## The Catholic Record

Price of Subscription-\$2 00 per annum THOMAS COFFEY, Editor and Publisher.
Approved and recommended by the Archishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa and St.
Boniface, the Bishors of London, Hamilton, Peterborough, and Ogdensburg, N. Y., and the clergy throughout the Dominion.
Subscribers changing residence will please give old as well as new address.
Obituary and marriage notices cannot be inserted except in the usual condensed form. Each insertion 50 cents.
Meesra Luke King, P. J. Neven, E. J. Broderick, and Miss Sara Hanley are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transact all other business for The CATHOLIC RECORD, Agent for Newfoundland, Mr. James Power of St. J. Jhn. Agent for district of Niplesing, Mrs. M. Reynolds, New Liekeard

LETTERS OF RECOMMENDATION.

Apostolic Delegation. Ottawa, June 13th, 1905. Mr. Thomas Coffey:

My Dear Sir,—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 strenucally defends Catholic principles and rights and stands firmly by the teachings and authority of the Church, at the same time promoting these lines it has done a great deal of good for the welfare of religion and country, and it will do more and more, as its wholesome influence reaches more Catholic homes. I therefore, carnestly recommend it to Catholic families. With my blessing on your work, and best wishes for its continued success, Yours very sincerely in Christ,

Donatus, Archbishop of Ephesus,

Linyrestry of OttaWa. Mr. Thomas Coffey :

UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA. Ottawa, Canada, March 7th, 1900.

Mr. Thomas Coff y:

Dear Sir: For some time past I have read
your estimable paper, The CATHOLIC RECORD,
add congratulate you upon the manner in
which it is published. Its matter and form
are both good; and a truly Catholic spirit
pervades the whole. Therefore, with pieus
are, I can recommend it to the faithful
Bleesing you and wishing you success, believe

Apost. Deleg. LONDON, SATURDAY, MAY 4, 1907.

REV. DOCTOR FOX'S ARTICLE ON THE "RELATIONS BE-TWEEN CHURCH AND STATE" CRITICISED.

BY REV. P. J. HENDRICK.

An article from the pen of the Rev. Dr. Fox on the "Relations between Church and State" appeared in the March number of the Catholic World, New York. A superficial perusal of the article

makes it evident that it was inspired

by the present condition of the Church

America with its condition in those countries where the union of Church and State holds or has held, arrives at the conclusion that the doctrine of union ought to be set aside, and thus insure a greater prosperity for the Church. No doubt the welfare of the Church is a all worthy the name, should have at heart, and anything or anyone who is maliciously opposed to the onward march of Catholicity, which means benefaction and civilization, should receive at his hands an unstinted measure of condemnation. The loyal Catholics of America, in public meetings assembled, did honor to the Church and the Republic by the way they so unequivocally and strenuously denounced the cowardly treatment of the Catholic Church by the infidel Government of France. Now Dr. Fox in his article tells us, that in all the eloquent speeches made by the American Bishops, priests and laymen "not a single remark can be found that could be interpreted as an approval of the doctrine that the Church and State ought to be united, and that it is the duty of the State in its corporate capacity to worship God and support a religion." It must be observed that these meetings of American Catholies had only one object in view, and that was to register a forcible disapproval of the French Government's action by condemning the sacri legious spoliation and diabolical persecution of the French Church. Who does not see that it would be altogether out of place at such meetings for Bishops, priests or laymen to criticise the policy of the Vatican? And we fail to see how Dr. Fox can conclude from the fact, that since no word of approval of the doctrine of union was uttered, that, therefore, these meetings disapproved of such doctrine. With equally good logic we might say that since no word was uttered at these meetings disapproving the action of Adrian IV., in giving Ireland to England, that, therefore, they approved of

But would it not be much better logic, would it not be much more in harmony with the object of these meetings, which was to sustain the dignity and authority of the Holy See, to conclude that since no word of disapproval of the doctrine of union was uttered, that, therefore, that doctrine was upheld? Yet Dr. Fox does not think so, for he tells us:

it. A very unlikely thing.

"It is not difficult to imagine what would have been the effect if the demon of mischief had prompted some one to rise and indignantly protest that Christianity only realizes its ideal when Church and State are united."

We presume that when the rev. doctor was writing these words he had visions of a Kentucky lynching in store for the poor over-ardent Ultramontane, who would have had the hardihood to uphold a policy and a principle which the Church has held and taught for cen-

of the Church, which is her most desirable status, is found in the union of Church and State is plain from the words of the Pontiff, he says:

"It would be very erroneous to draw the conclusion that in America is to be sought the type of the most de-sirable status of the Church, or that it would be universally lawful and ex-pedient for State and Church to be, as in America, dissevered and divorced." These words assert the necessity of

union between Church and State, and they also express what has been the policy of the Vatican, wherever it was practicable, for more than a thousand years.

The arguments which Dr. Fox brings against the inculcation of the doctrine of union, are, that it does not coincide with the American convictions; that at the present day it can only exist, if at all, in a small part of the Church's field; and that in the past it has produced a plentiful crop of evils. We once met an Irish priest in Lon-

don, Eng., and as he was expatiating on the evils of Ireland he fairly frothed at the mouth because there never was an Irish Pope. Who cannot see the absurd ity of such resentment? Yet that priest had more reason on his side than the Rev. Dr. Fox has for seeking the abrogation of the law of union, the setting aside of a policy whose object is to safeguard the interests of the Church, because they do not, forsooth, agree with American convictions. Look at the Church and look at Amer ica. Where is it possible for one to begin to institute any comparison between them? The Church is nineteer hundred years old. She was instituted by Christ and commissioned to teach all the nations of the earth, her jurisdiction is limited only by the confines of the world, she has a divine right to the obedience of those who are in any way her children, for her voice and commands are the commands and voice of Christ, Who said to her "He that heareth you heareth Me." She is supernatural in her origin and end, and even in the great majority of the means she uses to attain that end. Hence, if in France. Dr. Fox, after comparing she, in her accumulated wisdom and the conditions of the Church in experience of centuries, affirms that it is better for her to be united to the State in order that she may be better en abled to fulfil her mission, we consider it especially arrogant in any of her members to question either the opportuneness, usefulness or justness of her thing, that every Catholic, who is at policy. Such criticism manifests either a pride of intellect or a pride of will, or both, a rationalism and a liberalism to which two isms all the objections that are put forward against the union of Church and State may be redaced.

And what is America? She is a Republic whose existence dates back a little more than a hundred years, she is simply one amongst the many nations of the earth, she is not accounted the most learned or the most powerful, she is limited within certain degrees of latitude and longitude, her opinions and convictions on political and other matters are not received by some, and by others they are sneered at and repudiated.

Look at the shameful administration of justice in her courts of law, the bar barity of our lynch law is just a shade better than South sea-island cannibalism. The number of fortune tellers, clairvoyants, astrologers and divine healers which is to be found here, proclaims the universality of a degrading superstition. Mr. Broughton Brandenburg, writing in the Metropolitan magazine, for April, says that we are the most criminal nation in the world. Why, when we consider all this, together with the filthy divorce courts and the forty millions of unbelievers that here exist, is it any wonder that Roman ideas and American convictions do not harmonize? "That the doc trine of union can only exist, if at all, in a very small part of the Church's field" is no argument against the claim of the Church that it should exist everywhere, or at least, wherever the Church, should cease to inculcate the doctrine of union. As the body and soul are united so ought State and Church, for they are both working for the same end, viz., the happiness of temporal happiness, and the Church mand to lead him to eternal happiness. But since temporal happiness is a means to eternal happiness which and since the means cannot, without frustrating the purpose of its existence, be separated from its end, it separated from the Church. Hence, only in union can they find their natural, normal life. This is what the Church claims in theory and this is what she ardently desires to see in the concrete.

Leo XIII. in his encyclical letter Au milieu des sollicitudes " to the French Catholics, after advising them not to create any dissensions on the sub-

that belonged entirely to the Holy See,

says:

"We cannot use the same language on the other point which concerns the principle of the separation of Church and State, for it means nothing less than the separation of the human from the Christian and divine legislation. We will not dwell here to point out all the absurdities that are found in the theory of separation, for every one will easily understand them by himself. When the State refuses to give to God what belongs to Him, it must, necessarily, refuse to give to its must, necessarily, refuse to give to its citizens that to which they have a per feet right, for whether it be conceded or not, the true rights of man are born from his duties towards God. From this it follows that the State, when it is negligent in this matter, which is the principal end of its existence, is on the straight road to ruin, for it denies the very reason of its existence. This truth is so clearly proclaimed by the natural light of reason, that it forces itself upon every man who does not allow himse blinded by passion. Hence, Catholics should be very careful not to uphold in any way the doctrine of separation of and State. For to wish to se the State separating itself from the Church would be, logically, to wish that the Church was reduced to live according to the common rights of all citizens This condition of the Church, it is true is found in some countries, but it is mode of existence, which, if it unites to some advantages, especially when the ruler through a happy inconsequence is governed by Christian principles is govern and although these adv cannot justify the false ciple of separation, nor advantage ciple ciple of separation, nor permit ey render bearable a condition of things, which, practically, is not the vorst of all."

Did Dr. Fox ever read the above encyclical? We do not believe that he did, for it is scarcely probable if he had, that he would have had the hardihood to so openly run counter to the positive teaching of the head of the Church. But then it cannot be so easily supposed that the doctor never read the syllabus, and in that catalogue of errors we find the proposition that the Church should be separated from the State, and the State separated from Church," condemned by Pius IX. as erroneous. How, then, can we account for the bold stand taken by the doctor in this delicate matter? We confess that we are no mind reader, neither are we a discerner of spirits to any large extent, hence we will have to look for the reason in the ensemble of the doctor's article. However, it is not so hard to find it, and it may be expressed in the following terms "the union of Church and State is an antiquated piece of policy, it is un-American, it is a nuisance and never did produce much good, nearly all the nations have thrown it overboard, hence it is about time for the Church to quit talking about it." If that is not a sneer of contempt we fail to see what is.

Writing to the Bishop of Grenoble about certain refractory Catholics who had misconstrued the object of the above encyclical, Leo says :

" If there is one whose mission it is to determine the policy which can effect-ively safeguard the interests of religion, in which consists the supreme end of all things, he certainly is the Roman Pontiff.'

But poor Leo not being endowed with the prophetic spirit, did not know that in a few years after his death, a certain Dr. Fox would loom up in the American horizon, who would disabuse the Roman gant pretensions. However, the principle laid down by Leo is most Catholic and salutary, and he who acquiesces in it, cannot deviate very far, if at all, from what is just and true; while he who denies it exposes himself to the danger of being led into the paths of error, and of there being devoured by the heat of his own conceit, and of finally becoming a hindrance to the performance of what is useful and good. "In subsequent years." says the rev erend doctor, "with the tide of emigration came a great influx of Catholics from countries where the union of Church and State had inflicted upon their ancestors persecution and spoliapossible. Neither is it any reason why tion; upon themselves political disability and social inferiority." We wonder if the reverend doctor ever stopped to consider the import of his words? The obvious meaning is that the Church was linked with the State man. The State seeks to give him in persecuting Catholics, in depriving them of their civil and religious rights, endeavors by all the means at her com- in a word, in destroying the kingdom of God on earth. Who does not see the absurdity of such a state ment? No, we can no more the end of the Church, attribute these evils to the union of Church and State, any more than we can attribute divorce and all its consequent miseries to the sacrament follows that the State should not be of matrimony. It was the civil power which, by abusing its authority, sought to despoil the Church, to subject her to unjust laws and thus exterminate her that has been the cause of the many gross evils to which Dr. Fox refers. Again he says:

" Even the priests are glad to forget that the rulers of the Church required that the kingdom of the spirit should be aided by the sword of Cresar, and that if they study the turies! That the normally social life | ject of the concordat as it was a matter | history of union of Church and State

they will be disposed to moralize not merely on the good fruit it bore, but also upon the evils of which there was a plentiful erop."

Let us hear what the illustrious Archbishop of St. Paul has to say on this matter. Preaching in St. Patrick's church, Washington, a few years ago, he said :

"In history how sublime the role of the Roman Pontifi! How we glory in his achievements for morality and relig-ion! The Pontifi of Rome was the maker of Christendom; the maker and preservion! The Pontin of Rome was the maker of Christendom; the maker and preserver of its civilization. Who but the Pontifi of Rome sent at different times a message of truth to barbarous lands, extending thus the range of the Church's influence and saving the peoples of those lands to religion and civilization?

" Who but the Pontiff of Rome rose up in his might and smote with spiritual weapons the despots of people who fain would wrest from them their heaven-born liberties? Who but the Pontiff of Rome's supreme words of solemn warning were a check to power ful kings when those forgot the sanctity and inviolability of the marriage vow? Who but the Pontiff of Rome summored Christendom to stem the advancing flood of Mohammedan barbar ism, and how is it that the Pontiff of Rome was enabled thus to do wondrous things for God and for humanity? It is because he was independent all princes and peoples, unshackled by the whim or will of any local ruler." It is because the State was allied to

the Church, and the Church to State. Hence we see no reason why priests should be glad to forget that the Popes required the aid of Cæsar, for was it not in the interests of civilization and liberty, rather than for the direct pro; agation of the Faith that is was invoked? Or is it uplawful for a mother to ask her son to help her when she is about to be felled by the arm of an assassin? It is as unlawful for the Church, as it is for the least among her children, to tempt God; and tempting God she would be, did she not utilize those means which He has placed in her hands to further the interests of His Church, notwithstanding the promises He has made to her.

Again the doctor says:

"But the strain on the loyalty of the Church's children here... would face its most perilous ordeal if it were called apon to include in its Creed and Act of Faith the doctrine that Church and State are to be united."

The same thing was said about Papal Infallibility when it was brought before the Vatican Council, and the storm of opposition that was raised against it, both in and out of that council, did not prevent the Church from making it an article of faith. The strain that was then on the loyalty of some, as well as the evil forebodings of others, have all passed away, and the definition of Papal Infallibility, like all other dogmatic definitions, has only served to make the Church more lustrous by bringing out the strength of its faith, the grandeur of its unity as well as its imperishable divinity.

We have confidence in the faith of American Catholics, it may not be as simple as that of their forefathers, but it is more intelligent and more prudently active.

As we look from ocean to ocean and from lake to gulf we behold innumerable churches, schools, colleges, seminaries, hospitals and other religious institutions, noble monuments to the manly Christian zeal of our priests and prelates, but more so to the lively ith and generous disposition of our

people. The sincerity and stability of a faith, that has, at no little sacrifice, done so much to honor the victory of the Cross, cannot for a moment be doubted. And we may say, without fear of contradiction, that in no part of the Church's field has such progress been achieved as in the American republic. Hence, i Pius X. were to dogmatically define (a thing which is altogether improbable) that Church and State should be united, we have nothing to assure us that American Catholics would not receive that definition with the same obedience, love and hope, with which they have received all others. On the contrary, their loyalty to the See of Peter, their firm faith and their intelligent conception of their duties as Catholics, knowing as they do that the words of the Creed "I believe in the Holy Catholic Church" oblige them to receive not only the actual definitions of the Church, but also any definitions which the Church may at any future time decide to make. All this, we affirm, assures us that the evil forebodings which Dr. Fox entertains are without foundation in fact.

## A NOBLE PIONEER.

From the Richmond Hill Liberal, of April 18th, we take the following item having reference to one of the most estimable Catholics of the Dominion, one of the stalwarts of the old days, whose name will be held in honor by future generations. He is the father of that much esteemed and distinguished priest, Rev. Dr. Teefy, of the Arch-

diocese of Toronto: To day, April 18, M. Teefy, Esq, is receiving congratulations from many friends on the eighty fifth anniversary of his birthday. Few men have better reasons for congratulation. Mr. Teefy is enjoying good health at the age of

four score years and five, his mind is as clear as that of a man in the prime of life, and no person can take a deeper interest in books or esteemed and respected citizen. He is now in his fifty seventh year as Postmaster—the oldest Postmaster in the Dominion, having bern appointed in the year 1850 and he is the oldest Justice of the Peace in the County of York, having received the appointment in 1853. He was Clerk and Treasurer of this village for over thirty-two years, and resigned in 1905, when the village council "caned" him. The Liberal is pleased to join in sincerest congratuations.

ANSWER TO CORRESPONDENT. III. The next question which our corre-

pondent proposed was: "What manner of Spirit drove Jesus the Messian into the wilderness after His baptism?" The Spirit was the Holy Ghost, for the term Spirit with the article as it is here used in the Greek is invariably applied to the Holy Ghost. It is also evident from the account given by St. Matthew, where we read: "Then Jesus was led by the spirit into the desert, to be tempted by the devil." The contrast between the spirit which led our Lord into the desert and the devil who tempted him is clear. Had it been the devil who led Him then the evangelist would have said that He (our Lord) was to be tempted by him, . e., by the same spirit which had led Him into the desert.

The next question is: " Was Jesus not the Messias until after His baptism? Did He choose any disciples before His

baptism ?" Certainly Jesus was the Messias from the instant of His conception or Incarnation. His name had been announced by the Archargel and His mission foretold to His mother. The manifestation on the banks of the Jordan added not a single tittle to His Sonship: nor did it enhance the royalty of His eternal kingly brow. From the very beginning of His mysterious earthly career-from that moment, when by the power and operation of the Holy Ghost, the human nature was first formed and hypostatically united to the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity-from that moment was He the Word-made flesh, Jesus, the Messias. Two things are to be kept clear and to be insisted upon in the life of Jesus. They are His humanity and His divin ity. They were not confused in sub stance but united in Person, and that Person divine. They were not united in mere accident as the question im plies, and as we might be united with God now by grace, or separated from Him again by sin. Now the idea of the Messias amongst the Jews was not so clear and definite that He would be welcomed as He should be They were anxious for a Saviour, but it should be One Who would free them from earthly bondage. Their belief in the One God, the Jehovah of their fathers, was so intense that they could not understand how He would come down and walk amongst them. The divinity, therefore, of Christ, could not be so prominently manifested. Otherwise they would deny His humanity. The first part of the question is analogous to an old heresy which maintained that our Lord at the time of His baptism was made the Son of God-which up to that time He had not been.

He did not, so far as the gospels relate, choose His disciples or apostles until after His fasting in the desert. His public ministry began then. We do not deem it necessary to enter farther into the point, as the power which He conferred upon them is much more important to our faith than the day and hour of His choice. Nor must the question thus answered be any argument against its first part. If Christ did not choose disciples before His baptism it is no argument that He was not, until that hour, the Messias

ST. ANTHONY'S VILLA, QUEBEC.

On the heights overlooking the valley of the St. Charles river, with a superb view of the unequalled Laurentide mountains, and in close proximity to the beautiful church of the Franciscan Fathers, there stands a modest little structure, built on a foundation of faith, hope and charity. St. Anthony's Villa is an institution wherein English speaking girls can find accommodation according to their means, and every home comfort in the midst of the most refined and cultured surroundings. His Grace Archbishop Begin has blessed and approved the undertaking in a way worthy of his profound sense of justice, and in view of the establish ment of a long-felt want due the Irish people of old Quebec. The noble aims of this community should call forth the most generous encouragement from the heart of every Irish man and woman in the city where it has labored so earnestly and accomplished so much good during the past three years. The ladies in charge, who are devoting their lives, means and best energy to much to McGee, and his memory the grand work, speak glowingly of the should be kept green in the minds of prosperity hovering over Stadacona, and its absolute need of a national home to meet the requirements of its Irish Catholic people.

The RECORD extends its heartiest congratulations to the old Rock city, and looks forward with hope and congratulations to the old Rock city, and looks forward with hope and corever.—Bishop Spalding.

pleasure to seeing its first English convent, second to none in Canada and worthy of the race that is "Irish yet."

## THE DUEL.

We have received from a very esteemed correspondent a severe criticism upon a French play, the Duel, an English translation of which is being rendered by Mr. Otis Skinner as lead. ing actor. In criticizing modern plays we feel that high ideals and good stand. ards are not required. Taste has sadiy retrograded, deplore it and scold as we may. The best almost that can be looked for is that which can be tolerated. We agree with our friend, that the presentation, or as is too generally the misrepresentation, of a priest upon the stage is no good either for the priesthood or the stage. The objection is much stronger when in the development of the play the sacred rites have to be presented. The Duel was written by Henri Lavidan. A young duchess was married to an old man, who was on account of health placed in the care of a physician - a free-thinker, He naturally becomes very friendly to the Duchess. The lady seeks religious consolation and betakes herself to the neighboring church where she meets the Abbe Daniel. The Abbe is the hero of the play and brother of the physician. The latter learning that the Duchess is a penitent of his brother with whom he had quarreled several years before, interviews him, and mad with jealousy charges the priest with having become himself infatuated with the lady. Here is the duel-a moral one-between the two brothers. But common sense calms the storm. The Duke meets his death, thus leaving the Duchess a widow. The good Bishop, who had also been an inmate of this sanitarium, turns the Duchess from the idea of entering religion, which the Abbe Daniel had encouraged so strongly, and advises her to marry the doctor. Then sending for the priest he keeps him to his duty and sacred dignity. He reconciles the two brothers so sincerely that the Abbe performs the marriage ceremony. How far such a play is to be condemned will largely depend upon the public before whom it is played. Rendered in the midst of a simple Catholic society it would give scandal. A non - Catholic audience would be very differently impressed by it. In fact, a Protestant friend who had witnessed it in Paris, thought it a regular knock-down blow to the librespenseurs. It is not a travesty upon the priesthood or religion. It shows, by the practical regard of the Bishop for all the interested parties, the efficacy of Christian charity to heal long standing wounds, to keep all classes in their places and to avoid extremes. We never saw the play acted, nor has our correspondent. All the circumstances, in which the priest displays a mixture of weakness and strength, fail to impress ordinary Catholics with admiration either for the character or the acting. So far as Mr. Otis Skinner is concerned, it lies beyond our province to criticize him for taking the part of the Abbe Daniel. We understand his role in this is strong. The play will run as long as the public will patronize it. We do not think that will be long. It is too psychological and unreal ever to be popular. And to those who like the humiliations of the priesthood it cannot be palatable. It will satisfy only a few, so that its parts will soon be left in the green rooms and the play hardly be seen on the boards.

## THE LATE THOS. D'ARCY M'GEE.

Attention has once more been drawn to the fitness of erecting a monument on Parliament Hill, Ottawa, to perpetuate the memory of the late Thomas D'Arcy McGee, and we have great pleasure in making the announcement that at last steps are about to be taken to carry the project into effect. In the House of Commons, on the 25th of April, the Hon. Mr. Fielding said that provision would be made in the estimates of a future session for this purpose. The Government is to be commended for this course, and we trust that ere long a statue of the great McGee will be given place amongst those of other statesmen who have given of their best and sacrificed not a little for Canada. Amongst these McGee stands in the front rank, and future generations, viewing the statue of the brilliant Irishman, will study his character, his work, and his splendid speeches, all of which will be an education leading to nobleness of purpose, and patriotic resolve. Canada owes its people.

In the end, each one has but himself. And if God be not in that self, he is poor and wretched, though he

The Evening some time ago ser correspondent fo plain, unv facts as regards between Church The Evening Mathematical The first installed which are intensible of Catholic Tights of C tantly violated there exists a co far as the Frenc concerned. This the English and newspapers are u thing that will i French ally. H keeps from the of the outrageou

The Evening referring to this rdiale in Great Brita Germany. The agencies in Lenight: Why matters which us, and which the Governmen nothing of Italy the explanation of the English the way Cathol trampled upon A correspond paper having t infamous policy ceau Governm vas on the po from France.

Italian Ambas the offending might expect rize Clemences If it were not conspiracy of s shocked by ties such as v lecture by of the foremos The title o Teachers." M accuracy of t the tender ag by her teache on the previou pelled to sta the Lord's F class. She be art in Heaven At this point the schoolmas

there. Your

Don't tell fa

im in the s

for expulsion

continuing th " Give us th schoolmaster Step! It is The follow recite the Ha n this fashio manners abo woman visit never salute you know." Schoolmas tered all

with contem parents, Ca tions were perty confis every nursery of a gramme whi the complet from Frenc Journal. LAUDS T "What I Church" preached b Newark, la

Protestant which I ad and they of the san second, the fifth, femil the worsh confession. myself, w Church. who say admire an

and that also perse tus was b Calvin ga that his r we have Puritans tion of t We do no eye, but fighting, look into

> which w New Yor