

The Catholic Record.

Published Weekly at 484 and 486 Richmond Street, London, Ontario.

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

Editors: REV. GEORGE R. NORTHGRAVES, Author of "Mistakes of Modern Infidelity," THOMAS COFFEY, Publisher and Proprietor, Thomas Coffey.

Agents: Luke King, John Nigh and P. J. Neven are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and to transact all other business for THE CATHOLIC RECORD.

LETTER OF RECOMMENDATION. UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA. Ottawa, Canada, March 7th, 1903.

LONDON, SATURDAY, AUG. 22, 1903.

THE VICAR GENERAL.

As we go to press the Very Rev. Joseph Bayard, Vicar-General, lately parish priest of St. Thomas, who has been seriously ill at St. Joseph's Hospital, London, for the past four months, is, we regret to state, very low and is not expected to live many more days.

About a month ago, foreseeing that he should never be able to resume his duties as pastor of St. Thomas, the Very Rev. Father resigned his charge and sent a touching letter of farewell, with his blessing, to his beloved parishioners, between whom and their worthy pastor the kindest spirit had always existed.

We trust that now in his hour of suffering he will be kindly remembered in the prayers of his many admiring friends.

The Rev. Father West of Goderich has been appointed to succeed Father Bayard in the parish of St. Thomas.

IMAGINARY MACHINATIONS.

From the time when the announcement was first made that the Holy Father, Pope Leo XIII., was on the point of death, the despatches sent from Rome began to state that the Cardinals were in an embroilment regarding the election of a successor, and with great persistency this statement was kept up, not only during his whole sickness, but down to the moment of the election of Pope Pius X.

We were given to understand, and were in fact positively told, that Cardinals Rampolla, Oreglia, Vanutelli and several others were engaged in a regular electioneering campaign, intriguing in the manner of our own Ward politicians to take every advantage of their opponents to secure the prize of St. Peter's chair.

From among these reports we cull the following choice items: "Rome July 24.—Rampolla is leader. He stands good chance of being elected Pope; if not, Gotti, with whom he has agreement, may get it."

"Rome July 24.—Rampolla is leader. He stands good chance of being elected Pope; if not, Gotti, with whom he has agreement, may get it."

"Rome July 24.—Rampolla is leader. He stands good chance of being elected Pope; if not, Gotti, with whom he has agreement, may get it."

"Rome July 24.—Rampolla is leader. He stands good chance of being elected Pope; if not, Gotti, with whom he has agreement, may get it."

ballot, it is not probable that Gotti can be successful, this section of the Sacred College will decide on Cardinal di Pietro, one of Rampolla's most faithful followers."

Before this we were told by all the despatches that the stay of Cardinal Gibbons for some days in Paris had for object to unite the French Cardinals against Cardinal Rampolla, and that he had succeeded in his purpose.

"The anti-Rampolla tendency has more prominent candidates such as Cardinals Oreglia, Sorafino Vanutelli, Stoll, and Agliardi, which will cause difficulty in arriving at an agreement on any one of them. It is already fore-shadowed that should the success of their opponents be probable, this group will centre all their votes on Cardinal Sapecciatro, Archbishop of Capua."

Later on we read that for Cardinal Gotti to offer the Papacy, it was necessary that he should have the aid of Cardinal Rampolla, which, at first seemed an insurmountable obstacle, which, however, was removed by his expressing regret for having thoughtlessly accorded an interview to the editor of the Paris Figaro, wherein he spoke "rather too freely against Rampolla."

He [Cardinal Gotti] has made an agreement at the expense of the Curia, according to which he will be Pope, and Rampolla prefect of Propaganda, and one of Rampolla's proteges, Cardinal Tripepi, Secretary of State.

There was much more of the same kind, and finally, when it was made known that at the seventh ballot the Patriarch of Venice had been chosen by a vote which has been reported to have been unanimous it was stated that "after Monday's ballots, it was a foregone conclusion that he was the only candidate satisfactory to all to secure the necessary two-thirds."

We are not surprised that many Protestant religious papers were horrified at what they considered as unseemly efforts on the part of the Cardinals to secure the high position to which so many among them were supposed to be aspiring.

The authenticity of this Bull has been denied by most Irish historians, and it is the object of Professor Thatcher's investigations to ascertain whether or not its authenticity can be established.

The document is asserted to have been obtained by Henry in 1156; yet it is certain that Henry did not attempt to occupy Ireland in virtue thereof, for it was not till May 1169, and then it was on the invitation of the tyrant Dermot MacMorogh, king of Leinster, who had been abandoned by his vassals and deposed for his profligacy by Roderic O'Connor, king of Ireland, that the Normans knights Fitz Stephen and others, who were soon afterward reinforced by Richard Strongbow, invaded Ireland.

Henry himself did not go to Ireland to take possession thereof till 1172, and even then he did not advance any claim upon the island by virtue of the Pope's supposed donation, but solely by right of his own partial conquest.

On the other hand, it is sure that already at the time when Pope Adrian's Bull is said to have been issued, King Henry II. was not in good odor with Adrian; for a genuine letter of the Pope is extant of January 23rd, 1156, in which Theobald, Archbishop of Canterbury, is strongly rebuked for having "submitted to the king by joining with him in forbidding appeals to the Holy See."

Cardinal Rampolla, to whom especially the wire-pulling and canvassing are attributed, declared on the death of Pope Leo that this was the signal for his own retirement from public life.

This was certainly not the language which we should expect from one who was ambitiously aiming to obtain for himself, or even for some one of his friends, the supreme office. In fine, of the whole body of Cardinals we can truly say that they are men noted for their personal disinterestedness and piety and for their dignified bearing, and they should be the last men in the world to whom the machinations spoken of by the Roman correspondents should be attributed.

A further evidence that Cardinal Rampolla had no thought of these

machinations is to be found in the fact that it is now considered to be settled that he is to retire from the Secretaryship of State, and that Cardinal Martini, who was recently the Papal delegate to the United States, will fill their position which was so ably filled by Cardinal Rampolla.

There is no doubt that Cardinal Martinelli who filled so well his office as delegate of the Apostolic See on this continent, is well furnished with the ability and experience necessary for the performance of the duties of the important position to which it is expected he will be called.

We say unhesitatingly that those religious papers which so readily assumed that everything stated by the correspondents in regard to the Papal election was true, did so through antipathy to the Pope, whom they pretend still to regard as anti-Christ, and to the Catholic Church. We do not expect them to retract their ill-natured aspersions, for that is something they never do.

We must add that even while the correspondents declared that Pope Pius X. was elected unanimously, they took care to add that there were many sour faces among the Cardinals when his election was announced. It must be admitted by any candid reader that these two statements are not very consistent with each other.

THE SUPPOSED BULL "LAUDABILITER" OF ADRIAN IV.

We have received from the University of Chicago Press a pamphlet of eighty-eight pages written by Professor Oliver Joseph Thatcher of that University, entitled "Studies concerning Adrian IV. on the offer of Ireland to Henry II."

Mr. Thatcher remarks that "the subject of which his work treats 'is one which has puzzled historians, and its discussion has been obscured and embittered by the hostilities engendered by differences in race, in nationality and in religion.'"

Pope Adrian IV. was the only Englishman who was ever elected to the Pontifical throne of St. Peter. He was chosen on Dec. 5th. in the year 1154 and occupied the position of Head of the Church till his death in 1159. Henry II. came to the English throne on the death of Stephen in October 1154, and was crowned solemnly on December 19th in the same year.

He had before this contemplated for many years the subjugation of Ireland, and it is asserted by certain historians that he obtained from Adrian a Bull authorizing him to enter and possess Ireland in order to sow in that country "the acceptable seed of God's word," and "to bring the people to obedience to law, and to root out from among them foul sins and wickedness, as also to yield and pay yearly out of every house, a yearly pension of one penny to St. Peter."

The authenticity of this Bull has been denied by most Irish historians, and it is the object of Professor Thatcher's investigations to ascertain whether or not its authenticity can be established.

The document is asserted to have been obtained by Henry in 1156; yet it is certain that Henry did not attempt to occupy Ireland in virtue thereof, for it was not till May 1169, and then it was on the invitation of the tyrant Dermot MacMorogh, king of Leinster, who had been abandoned by his vassals and deposed for his profligacy by Roderic O'Connor, king of Ireland, that the Normans knights Fitz Stephen and others, who were soon afterward reinforced by Richard Strongbow, invaded Ireland.

Henry himself did not go to Ireland to take possession thereof till 1172, and even then he did not advance any claim upon the island by virtue of the Pope's supposed donation, but solely by right of his own partial conquest.

On the other hand, it is sure that already at the time when Pope Adrian's Bull is said to have been issued, King Henry II. was not in good odor with Adrian; for a genuine letter of the Pope is extant of January 23rd, 1156, in which Theobald, Archbishop of Canterbury, is strongly rebuked for having "submitted to the king by joining with him in forbidding appeals to the Holy See."

Cardinal Rampolla, to whom especially the wire-pulling and canvassing are attributed, declared on the death of Pope Leo that this was the signal for his own retirement from public life.

This was certainly not the language which we should expect from one who was ambitiously aiming to obtain for himself, or even for some one of his friends, the supreme office. In fine, of the whole body of Cardinals we can truly say that they are men noted for their personal disinterestedness and piety and for their dignified bearing, and they should be the last men in the world to whom the machinations spoken of by the Roman correspondents should be attributed.

A further evidence that Cardinal Rampolla had no thought of these

country was surely not great, and this fact itself would give rise to a strong suspicion that the so-called Bull attributed to Pope Adrian is a forgery.

In addition to this, Ireland is described in the Bull as a country would be described which had not yet received the light of faith, or that it was overrun by Pagan or Mahometan invaders. But this was not the case, as the Danes had been driven out from Ireland nearly a century and a half before the Bull was supposed to have been written, and at this period there was no country more thoroughly Christian or more faithful to the Holy See than Ireland.

But Professor Thatcher discovers inherent evidences in the so-called Bull itself to show that it is certainly a forgery. In fact the theory that it is genuine would, according to the Professor, show that all the forms which are accustomed to be used in conferring territory had been neglected in this instance by the Roman cancellaria, an hypothesis which cannot be seriously maintained.

The professor compares this supposed Bull with Bulls which belong to the same period, and it is found to differ from them all in many essential respects, and to such a degree that its spuriousness becomes evident. The conclusion reached by him is that the Bull Laudabiliter, which is the word with which the document begins, was merely "a student's exercise."

According to the Professor, "had before him a genuine letter of Adrian IV. from which he borrowed several sentences, adopting them badly and in an awkward way to suit his purpose."

The professor gives excellent reasons for the conclusion at which he has arrived, but the arguments by which he has fortified his theory are too long to be given here in full. We shall therefore add only that they are well sustained by comparison with authentic official documents of the same period and the same Pope. The conclusion arrived at confirms what is generally maintained by Irish historians that the celebrated Bull Laudabiliter, which is found in the official Bullarium of Rome, is but a lame attempt to cast odium on the Popes on account of their supposed claim to dominate, or even own all Christian, as well as all non-Christian lands.

Professor Thatcher's pamphlet is a work of great research which may be obtained from the University of Chicago Press, the price being \$1.00. We have no doubt that many of our readers who take an interest in the study of Irish history, will be glad to add this little volume to their libraries.

CHEAP MARTYRDOM.

Recently ten thousand representatives of sixty Free Church Churches in London met in the Albert Hall to protest against the Government's London Educational Bill. This Bill is based on the same general principles as the Educational Bill of the Kingdom, which provides for giving the same Government aid to the voluntary or denominational schools which has for the last thirty years been given to the Board schools which are secular in their teaching—even to Godlessness; and we have had recently several British non-Conformist ministers who have preached in Canadian churches upholding the English non-Conformist position, the latest being the Rev. Mr. Campbell, a prominent Presbyterian clergyman of London, England, who preached on this line in Montreal.

The general Educational Bill for England has been the law of the land for some months, but owing to the very great population of London, it was necessary to make provision for the management and conduct of the city schools, somewhat different from that of the rural districts; and this is the present issue. The same opposition which has been given to the general Educational Bill is being offered to the Bill for London city; and it has been remarked that throughout the violent discussions which have taken place on the subject, scarcely a word has been said of the proper education of the children, but all has turned upon the religious cry. It is a fight for the most part between the clergy of the Established Church and their backers, and those of the so-called Free Churches.

Catholics, who have a very complete system of religious schools throughout England, naturally take side with the Anglicans in this discussion, as the battle is for the right of giving to their children a Catholic education, without being obliged to pay also for the education of those who wish religion to be altogether excluded from the schools.

The Methodists have likewise their denominational schools in England, but, strange as it is, they appear to have abandoned the party of free education in the present contest, and to have thrown in their lot with that of the non-Conformists in general. The sentiment of non-Conformity, and of being with the other Free Churches in a battle with the Established Church,

has proved too strong for even the motive of their real interest, and at the last Conference of the Methodist body it was resolved by a considerable majority to side with the Free Churches in this contest, though a respectable minority were in favor of the opposite policy.

Passive resistance to the law has been recommended by many Free Church ministers speaking in public at meetings gathered to oppose the passage of the Educational bill, and now that it has actually become law, the papers every day contain news of refusals to pay rates in divers parts of England. This is what the "passive resistance" which has been recommended means.

It is not proposed to resist the tax-gatherers by force, but when they come to gather the taxes, the ratepayer is to refuse payment, and as a matter of course, his chattels are seized to the amount necessary to cover the sum required. The goods are put up at public auction, and are usually bought in by the recalcitrant ratepayer himself or by one of his friends for him, and the brave ratepayer gains the glory of martyrdom at the somewhat low price of the bailiff's charges. It is a cheap way of becoming a martyr, but it pleases the sufferer (?) and he may be placed on the calendar of martyrs for the admiration of future generations.

There is no doubt that there are rare occasions when the laws of the land are to be disobeyed, because the human law is wrong. Thus the Apostles of Christ when they were commanded not to preach His Gospel, proclaimed that they must do this because they had received the command from God Himself to "teach all nations" and to preach that Gospel "to every creature."

When the governors of provinces commanded them to keep silence in regard to Christ and His teaching and miracles they could justly say: "It is better to obey God and men."

The Divine law is undoubtedly above the civil law, and when the laws of the land enact what the law of God forbids, the law of God must be obeyed in preference.

But it is not sufficient to say, "my conscience tells me that it is wrong to put the education of the children of England into the hands of the priesthood." This is what the non-conformists say in vindication of the position they have taken.

Some people make up their minds that they are obliged to a line of conduct to which they are in reality not bound, and the vagaries of the human intellect are such that some people even imagine that they are bound to do what is in reality wrong. There are in fact false as well as right consciences, and when laws appear to conflict, it is our duty to weigh well on which side is the right.

In the present instance the passive resisters declare that conscience tells them they should not contribute to the religious education of the children of Anglicans and Catholics, whereas the recently enacted laws oblige them so to do. One speaker, Mr. Channing, said amid great applause at the great Hyde Park meeting held some weeks ago to protest against the London Educational Bill:

"The Educational Bills have swept away religious liberty, and handed over the children of the schools to the merciless despotism of the priests and the sacerdotal clergy."

Let the matter be examined judicially instead of passionately, and it will be found that such is not the case. The Government has assumed the responsibility of supporting education. There may be two opinions on the question whether or not it is advisable that the Government should take on itself the whole of this burden or not. Our own contention is that the Government does well to support and even to enforce education, but to do so in such a way as to leave parents perfectly free to give such religious education to their children as they see fit. The religious education of the children is certainly not the duty of a government which has so mixed a population to deal with as exists in England or in Canada. But neither should the Government give an advantage to those who wish for no religion in the schools, over those who wish to have religious teaching for their children.

Before the institution of the Board schools, there was perfect equality. All were free to send their children to such schools as they thought fit to establish, and most of the schools gave religious teaching for the reason that most of the people desired teaching of this kind. In fact, most of the teaching was done by the Churches. When the Board schools were established, at once an undue advantage was given to those who desired to exclude religion from the schools, as the Board schools alone received adequate Government assistance, while the religious schools were left to struggle with little or no aid from the taxes of the people towards which all had contributed. A great injustice was thus inflicted upon the majority, and the recent educational legislation was designed to correct this

injustice by placing the voluntary or denominational schools on the same plane with the Board schools. We maintain, therefore, that the Educational Bills against which the non-conformists are protesting so loudly are merely the corrective of a gross injustice which was, unintentionally perhaps, but not the less really, inflicted upon the large majority of the people who sent their children to the voluntary schools.

The non-Conformists will not be asked under the Educational laws to support a religious education against which their consciences revolt, but they will merely be required to let the advocates of religious education use that portion of the taxes which they have paid to the tax-collector, for the education of their own children. From this it will be seen that the cheap martyrdom they are seeking is a martyrdom in the cause, not of religious liberty, but of irreligious tyranny.

It is not expected that the determined manifestations of opposition on the part of the non-Conformists to the London Educational Bill will make the Government hesitate in pushing it through Parliament. A wrong has been done to the large majority of the people, and the Government is determined to rectify that wrong, firm in the belief that it will be sustained by that majority, even though the minority is acting strenuously to have the wrong perpetuated.

THE IRISH LAND BILL.

The Irish Land Bill has passed its crucial ordeal in the House of Lords, and now goes back to the House of Commons for the consideration of the amendments added in the Upper House. The amendments made are in the interest of the Irish landlords, and were introduced at the desire of the landlords. The principal amendment increases the provision made for the legal expenses of the landlords out of the British exchequer.

The Duke of Devonshire said, before the passing of the Bill to a third reading, that he is unable to forecast what action the House of Commons will take on the landlords' amendments, nevertheless he expressed confidence that the Government will not be altogether irreconcilable in regard to them.

From this it is inferred that the amendments will be accepted, and that the Bill will become law with the amendments incorporated in it by the Lords, or at least that it will be passed if the Irish Nationalists are willing to accept it in its changed shape. This, they will most probably do.

Lord Abercorn, on behalf of the landlords, thanked the Duke for his courteous reception of the amendments, and said he believed the bill would be a great benefit to the whole people of Ireland. He trusted that the House of Commons will receive the amendments in the same spirit in which they were taken by the House of Lords in passing them.

Later news is to the effect that the House of Commons has passed the Bill with the amendments of the Lords, two unimportant amendments excepted. This proved to be no obstacle to the final passage of the Bill, as a committee from the House of Commons waited upon the Lords to arrange for its acceptance, and the matter being satisfactorily arranged, the Bill was passed and will become law as soon as the Royal assent is given. It will come into operation next November.

A SOCIALISTIC SNEER.

The spirit which animates the godless party of Italy is well shown by an article published by the Socialistic organ at Rome, The Avanti, which says in reference to the death of Pope Leo XIII.: "We Socialists, without disdain but with indifference, pass before this corpse and await the new enemy."

While the whole world, Protestant as well as Catholic, stands respectfully and with uncovered head before the bier of the great, good and venerable successor of St. Peter, acknowledging that he had been in love for all mankind's Vicar on earth, this representative of Socialism stands alone in casting a stone at the illustrious and much lamented dead.

The Avanti is, of course, aware that the new Pope will be as stern a foe to godlessness—whether it appears under the character of Socialism, Atheism or Pantheism—as was Leo XIII., and in the future Popes as well as in those Popes who have passed out of this life, Atheism in all its forms will have an unrelenting adversary. But no such assumed indifference as that behind which the publisher of the Avanti masquerades, will turn any successor of Leo XIII. from the path of rectitude or Christian morality, for the promise of Christ will hold good to the end of time, that the gates of hell shall not prevail against His Church, with which He will abide even to the consummation of the world. The spirit of socialism, at least in its rabid form, is the spirit of the demon.

The Canadian itself as pleased effect which it of the revolt against the nat pal," which wa can Church in that country h dependent. In the very fact feeling against lent reason to Church of C adopt it as hopes also that banished from government c trying to sub name of the " Altogether, name in the appear to be supposed, as Episcopal Co of name wa against chan to 2.

The Americ thus once mo that it is u Church in the fathers took which is to existence is Catholic Ch It was not, recently as name Prot "witness cause it pr ings of the of the argu as it was which the G that name in it was made Church in deemed nec can Church England. Anglicanism present-day of the Chur many hund risen withi years to di the unity true of the United Sta mother Ch and of its s of England and Cana Protestant faith, a Church pose, if the a Cathol protest.

The soc or may not adopted States at tury, but any bette was forece ing laws dominant their shou but it has be the c neither r the Chur no longer the sold change, a will tell become f We m Lord Ro of Lord popular ous dict Histor that th The Lu Diet of against which v It had Worms Lutherer the way of hear tained ity wh further would

It was re Osborn sermon the d etymolo attestat He name a posi truth. The n in the accep the p ful ex it any tion,

It was re Osborn sermon the d etymolo attestat He name a posi truth. The n in the accep the p ful ex it any tion,

It was re Osborn sermon the d etymolo attestat He name a posi truth. The n in the accep the p ful ex it any tion,

It was re Osborn sermon the d etymolo attestat He name a posi truth. The n in the accep the p ful ex it any tion,

It was re Osborn sermon the d etymolo attestat He name a posi truth. The n in the accep the p ful ex it any tion,

It was re Osborn sermon the d etymolo attestat He name a posi truth. The n in the accep the p ful ex it any tion,

It was re Osborn sermon the d etymolo attestat He name a posi truth. The n in the accep the p ful ex it any tion,

It was re Osborn sermon the d etymolo attestat He name a posi truth. The n in the accep the p ful ex it any tion,

It was re Osborn sermon the d etymolo attestat He name a posi truth. The n in the accep the p ful ex it any tion,

It was re Osborn sermon the d etymolo attestat He name a posi truth. The n in the accep the p ful ex it any tion,

It was re Osborn sermon the d etymolo attestat He name a posi truth. The n in the accep the p ful ex it any tion,