

Truly, Brother Johnson will a tale unfold at his next camp-meeting in far-off Galveston.

Although he has taken his Church trouble so keenly to heart, Johnson announces that he bears no animosity to the Sydney people generally. He is quite magnanimous about them. In spite of their bad treatment of him, 'I am not going to be nasty about the Sydney people,' he told the interviewer. On the whole, he can afford to be generous. In defeating Tommy Burns, he practically routed all his enemies; and he can afford to be forgiving on the principle of the dying Spanish Noble who, asked by the priest if he forgave his enemies, looked up with a seraphic smile, saying, 'I have killed them all.'

The Catholic Paper

The *S.H. Review* quotes an interesting extract from a collective pastoral letter recently issued by the Catholic hierarchy of Lombardy (Italy) to their flocks. 'Preaching,' they say, 'especially catechetical preaching, is excellent, indispensable—but to-day it is not enough. . . . Humanly speaking, there is no preaching that can prevail against the strength of an evil press. It is imperative, therefore, that we should oppose press to press if we are to prevent the spread of impious teachings among the people. To-morrow it may be too late. . . . Everything points to a great battle in the near future in the social and religious field, and the principal arms employed in it will be the arms of the press. Let everything be done, therefore, to help the Catholic press. We earnestly recommend the clergy to give the utmost possible circulation to the Catholic press.'

Cardinal Moran on Sport Worship

The Cardinal-Archbishop of Sydney sees in excessive devotion to sport the seeds of national decay. 'When Imperial Rome,' said his Eminence to a *Daily Telegraph* interviewer, 'entered upon her period of decay, the youth of the city were pursuing the same sport worship that is characteristic of Sydney at the present day.' In his *Table Talk* Leigh Hunt remarks that 'the moment a man finds a contradiction in himself between his sports and his humanity, it is a signal that he should give them up.' This is, in substance, the plea of the Cardinal against certain boxing exhibitions that in our time have come to be little less brutal than the old contests with the naked fists such as that which took place between 'Donnelly and Cooper, who fought all on Kildare.' 'When I was a young man at college,' said the Cardinal to the interviewer, 'we had our boxing amusement without the gloves, and no element of brutality ever entered into our sport, as it apparently does, even with the gloves, to-day. The worst feature of all is that money is just now playing such an important part in all our outdoor amusements. It cannot be argued that the same honesty of purpose pervades the doings of the athletes when stakes and side-wagers come to be an important factor, as in the case of horse-racing. Leave that part of the business on one side, and there will be no need to talk of the decadence of sport, nor will the brutal element present itself. I marvel to see how the question of monetary gain has insinuated itself into sport, for in my day there was none of it.'

Mixed Marriages

A Spanish 'wisdom' places a discount on advising a man to go to the wars or marry, and an Irish proverbial saying cautions young people to be slow and guarded about 'tying a knot with their tongue which their teeth can't open.' For Catholics some such caution is very necessary in regard to unions in which there is a difference over so intimate and practical a matter as religion. In Germany all such marriages are registered as mixed, and, with the religion in which the children are brought up, are made the subject of statistical returns. In his *Kirchliches Handbuch*, Father Krose, S.J., gives, from the official statistics, some melancholy figures showing the results of mixed marriages in the German Fatherland. Of the children born of these unions, 423,895 (56.8 per cent.) were brought up as (at least nominally) Protestants, and 321,955 (43.2 per cent.) as (more or less) Catholics. Catholics in these countries need not go so far afield as Germany for a warning example as to the evils of mixed marriages—from which the ranks of the churchless, rather than of the churches, are year by year recruited. Our own countries' experience affords a more than sufficient ground for the appeal that is made in the churches on each succeeding second Sunday after the Epiphany.

'Catholic Marriages.' The book of the hour. Single copies, 1s posted; 12 copies and over, 8d each, purchaser to pay carriage. Apply Manager, 'Tablet,' Dunedin.

'It's selling well, because it's satisfying well.' Hondai Lanka Tea represents 'the most for the money.'

CATHOLIC DISABILITIES IN THE BRITISH ISLES

THE BILL FOR THEIR REMOVAL

The thanks of all Catholics in the United Kingdom and in the Empire at large will (says the *London Tablet*) go out to Mr. W. Redmond for his efforts to remove the civil and religious disabilities which still disgrace the Statute Book in our regard. We have little doubt that when he rose in his place in the House of Commons on Tuesday in last week, to ask leave to introduce his Bill for this purpose, that many who watched him dimly wondered what they were about to be asked to do. For was not an Emancipation Act passed in 1829 which was to relieve Catholics of the disabilities imposed upon them by the penal code, and to place them upon a footing of equality with their fellow-citizens? But that Act was not all that many people, who have not studied its provisions, nowadays seem to think. It is quite true that it was to a large extent an Act of Emancipation, for it repealed the various enactments which, by the oaths and declarations they required to be made against our belief and practice, blocked the way to our voting or sitting in Parliament and to our holding civil, military, and municipal positions. But the Act did not stop here. Whilst giving emancipation upon certain points with one hand, it inflicted pains and penalties with the other by the enactment of certain provisions which, as Mr. Redmond declared, were of the 'most offensive and insulting character towards Catholic people.' We might sit in Parliament, and even hold office, but the great prizes of political life were to be denied to those who, except for their being Catholics, might have proved their worthiness to hold them. No Catholic, it was laid down, could sit on the Woolsack, or be Lord Lieutenant of Catholic Ireland. But this was not all. Under heavy penalties our priests were forbidden to exercise any religious function, or wear the habits of their order, outside the walls of private houses or of our churches, and in Clause 28 a brutally frank provision was made for the suppression and extinction of the religious Orders within the realm. All Jesuits and members of other religious Orders then living in the land were to register themselves within six months, and any others were forbidden, under the severest penalties, to enter the kingdom. Indeed, so evidently was this Act of Emancipation one of offensive and unjust restriction that a prominent Catholic journalist of the day, William Eusebius Andrews, editor of *The Truth-teller* brought out the issue of his paper announcing the passing of the Act in deep mourning. In spite, however, of the obnoxious enactments thus included in the Act, the measure of relief which it extended was welcomed by the majority of the Catholics of that day. But the penal provisions that brand us alone amongst our fellow-citizens with civil and religious inferiority, after seventy-nine years of boasted progress and enlightenment, still stand upon the pages of the Statute Book ready to the hand of any bigot or oppressor who may desire to use them against us.

This is surely little creditable to English justice and fairplay. We are citizens of the Empire equally with those who would oppress us; we bear our share, and in some matters more than our share, of the public burdens; and we have a right to be placed upon an equal footing before the law. Against this it may be objected that as most of the enactments in question have, in the words of Sir James Stephen, been 'treated absolutely as a dead letter' ever since they were passed, there is no need for us to worry for their repeal. Unfortunately, however, these provisions are not the dead dogs that some people think. In spite of the attempt made in 1891 by Mr. Gladstone, Lord Morley, and Mr. Asquith to clear the way for Catholics to the Lord Chancellorship of England and the Lord Lieutenancy of Ireland, the Emancipation Act still stands as more than 'a lion in the path.' And more recently still, we have had attempts at the enforcement of other restrictive provisions of the Act. It will be remembered that in 1902 the Protestant Alliance applied to Mr. Kennedy, a police magistrate, for summonses against three individual Jesuits under the Act with a view to their banishment, and on an appeal to the Court of King's Bench the judges refused to issue the *mandamus* to compel him to act on the plea that he had exercised a legitimate discretion. All, then, that stands between our religious orders and expulsion is the temporary absence of active bigotry and the discretion of the particular magistrate to whom application may be made. Such a state of things is not only not creditable, it is not endurable, for it places the security of peaceable citizens at the mercy of the first fanatic who may chance to come along. Nor need we go so far back as six years ago for a proof that these disabilities, 'the solitary and belated relic of a past which can never be rebuilt,' as Mr. Asquith has called them, may be used against us. Only a

'Be kind tae auld Grannie.' Ladies appreciate a box of Hondai Lanka as a Christmas present.