabitants of Canada and the right of clergymen of the Anglican church to solemnize marriage between them would be deemed to have been introduced without express legislation as a result of the acquisition of the country by Great Britain. In my opinion, the Anglican clergy after the Conquest also shared with the Catholic priests the right under the civil law to solemnize the marriages of Protestants with Catholics, although the validity of such marriages if not solemnized before the Catholic Curé, under the law of the Catholic Church dates only from the necessary result of the situation as recognized by their Lordships of the Privy Council in *Brown v. The Curé, etc.*, of Montreal (The *Guibord Case*) L. R. 6 P. C. 157, at pp. 206-7 and of the doctrine enunciated in *Long v. The Bishop of Cape Town*, 1 Moore, P. C. (N. S.) 411, at p. 401; one where there is no church established by law in the same situation with any other religious body—in no better, but in no worse, position."

While British settlers in British Colonies and in conquered and ceded territory are themselves entitled to the benefit of their own marriage laws, and are unaffected in this respect by the laws of the country (*Lautour v. Teesdale* 8 Taunt., 830), the latter, nevertheless, as part of the private law (*Salmond on Jurisprudence*, c. 484; *Holland on Jurisprudence*, p. 168, govern the persons subject to the law of the country, in the absence of the new Sovereignty. Halleck on International Law, (4th. ed.) Vol. 2, p. 516; *Blackstone* (Lewis v. 1902) Vol. 1, pp. 107-8.

The Royal Proclamation of 1763 and the instructions given to the Governors between 1763 and 1774 are invoked in support of the contention that during this period the English Common Law was in force in Canada. I am unable to accept this view. (See Chief Justice Hey's Report I. L. C. Jurist, Appendix.) But whether it be or be not well founded, by the Quebec Act, passed by the Imperial Parliament in 1774, it is expressly enacted (S. 4) that the:— "Proclamation of the 7th October, 1763 so far as the same relates to the said Province of Quebec, and the Commission under the authority whereof the Government of the said province is at present administered and all and every the Ordinance and Ordinances made by the Governor-in-Council of Quebec for the time being relative to the civil government and the administration of justice in the said province—be and the same are hereby revoked, annulled and made void from and after the first day of May, 1775."

Secs. 5 and 6 of the Quebec Act are as follows:— "5. And for the more perfect security and ease of the minds of the inhabitants of the said Province, it is hereby declared that His Majesty's subjects professing the religion of the Church of Rome, and in the said Province of Quebec, may have and hold the free exercise of the religion of the Church of Rome, subject to the King's supremacy, declared and established by an Act made in the first year of the reign of Queen Elizabeth over all the dominions and countries which then did, or thereafter should belong to the Imperial Crown of this Realm; and that the Clergy of the said Church may lawfully receive and enjoy their accustomed dues and rights with respect to such persons only as shall profess the said religion."

"6. And be it further enacted by His Majesty's Canadian subjects within the Province of Quebec, the religious orders and communities only, excepted, shall hold and enjoy their property and possessions, together with all customs and usages relative thereto, and all others their civil rights, in as large, ample, and beneficial manner as if the said Proclamation, Commissions, Ordinances and other Acts and Instructions were not made, and as may consist with their allegiance to His Majesty, and subjection to the Crown and Parliament of Great Britain, and that in all matters of controversy relative to property and civil rights, resort shall be had to the laws of Canada as the rule for the decision of the same; and all causes that shall hereafter be or be to be appointed within and for the said Province by His Majesty, his heirs and successors, shall with respect to such property and rights be determined agreeably to the said laws and customs of Canada until they shall be varied or altered by any Ordinance that shall from time to time be passed in the said Province by the Governor, Lieutenant-Governor or Commander-in-Chief for the time being, and with the advice and consent of the Legislative Council of the same, to be appointed in manner hereinafter mentioned."

No new provisions had been made for the keeping of the registers of baptisms, deaths and marriages in Canada between the date of the cession and the year 1795, when the Statute 35 George III, c. 4 (L. C.) was passed. In sec. 1 it enacts:— "That from and after the first day of January, which will be in the year subsequent to the passing of this Act, in each parish church of the Roman Catholic communion, and also in each of the Protestant churches or congregations within this Province, there shall be kept by the rector, curate, vicar, or other priest or minister doing the parochial or clerical duty thereof, two registers of the same tenor, each of which shall be reputed authentic, and shall be equally considered as legal

evidence in all courts of justice, in each of which the said rector, curate, vicar or other priest or minister, doing the parochial or clerical duty of such parish or such Protestant church or congregation, shall be held to enrol regularly and successively all baptisms, marriages and burials so soon as the same shall have been thus performed."

Sec. 10 declares that certain registers of the Protestant congregation of Christ Church, Montreal, shall "have the same force and effect to all intents and purposes as if the same had been kept according to the rules and forms prescribed by the law of the province."

Sec. 11 contains a similar provision in regard to other defective registers; and s. 15 of the same statute is as follows:— "15. And be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid, that so much of the twentieth article of an Ordinance passed by His most Christian Majesty in the month of April, in the year one thousand and six hundred and sixty-seven, and a declaration of His most Christian Majesty of the ninth of April, one thousand seven hundred and thirty-six, which relates to the form and manner in which the registers of baptisms, marriages and burials are to be numbered, authenticated and the penalties thereby imposed on persons refusing or neglecting to conform to the provisions of said Ordinance and declaration, are hereby repealed so far as relates to the said registers only."

In view of these statutory provisions it would seem that the Quebec Act of 1774 as it existed at the time of the Conquest had continued in force in regard to the keeping of marriage registers. Chief Justice Sewell, in *ex parte Spratt*, Stuart's Reports, p. 90, decided in 1816, says:— "The British Statute, 14 Geo. III, c. 83, commonly called the Quebec Act, declared the law of Canada, as it stood at the Conquest, to be the rule of decision in all matters of controversy and civil rights."

He adds at p. 96 that:— "The right of keeping a register of baptisms, marriages and sepultures, with the power of entering the entries made in authentic registers or records, which by the twentieth article of the Edict of 1667 was at the Conquest vested in the then Parish Priests of Canada was, by law, considered to be so vested in them not by reason of their spiritual or ecclesiastical character but because they were by law the acknowledged public officers of the temporal government. Under the Ordinance of 1667, which was the law antecedent to the Statute 35 George III, Chap. 4, the keeping of registers was entrusted to the curés of the Catholic Church and to their successors in office and to such public officers as were appointed with only and the authority as priests in Holy Orders recognized to be such by law and as public officers in their respective stations."

It extends the power of keeping registers to Protestant ministers, but still requires that all persons keeping registers whether Catholics or Protestants shall be priests in Holy Orders recognized to be such by law and to be competent officers in their respective stations. . . . In conformity to this general declaration and to the Ordinance of 1667, the sixth section of the Statute especially enacts "that every marriage shall be signed in both registers by the clergyman celebrating the marriage who must necessarily be a priest in Holy Orders recognized to be such by law, since by the law of Canada a marriage can only be celebrated by such a character."

The learned Chief Justice, of whom Mr. Justice Lemieux rightly observed that he "has left a great name in the jurisprudence contemporaneous with the events which followed the Quebec Act," clearly considered that the registers of Catholic priests and clergymen of the Church of England were recognized by law as equally entitled to solemnize, and to keep registers of marriage, the former for Catholics and the latter for Protestants, and that the Quebec Act was declaratory of this right, which was then recognized by the Provincial Act of 1795.

When we find that down to 1866, when the Civil Code was enacted, there is no trace of any other civil authority for the solemnization of marriage by Catholic priests and that their right to solemnize marriage and to keep registers of civil status prior to that time has never been questioned, and when we find that right recognized in the Civil Code as something unquestionably existing, the conclusion seems to be inevitable that, as a result of the reservation in the articles of capitulation of their rights and privileges, and the exercise of their rights by the inhabitants of Quebec and Montreal, the assurance in s. 5 of the Quebec Act to the clergy of the Catholic Church that they should "hold receive and enjoy their accustomed dues and rights with respect to such persons only as shall profess the said (Catholic) religion," the provision by which His Majesty's Canadian subjects within the Province of Quebec should "hold and enjoy all their civil rights," and the continuation of "the laws of Canada as the rule for the decision of all matters of controversy relative to property and civil rights"—the respective rights of the Catholic clergy and lay citizens as they existed at the time of the Cession in regard to Marriage were preserved.

The French law, so far as it could be applied, governed the keeping of registers by the Anglican clergymen, as the Act of 1795 establishes.

The Criminal Law of England was by the Quebec Act expressly declared to be the law of the Province. Commercial and Maritime laws of England were subsequently specially introduced. But in all matters of "civil rights" the law of Canada as it stood at the Conquest was declared to be and remained "the rule of decision." Whether marriage in Quebec should be regarded in the civil courts as a civil contract, or as would seem to be the better opinion, should be deemed a religious contract producing civil effects, it is for all civil purposes governed by the civil law, and, in view

of the foregoing provisions, there can be no reasonable doubt that the law in Lower Canada has been since the Conquest, as is declared by Chief Justice Sewell, the Civil Law which was in force at the time of the Conquest. In *Citizens Insurance Co. v. Parsons*, 7 A. C., 96, Sir Montague Smith in delivering the judgment of the Privy Council, at pp. 110-11 says:—

"The law which governs civil rights in Quebec is in the main the French law as it existed at the time of the Cession of Canada and not the English law which prevails in the other provinces. . . . It is to be observed that the same words civil rights are employed in the Act of 14 George III, c. 83, which made provision for the Government of the Province of Quebec. Sect. 8 of that Act enacted that His Majesty's Canadian subjects within the province of Quebec should enjoy their property, usages, and other civil rights as they had before done, and that in all matters of controversy relative to property and civil rights resort should be had to the laws of Canada, and be determined agreeably to the said laws. In this statute the words 'property' and 'civil rights' are plainly used in their largest sense."

TO BE CONTINUED DANNY RAGAN'S PENANCE

Danny Ragan was a mule driver in the Cedar Hill colliery. He was not quite eighteen, but he was tall and broad-shouldered, and had the strength of a giant. Danny came from a family of miners. His father had been killed in an explosion of mine damp, and two of his younger brothers were breaker boys, so mining was the only thing he knew anything about.

He was accused of being homely and he never denied the charge. But beauty is largely a matter of taste—and that is very elusive. If you had the poetic instinct you would have sworn that Danny's big dreamy eyes were two patches of blue sky snatched from the vault above. If you were musical you would have said that his laugh was the most heavenly thing in the world, and if you were a painter you would have seen that his mere smile made his honest, freckled face look like a burst of sunshine.

He was not a man of letters. Writing was a sort of tight rope performance not to be attempted by him often, and then only in fear and trembling. He could not write a letter, and with many puckeringings of the brow, and much knitting of the eyebrows. He knew nothing of the higher mathematics, but it was a shrewd man who could get the better of him in a matter of dollars and cents.

Danny, it is almost needless to say, had little of the world's goods, but he had something infinitely more valuable, and that was a deep, abiding faith. His religion was his life. It was in the blood. He did not talk about it—it was too sacred for that—and he did not display it unduly, but unconsciously it colored all of his actions.

Danny might have been hard put to express precisely the feeling that was engendered in his heart by this lively faith. But he was always conscious that it was there and he knew just how it influenced him. It was his infallible remedy, to be used always in times of need. Its effect was like a cooling lotion applied to a burn, or as a drop of water to parched lips.

Danny, it must be confessed, did not cut much of a figure in the community. He was liked by women, children and animals, and tolerated by supercilious boobies who happened to wear better clothes than he, or who loftily aired opinions which they borrowed from neighbors or read in the newspapers. They did not think much of a mule driver.

Danny lost caste very much when he declined an invitation to join the local militia. He said, with a comical twist of his mouth, that he did not fancy the idea of being felled by a pair of bayonets. They told him that it was necessary for every man to be prepared to protect his life and property, and his retort was that he could get ready in a jiffy if the emergency arose. Some of them even intimated that Danny was a coward, but he only smiled in a mournful way and shook his head and did not resent the charge.

One day something happened at the Cedar Hill colliery. Which is only another way of saying that there was an explosion of coal gas, and the roof of the chambers caved in, and half a dozen men were imprisoned under the debris. Danny happened to be passing the surface of the earth that day. His half blind mule was having a holiday and it stood there, looking over the horizon with all of the wonder and amazement of a newborn babe first opening its eyes on this wonderful world of ours. Danny was standing there with his big arm around the shaggy neck of the beast, patting it affectionately, and talking to it as though the poor thing were his long lost brother.

He heard the dull roar from the bowels of the earth, and hastened to the entrance of the mine, where a score of men and some women were standing in a state of nervous tension. "What's the matter?" he asked. Danny always did ask foolish questions. "An explosion!" answered a tremulous one. "Sure that's nothing," said Danny. "Explosions are as common here as big wind in the old country."

"But the mere boom the response, in an agitated voice. "Six men are down there." Danny straightened up to his full height. He glanced at the circle of pale faces. One or two of the crowd slunk in the background. "Why don't some of you go to the rescue?" he demanded. "There was silence for a moment. Presently one man, a little bolder than the others, spoke: "It's too dangerous. One gas explosion follows another."

The Catholic Record

Price of Subscription—\$1.00 per annum. United States & Europe—\$1.50.

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

Advertisements for teachers, situations wanted, etc. to cost each insertion. Remittance to accompany the order.

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

Mrs. L. M. King, P. J. Neven, E. J. Broderick, M. J. Hagan, Mrs. W. E. Smith and Miss Sara Hanley are authorized to receive and forward to subscribers and to connect all other business for the Catholic Record.

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

When subscribers ask for their mail at the post office it would be well to tell the clerk to give them their CATHOLIC RECORD in a few places on the part of delivery clerks who will sometimes look for letters only.

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

In St. John, N. B., single copies may be purchased from Mrs. M. A. McGuire, 240 Maine street.

LETTERS OF RECOMMENDATION

Apostolic Delegate to Canada, Ottawa, June 13th, 1905.

Mr. Thomas Coffey: Since coming to Canada I have been a reader of your paper. I have noted with satisfaction that it is directed with intelligence and ability, and above all, that it is imbued with a strong Catholic spirit.

It is this persistent, conscientious ignoring of the difference between the true Bible as preserved in its integrity by the Catholic Church, and the emasculated version thrown broadcast by Protestant Bible Societies, that makes it so hard for us to have any respect for the mental or moral outlook of those engaged in the work.

UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA, Ottawa, Canada, March 27th, 1900.

Mr. Thomas Coffey: For some time past I have read your paper, the CATHOLIC RECORD, and congratulate you upon the manner in which it is published.

It is not stated whether he is to serve on the Roman committee, or on that charged with the supervision of the South American mission.

LONDON, SATURDAY, JULY 6, 1912

NOTES AND COMMENTS

MR. AUGUSTINE BIRRELL, Chief Secretary for Ireland, is to be ranked among those who, though not Catholics, recognize in Catholic education the most effective antidote to the materialistic tendencies of the age.

ONE OF the new bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States bears the classical and euphonious name of Homer C. Stutz.

"THE ROMAN Catholic papers on this continent," remarks the Christian Guardian, "would like us to believe that the Roman Church does not oppose the circulation of the Bible among its people."

THIS IS a very good illustration of the persistence with which sectarians will propagate a false idea. The object of course is to emphasize one of the oldest Protestant fictions extant, to the effect that the Catholic Church essays to keep her children in ignorance, and, as a means to that end, discourages the circulation of the Bible in the vernacular.

WHAT THE Christian Guardian would have said had it been honest, is that the intrusive Bible peddlers of Vera Cruz were arrested (we are taking the Guardian's word for it that they were arrested at all) for circulating mistranslated and

emasculated copies of the Bible, and for stirring up strife and sowing the seeds of disunion in families. That they were not circulating the true Bible, as preserved in its integrity by the Church, scarcely needs affirmation.

It is this persistent, conscientious ignoring of the difference between the true Bible as preserved in its integrity by the Catholic Church, and the emasculated version thrown broadcast by Protestant Bible Societies, that makes it so hard for us to have any respect for the mental or moral outlook of those engaged in the work.

THE BRIGHT spot in the Christian Guardian is, to our mind, the space allotted to its Montreal correspondent. This writer, whoever he may be, at least tries to tell the truth in regard to Catholics, and, in the surrounding wilderness, that must be counted a great gain.

HIS REFERENCE in a late issue, for example, to the Fete Dieu procession on the Sunday within the octave of Corpus Christi, was in good taste and with due regard to the beauty and solemnity of the occasion.

AS ILLUSTRATIVE of the growing tendency on the part of thinking Scotsmen to look the facts of the pre-reformation period in the face, we may be permitted to refer to a lecture delivered before the Scottish Ecclesiological Society last January, by Rev. Archibald B. Scott of Kildonan.

WE QUOTED last week a specimen of the ludicrous effects sometimes produced by the daily papers in reporting Catholic news items or describing Catholic ceremonies. Here is another for which we are indebted to the Catholic Herald of India.

AN AUTHENTIC item of news is that the Jesuits are to open a college in Tokyo, the Japanese Government having enabled the Fathers to acquire a block of land for the purpose in the inner town of Kojimachi.

A CHALLENGE, A THREAT AND A WARNING

The tumult and the shouting over the N. Teners, and the absurd clamor for a "union marriage law" for the Dominion have pretty well died away.

"The outstanding feature of the judgment is the recognition of the supremacy of the provinces over all matters relating to the solemnization of marriage, so that should the province of Quebec pass a law to-morrow requiring that Roman Catholics could only be legally married within the province, throughout the Dominion so far as the civil law is concerned, then to pass legislation based on the principle that marriage is a civil contract only, entirely eliminating the ecclesiastical element."

WHEREUPON the Hamilton Herald, with great consideration for the peace and welfare of Canada, thus sternly threatens Quebec:

"This is all true. But the powerlessness of the Dominion parliament would not long continue if the Quebec legislature were to do what Mr. Mignault interpreted as a challenge to Canadian Protestantism, and the challenge would be accepted. Such an agitation would follow that the Dominion parliament would be compelled to take the necessary steps to get the B. N. A. Act amended as to vest in the federal authorities the power to regulate the conditions of marriage throughout the Dominion so far as the civil law is concerned, then to pass legislation based on the principle that marriage is a civil contract only, entirely eliminating the ecclesiastical element."

THE POSITION OF CATHOLICS IN NOVA SCOTIA

THESE things may be very remote possibilities; but perhaps not so very much farther off than the agitation of Canadian Protestantism that will result in "legislation based on the principle that marriage is a civil contract only, entirely eliminating the ecclesiastical element."

which was provincial autonomy. They laid the foundation broad and deep, the building rises majestically; but if we have to go back and remake the foundation we may find ourselves like the man who began to build and was unable to finish.

IT IS WORTH while to add to the challenge and the threat a warning. Let us count the cost of fomenting a spirit fatal to Canadian nationality.

THAT ENCYCICAL

A HARDY perennial is the familiar Protestant calumny of the Church in South America. But certain zealous Christian missionaries, whose financial interests were dependent on the sympathy of the Protestant public, began to realize that bald assertion and repetition of scandalous conditions amongst a corrupt and immoral priesthood was not enough.

THE REV. Mr. Speer, Secretary of the Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions, over two years ago at the Rochester Convention of the student volunteers of the Presbyterian Church, quoted from what he affirmed was an encyclical from the Pope to the Archbishop of Santiago wherein the Holy Father deplored the existence of just such scandalous conditions as our pure-minded Presbyterian friends alleged existed there and elsewhere in South America.

IT HAS TAKEN Rev. Father Charles A. Martin, of Youngstown, Ohio, all this time to trace this villainous forgery to its source and to expose the perpetrator. But he has done his work so well that the more self-respecting Protestant papers which lent themselves to the circulation of the calumny have now the grace shamefacedly to retract.

THE TORONTO Christian Guardian a couple of years ago gave prominence to Mr. Speer's promulgation of the bogus encyclical while on a visit to the city of Rochester. We hope our contemporary will now make retraction.

THE POSITION OF CATHOLICS IN NOVA SCOTIA

IN THE previous articles, dealing with positions in the gift of the provincial authorities, it was pointed out that of the three portfolios in the provincial executive not one was given to a Catholic. "That may be good politics or not. At any rate, it is unfair. Now let us look at the subordinate positions in the gift of the local government."

REFERRING to a decision in a Montreal case the Globe says: "The lesson should be of value in ending much loose talk about ecclesiastical law and civil law. The only laws that have binding effect in this country are the laws of the State." In the news columns of the same issue is printed the following:

COURT the proportion is fairer. Out of seven there are two Catholics. To fill a public position for which he may be fit is a reasonable and proper ambition for any person. It is as laudable in a Catholic as in a non-Catholic. It must, however, be discouraging to the one to find that by some means which he does not quite understand he is handicapped in the running; that to a certain extent he is deprived of the chances which seem to be open to his fellow-citizens of other faiths.

EVERY Monday morning brings us deliverances from some of the preachers of the sects antagonistic to the Catholic Church. Rev. Mr. Vining, Baptist, is the latest offender. He would feign have all Catholic countries adopt the Baptist creed and he would have all Baptists put their hands in their pockets and contribute liberally to this end.

THE REV. Mr. Speer, Secretary of the Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions, over two years ago at the Rochester Convention of the student volunteers of the Presbyterian Church, quoted from what he affirmed was an encyclical from the Pope to the Archbishop of Santiago wherein the Holy Father deplored the existence of just such scandalous conditions as our pure-minded Presbyterian friends alleged existed there and elsewhere in South America.

IT HAS TAKEN Rev. Father Charles A. Martin, of Youngstown, Ohio, all this time to trace this villainous forgery to its source and to expose the perpetrator. But he has done his work so well that the more self-respecting Protestant papers which lent themselves to the circulation of the calumny have now the grace shamefacedly to retract.

THE TORONTO Christian Guardian a couple of years ago gave prominence to Mr. Speer's promulgation of the bogus encyclical while on a visit to the city of Rochester. We hope our contemporary will now make retraction.

PLAIN SPEAKING

WITH pleasure we give place in this issue to a communication under the caption "Modern Religious Conditions," written by Rev. Robert Ker, pastor of Christ's Church Cathedral, Hamilton. It is a thoughtful and candid presentation of the case. Indeed, all pronouncements made by this distinguished Anglican divine are characterized by a sincerity of purpose and an honesty of utterance which bring him the respect and esteem of members of all Christian denominations.

THE EDITOR of our Ottawa contemporary read this statement made by a preacher in Toronto who courts notoriety. Can it be possible he has not seen the contradiction made by the authorities of St. Michael's Hospital? They know nothing of such an occurrence. It is such canards as this that create bad feeling in the community. They should be stopped, even if we go the length of having the authors dealt with by the police.

SOMETHING TO THINK ABOUT

MONTREAL, June 21.—Every farm that is put up for sale in Alberta is bought up by the Mormons, said Rev. W. A. Reid who has just returned from Alberta, where he is superintendent of missions for the Presbyterian church, to take the pulpit of Stanley Street church here. Mr. Reid said he knew Mormons at close range, and they were a great menace to the civilization of the present time. There are 20,000 Mormons in Southern Alberta. The little town of Raymond alone sent out 30 missionaries to Great Britain, and the Mormons claim that they have 800 missionaries at work in Great Britain to-day. Their converts are coming in through the port of Montreal at the rate of 100 a week, and something should be done in the matter. It was announced at the meeting that this morning 73 converts had landed at Quebec.

IT WILL be noted that these "convert" Mormons do not come from Catholic countries. There seems to be no effort made to stem the tide of these undesirable, while thousands of dollars are being subscribed by foolish people to furnish the sinews of war for other foolish people who are engaged in a fool's errand to take the Gospel to people who already possess it in all its fulness and live the simple Christian life so dear to the heart of our Savior. In Quebec province the people live close to nature and are very near to God. They have large families and are peopling the land. Huge sums are subscribed to bring them the "evangelical" message of salvation by people who have as a rule very small families or none at all. Truly this is an age of hypocrisy and humbug. This thought came to us with striking force a few days ago when it was announced by a Baptist preacher in this city that a collection would be taken up for the establishment of a Baptist University in Russia. The

LONDON, June 21.—The House of Lords has judicially dismissed the appeal of Canon Thompson against the motion by the Ecclesiastical Court of Arches by refusal to administer Holy Communion to Mr. and Mrs. A. N. Baulster, because the lady was a deceased wife's sister. The parties were married in Montreal, the lady being a Miss Peter-son. The Lords' decision is unanimous and upheld the judgment of three inferior courts. It will have a disturbing effect in high church circles, who hold that the recent parliamentary legislation rendering legal the marriage of a deceased wife's sister, does not abrogate the ancient canon law forbidding such marriage.

THE QUESTION now arises, if a church has no business meddling in affairs of State, why should the State declare who should and who should not be eligible to receive "Holy Communion"? There are things, dear editor, which belong to Caesar and things which Caesar should not interfere with. We have divine authority for this.

THE POOR MAN'S AUTO

THIS has been stopped, or rather a verdict to that effect has been given by Chancellor Boyd, who, we doubt not, felt he was not administering the law as he finds it. We give the story in brief. A trolley line runs between London and Port Stanley, and, having obtained a Dominion charter, and having connection with the trade of the Republic, the company feel they are justified in running cars on Sunday. Upon the inception of the movement the Lord's Day Alliance, through William Kerley, of St. Thomas, took action to have the operation of the cars on Sunday stopped. The case will be appealed to a higher court and then will come up the confederation-old question as to provincial rights. Meantime the action of the Lord's Day Alliance gives us one more illustration of the mischievous meddling of the preachers in secular affairs. It may be that these gentlemen are actuated by a desire to preserve the sanctity of the Sabbath, but there are many who think that their prime motive is to preserve a good attendance at their churches. The work of the prosecuting attorneys of the province has been made light by the ardent desire of a goodly number of preachers to become detectives and policemen. Keeping the Sabbath in gruesome fashion, abusing the Pope on occasion in pulpit and platform, and delivering eloquent sermons on the catchy happenings of the day, is the procedure of too many of them. The wonder is that our non-Catholic fellow-citizens have not ere this made an effort to counteract the unseemly meddling tendencies of these preachers. We may be thankful that they are not all built on exactly the same plan. Meantime the well-to-do gentlemen who contribute liberally to church funds may continue to roll about the country in their autos on the Sabbath day, but the poor man who can contribute but the penny may not take the trolley to enjoy the lake breeze when it is 90 in the shade.

"NO HELL" DOCTRINE

REV. James W. Pedley, of Toronto, Congregationalist, has wiped away all doubt in the minds of his congregation as to the existence of hell in the next world for the punishment of those who do not lead a good life in this. All manner of unregenerate and unrepentant rascals—guilty of murder, robbery, immorality, blasphemy, lying, etc.—may now sleep peacefully. There is no inferno. Said he: "I reject the doctrine of unerring, unpeppable and endless torment because it is a libel on my God. The word 'hell' has no right to be in the New Testament." Furthermore, he tells us he did not know what would become of the man who scorned God and gave himself to evil, but he knew there would be certain retribution. How does he know? Has he had a vision? Our divine Lord's words are in the New Testament and the New Testament tells us there is a hell. Has the Redeemer inspired Rev. Mr. Pedley to declare that He made a mistake? Again! Rev. Mr. Pedley said "that he had dismissed the old and flagrant idea of hell fire. It was burnt out and the ashes are cold." Just here some criminally inquisitive person might rise up and ask, "How do you know the ashes are cold?" In Monday morning's paper we also have a deliverance from Rev. C. O. Johnson, the same being his farewell sermon at the Queen Street Methodist Church. Whilst his congregation thought fit to make noisy signs of regret at his departure the people of Toronto generally will, when he takes the train for Hamilton, leave a sigh of relief. In the inner consciousness of the good old public there is after all but little admiration for stump orators in the pulpit whose utterances tend but to the promotion of bad blood and all manner of recrimination. The Globe report tells us that "prolonged applause" followed some of his utterances. Noisy demonstrations in a so-called place of worship, which remind us of the applause following a brilliant play on the ball field, will serve to bring the conviction that some churches and some preachers are not what they ought to be. If the thoughtful man on the street had an opportunity of a glance at the interior of Queen Street Methodist Church while Mr. Johnson was in one of his Roosevelt moods, and then proceeding to St. Michael's Cathedral during Vespers, and noticed the quiet, dignified, whole-hearted attitude of worship of the Almighty in that sacred sanctuary, and then if he took a glance at all the other Catholic Churches in Toronto at the same time and found like behaviour, it would not take him long to conclude that the old Church after all is the

people of this sect, in that great empire, said the preacher, number ten thousand adherents. But it is in Catholic countries, or countries giving allegiance to the Pope, that they throw their whole heart and much of their means into the work. They dearly love to fish for souls in Roman waters whilst all about them they could every day in the year make a catch that would sorely try the strength of their nets. But, let us repeat, this is the age of humbug.

THE POOR MAN'S AUTO

THIS has been stopped, or rather a verdict to that effect has been given by Chancellor Boyd, who, we doubt not, felt he was not administering the law as he finds it. We give the story in brief. A trolley line runs between London and Port Stanley, and, having obtained a Dominion charter, and having connection with the trade of the Republic, the company feel they are justified in running cars on Sunday. Upon the inception of the movement the Lord's Day Alliance, through William Kerley, of St. Thomas, took action to have the operation of the cars on Sunday stopped. The case will be appealed to a higher court and then will come up the confederation-old question as to provincial rights. Meantime the action of the Lord's Day Alliance gives us one more illustration of the mischievous meddling of the preachers in secular affairs. It may be that these gentlemen are actuated by a desire to preserve the sanctity of the Sabbath, but there are many who think that their prime motive is to preserve a good attendance at their churches. The work of the prosecuting attorneys of the province has been made light by the ardent desire of a goodly number of preachers to become detectives and policemen. Keeping the Sabbath in gruesome fashion, abusing the Pope on occasion in pulpit and platform, and delivering eloquent sermons on the catchy happenings of the day, is the procedure of too many of them. The wonder is that our non-Catholic fellow-citizens have not ere this made an effort to counteract the unseemly meddling tendencies of these preachers. We may be thankful that they are not all built on exactly the same plan. Meantime the well-to-do gentlemen who contribute liberally to church funds may continue to roll about the country in their autos on the Sabbath day, but the poor man who can contribute but the penny may not take the trolley to enjoy the lake breeze when it is 90 in the shade.

"NO HELL" DOCTRINE

REV. James W. Pedley, of Toronto, Congregationalist, has wiped away all doubt in the minds of his congregation as to the existence of hell in the next world for the punishment of those who do not lead a good life in this. All manner of unregenerate and unrepentant rascals—guilty of murder, robbery, immorality, blasphemy, lying, etc.—may now sleep peacefully. There is no inferno. Said he: "I reject the doctrine of unerring, unpeppable and endless torment because it is a libel on my God. The word 'hell' has no right to be in the New Testament." Furthermore, he tells us he did not know what would become of the man who scorned God and gave himself to evil, but he knew there would be certain retribution. How does he know? Has he had a vision? Our divine Lord's words are in the New Testament and the New Testament tells us there is a hell. Has the Redeemer inspired Rev. Mr. Pedley to declare that He made a mistake? Again! Rev. Mr. Pedley said "that he had dismissed the old and flagrant idea of hell fire. It was burnt out and the ashes are cold." Just here some criminally inquisitive person might rise up and ask, "How do you know the ashes are cold?" In Monday morning's paper we also have a deliverance from Rev. C. O. Johnson, the same being his farewell sermon at the Queen Street Methodist Church. Whilst his congregation thought fit to make noisy signs of regret at his departure the people of Toronto generally will, when he takes the train for Hamilton, leave a sigh of relief. In the inner consciousness of the good old public there is after all but little admiration for stump orators in the pulpit whose utterances tend but to the promotion of bad blood and all manner of recrimination. The Globe report tells us that "prolonged applause" followed some of his utterances. Noisy demonstrations in a so-called place of worship, which remind us of the applause following a brilliant play on the ball field, will serve to bring the conviction that some churches and some preachers are not what they ought to be. If the thoughtful man on the street had an opportunity of a glance at the interior of Queen Street Methodist Church while Mr. Johnson was in one of his Roosevelt moods, and then proceeding to St. Michael's Cathedral during Vespers, and noticed the quiet, dignified, whole-hearted attitude of worship of the Almighty in that sacred sanctuary, and then if he took a glance at all the other Catholic Churches in Toronto at the same time and found like behaviour, it would not take him long to conclude that the old Church after all is the

