

The Catholic Record.

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

VOLUME XXX.

LONDON, ONTARIO SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 1 1908

1528

The Catholic Record

LONDON, SATURDAY, FEB. 1, 1908.

THE GENTLE ART OF "KNOCKING."

In the course of a long communication addressed to this office a writer thumps over oft repeated commonplaces ancient Catholic writers and journals. His is a melancholy story inspired mayhap by biliousness. We dare not to suggest a remedy, for men of this type avoid anything that might conduce to a healthy mind. They seem to be content to see things which are not visible to others and to harp endlessly and monotonously on our shortcomings. Why, they ask, are books by Catholics so expensive. It is a pity that their craving for light and truth cannot be satisfied for nothing. But this grievance is due to either misinformation or ignorance. It is merely a "bluff," because the average book from the Catholic press is not a whit more expensive than the output of its secular competitor.

That Catholic writers are far inferior to others is a debatable question. They do not concoct smelly messes ye olde problem novels, but some of them can and do write stories which leave no stain on the mind, and as interesting withal as any of their belated rivals. So let us be honest. Fiction, by the Catholic, is not at an exorbitant price. The Catholic Truth Societies' books cannot tax the resources of the most modest purse. Let us forswear jaundiced remarks and give to Catholics, if not the support that represents money, at least that which connotes sympathy with its aims and ambitions.

LEST WE FORGET.

It is to our mind not an inopportune time to reiterate that our politicians are not necessarily representative Catholics. When we speak of a Catholic we have in view one who obeys the Church, and manifests in his life the love and truth he claims to possess. A few honied words before an election should not make us a whetstone for the political razor. We should rather give our support to the non-Catholic of integrity than to the Catholic who is deficient in character. From the man who values the plaudits of his conscience more than the applause of the crowd, who is chary of promises and averse to questionable methods, we can get far more efficient service than from the gentleman whose policy is that of expediency, who does not promise as prodigally as John D. does not dollars to his Baptist University, and whose devices are frowned upon by the Church. If politicians must carry our banners their hands should be clean, their honor untarnished, their devotion to the Church above suspicion. If we cannot trust our wives and daughters to them, we must assuredly deny them any prominent part in the safeguarding of our interests.

We are not essaying the roll of amateur reformer, who is a nuisance, and whose efforts are futile to the verge of paths. We merely point out that as we are not few in numbers and not unendowed with common-sense we should be an insuperable obstacle to the political progress of the gentlemen who are Catholics on occasion.

WITH A DIFFERENCE.

Deprecating the notion that the Church of England began with Henry VIII, the Bishop of London says that the Bishops of London have sat in Fulham Palace, without a break, for thirteen hundred years. But he forgets to add that between the bishops of pre-Reformation days and those of the English Church of the present day, there is no connection except that they occupy the same soil. The office of the Bishop of London is not the same as it was before Henry VIII. There is no link, either historical or organic, between them. He is not the successor of the pre-Reformation Bishop of London because he has not the same office and because his religious tenets are entirely and essentially different. Before Henry VIII, the English prelates obeyed the Pope "as their venerated Father whom the whole Catholic world has recognized as worthy of all love, while confiding to him the government of Christ's Church."

That the Headship of the Pope was admitted is beyond the pale of doubt.

AN AUTHORITY.

Professor Matland shows, in his History of English Law, that the whole legal procedure in pre-Reformation

times was marked by "stark papalism."

In History of Edward III, by J. Baker, p. 129, we find the following excerpt from a letter written by Edward to the Pope:

"If any evil suggestion to the contrary (his obedience) come to the ears of your Holiness, let it not be believed all the son who is concerned be heard before the Tribunal of your Holiness presiding over every creature which to deny is heresy."

Is this the belief of the Bishop of London of to-day? Does he echo the professions of loyalty to the Pope that fell from the lips of the prelates who sat in Fulham Palace before Henry VIII. His jurisdiction comes from the State: that of the pre-Reformation bishops from the Roman See. But what possible connection is there between a Bishop who, holding to the Thirty Nine Articles, believes that the Mass is a blasphemous and dangerous deceit, in two sacraments, etc., and the Catholic prelates who lived in the days when the English Church was free and not trammelled by the civil power.

But the Bishop of London is optimistic as to the future. To him it is unshaken by any shadow of evil portent, though others as spiritual-minded, if not as sanguine as he is, get small comfort out of the wrangling and dissension among the adherents of the modern Church of England, the little attention given to episcopal mandates, and the drift to Rome.

To the Bishop's declaration that "we stand for freedom of thought, freedom for study," we may say that his communion has stood for many things, and has, in a word, viewed with complacency incompatible opinions and teachings within its pale. That we do not exaggerate the case may be seen from the following words of Rev. Dr. Lee, written when he was Vicar of Lambeth: "For it is not perfectly true—would it were not!—that members of the Church of England—that is, all English men—may believe what they please and deny what they please? The Holy Scriptures may be inspired, or they may not. Baptism may convey grace, or it may not. The Eucharist may be regarded as a true sacrifice, or no sacrifice at all. The eternal punishment of the wicked may be accepted or rejected. The Apostolic Succession and the priesthood may be either fundamental doctrines or medieval superstitions."

A MATTER OF HISTORY.

The Bishop of London speaks of a great Bishop leading the barons of England, and presenting the Magna Charta to King John. And this king was forced by Innocent III. to do penance and to make good all damages he had done to the Church. More, on May 15, 1213, he knelt before the Legate Pandolph, at Dover, and surrendered his dominions into the hands of Innocent and received them back, promising to give allegiance to the Roman Pontiff and his successors.

The "great Bishop" Langton says that he made King John swear that he would do away with unjust laws and would recall good laws such as those of King Edward. It went hard with this imperious and ambitious ruler to submit, but the fact that he did is proof enough that an English King did not at that time dare to incur the anathema of the Holy Father, and that England was intensely Catholic. It is a far cry from King John to Queen Elizabeth, who told the Bishop of Ely that he was her delegate. "Proud prelate," she says, "I understand you are backward in complying with your agreement, but I would have you know that I who made you what you are, can unmake you, and if you do not forthwith fulfil your engagement, by God I will immediately unroof you." Even Mr. Proude admits that the Queen desires to dress up her Bishops as counterfeits of the Catholic hierarchy; and half in reverence, half in contempt, compel them to assume the name and character of a priesthood which both she and they know in their hearts to be an illusion and a dream.

THE SUCCESSOR.

The Bishop of London refers to the gift of a pulpit made from stones of Canterbury Cathedral, the shrine of St. Augustine. The Archbishopric of Canterbury is no longer the See of St. Augustine's successor. Canterbury Cathedral no longer bears witness to the faith that was treasured by so many generations before Henry VIII; it no longer teaches that the Pope is the Teacher and Guardian of sound doctrine, and with the Church of Rome on account of her more perfect headship, it is necessary that every Church,

that is, the faithful everywhere disoriented, should agree. Our wish is that the non-Catholic may be enabled to see that St. Augustine's successor is not at Canterbury but in substance at Westminster in the person of the present Catholic Primate of England.

CATHOLIC TAXES FOR ROMAN CATHOLIC SEPARATE SCHOOLS.

For the benefit of Separate school trustees and supporters we give the result of an arbitration made by His Honor Judge Snider, in the city of Hamilton, concerning the errors made by certain officials in the employ of the City Council.

All city officials are paid by Catholics the same as by other citizens and we assume that the Hamilton officials are a fair sample of the officials in other parts of the Province and it is certain that every Separate School Board in Ontario should at once look into the finances and make sure that the taxes of all Catholic ratepayers are really secured for the benefit of the Separate schools to which they belong.

The arbitration was brought about as follows:

The friends and supporters of the Roman Catholic Separate schools in the city of Hamilton having experienced great difficulty in the collection of their rates and taxes in the past and it might be said that this difficulty has been in existence with reference to Separate schools ever since the Separate school laws in this province, the Separate school laws were favored with Separate school laws in this province, the Separate school laws or in the working of the machinery therein supplied for the collection of Separate taxes, but the difficulty arose through the carelessness, errors of judgment or intentional errors on the part of the officials in the employ of the city of Hamilton who had in charge the task of collecting and appropriating the moneys which were levied and rated upon the Separate school supporters for the purpose of maintaining their schools.

Very many years ago it was contended by the late city solicitor and also by the late city clerk that unless a notice in writing was given by a Separate school supporter to the effect that he was a Roman Catholic and wished to support Separate schools he would be placed as a Public school supporter. This was even carried to such an extent that if the Separate school supporter who had already given notice in one block in the city when he was assessed in one year and should at the next year be living in the next block when the assessment was being made he would be placed as a Public school supporter. The present matter was referred to the assessor (who in many instances had been the assessor for many years and knew the rate payer well) being that he was not the same person who was assessed in the previous year. If, however, he saw fit to put down the Roman Catholic as a supporter of Separate schools and such notice was not available in the city clerk's office the city clerk took upon himself the duty of changing the assessment rolls and placing him as a supporter of Public schools. The Separate school supporters were obliged to strike an extra rate in order to maintain their schools and this was caused principally by reason of the school tax not going to the proper school boards for reasons herein before in part set forth.

The Hamilton Separate School Board being of opinion that their taxes were not all coming to them as a Public school supporter. The present matter was made by the city assessors, to go through the assessment rolls at great expense to themselves and find out, as they did, the numerous errors that were contained in the rolls, their only object in view was to obtain what justly belonged to them. Having ascertained the great number of mistakes and alterations hereinbefore referred to the Separate School Board went to the expense of obtaining new notices from the Separate school supporters and deposited them with the city clerk. This state of affairs continued for many years until the year 1907 when the Separate School Board seeing that were constantly losing money by the old method of affairs determined to investigate matters and they placed the matter of their school affairs and assessment and taxes in the hands of their solicitor, Mr. M. J. O'Reilly, K. C., who at once took matters up with the Mayor of Hamilton. The matters in dispute were referred by the Mayor to the city clerk and by the city clerk to the Finance Committee of the city of Hamilton, and by the Finance Committee referred to the City Council and by the City Council they were referred to the Judge of the County Court who arbitrated thereon and finally handed out his reward, a synopsis of which is here under written.

Under the judgment the Separate schools of Hamilton receive from the city almost \$5,000, of which they had been unjustly deprived. What is of much more importance, however, is that the law is once and for all clearly defined in the matter, as will be seen from the following synopsis:

SEPARATE SCHOOL TAXES.

In the recent arbitration between the Board of Trustees of the Roman Catholic Separate schools for the City

of Hamilton and the Municipal Corporation of the City of Hamilton the errors in assessing Roman Catholic Separate school supporters and in collecting the taxes therefrom were clearly shown and the law with reference to Roman Catholic Separate schools has been clearly and distinctly defined.

Under Separate School Act, being R. S. O., Chapter 24, Section 43, it is provided that an index book shall be kept for the purpose of entering the names of Separate School Supporters. By Section 49 of the Separate School Act it is also provided as follows:

"The Assessor shall accept the statement of, or made on behalf of the rate payer by his authority, and not otherwise, that he is a Roman Catholic, as sufficient prima facie evidence for placing such person in the proper column of the Assessment Roll as a Separate school supporter, or if the Assessor knows personally any rate payer to be a Roman Catholic this shall also be sufficient for placing him in such last mentioned column."

By reason of the latter section it is clear that a Roman Catholic known to be such to the Assessor must be placed on the Assessment Roll as a Separate school supporter unless the Assessor give reasons to the contrary, and the contention is borne out and fortified by the Assessment Act of 1904, being 4, Edward 7, 1904, page 101, Section 27 of said act provides as follows:

"That where the entry in the index book kept under the Separate School Act does not show a rate payer to be a supporter of Separate schools the Assessor shall accept the statement of the rate payer or a statement made on his behalf, and by his authority and not otherwise, that he is a Roman Catholic as sufficient prima facie evidence for placing such person in the proper column of the Assessment Roll for Separate school supporters, or if the Assessor knows personally any rate payer to be a Roman Catholic this shall also be sufficient for placing him in such last mentioned column."

It is quite clear, therefore, that it would not be necessary that a notice should be given in order to entitle a rate payer to have his taxes go in support of Separate schools if he so desires them, and this was held by Chancellor Boyd and Mr. Justice Robertson in the case reported in 18 Ontario reports, at page 696, entitled "In the matter of Roman Catholic Separate schools." In that case several questions were referred to the High Court Judges above mentioned, and arguments thereon were made by Sir Charles Moss, now Chief Justice for the Court of Appeal for Ontario, and Dr. O'Sullivan, and the decision was handed out on the 23rd of December, 1899, upholding the contention stated above.

In the judgment delivered by Colin G. Snider, Esq., Senior County Judge of the County of Wentworth, to whom the present matter was referred, he finds "that a number of these incorrect assessments were caused partly by some of the assessors not searching the index book of these rates with sufficient care, partly to carelessness in comparing the assessment rolls with the assessor's field notes from which the rolls are made, and partly to the fact that the instructions given by the assessment commissioner to the assessors, was not in accordance with the law."

No Roman Catholic has been assessed as a supporter of Separate schools unless he had given notice in writing and that notice entered in the index book. No attention was paid to his request to be so assessed made to the assessor when making the assessment. If a man who had not given a notice in writing, by chance was, on request, put down by the assessor as a Separate school supporter the city clerk in making up the collector's roll made a practice of striking him off the Separate school list and putting him down as a Public school supporter. This course is not according to the Statute and the notices should be taken only as a guide and a verbal request of the rate-payer should be acted upon as well as the written notice.

The city clerk in all cases where the religion of a rate payer was given as a Roman Catholic in the assessment roll but who was not marked as a supporter either of the Separate or Public school puts every such rate payer down as a Public school supporter. The Separate School Act and the Assessment Act quite clearly make it the assessor's duty in every case where he has no special instructions as to which school to put down to accept the fact that a rate payer is a Roman Catholic as prima facie evidence that he is a Separate school supporter and it is his duty to put each such person in the Separate school list. If the assessor puts down no school but the letters "R. C." only, in my opinion the city clerk's duty is to act as the Assessor ought to have done but failed to do, that is, in the absence of instructions to the contrary, put each such person down in the Separate school tax column. There are a good many of such cases on the rolls."

It may be well said that the law is now settled on this point, and the fact of a rate payer being a Roman Catholic is sufficient without any other notice to be placed as a Separate school supporter. The duty is now cast upon, as it always has been, the assessor to show why such rate payer should not be placed as a Separate school supporter. Some instances have occurred where Roman Catholics were placed on the Assessment Roll as Protestants and supporters of Public schools, although they had originally sent in notices and stated their desire to be assessed as

Separate school supporters. Instances of this nature should be few, but it is one point which must be watched closely. For instance, cases have been shown where in the assessment roll the rate payer has been properly entered and recorded as a Roman Catholic Separate school supporter, but in the office of the clerk of the municipality in transcribing the name from the assessment roll to the collector's roll the change has been made and that rate payer has been put down as a Public school supporter. This also must be watched, but cases of this nature will be few now that the system of assessing Separate school supporters has been changed, and put on a proper footing; that is, to assess all Roman Catholics as Separate school supporters unless a reason to the contrary is shown.

HOW THE LAITY MAY CO-OPERATE.

In a recent sermon Cardinal Gibbons spoke of the way in which the early Christians—laymen as well as priests and Bishops—were apostles of the faith. He said:

"The primitive Christians aided the apostles not only by their edifying example, but also by their zealous co-operation. They were all missionaries on a limited scale. They were ever ready to give an account of the faith and the hope that were in them. The more enlightened lay converts, like Tertullian, Justin Martyr and Lactantius, vindicated the claims of Christianity by learned treatises. The merchant was a traveling missionary. Together with his wares, he brought a knowledge of Christ to the houses which he entered. The soldier preached Christ in the camp. The captive slave preached Him in the mines. The believing wife made known the Gospel to her unbelieving husband, and the believing husband to his unbelieving wife; and thus, as all nature silently though eloquently proclaims the existence and glory of God, so did the whole Christian family unite in magnifying the name and in proclaiming the divine mission of our Saviour Jesus Christ."

The Cardinal instanced this activity of the layman in the early Church as an example which should be followed by the Catholic layman of to-day. The Catholic laity should co-operate with the clergy in the work of making the Church of Christ better known and loved. He continued:

"But your faith should not only adorn your own person; it should also diffuse its heavenly perfume among those with whom you are thrown in family or social relations. We need your help. We have seen what valuable and efficient aid the primitive Christians rendered to the apostles in propagating the Gospel. And if the apostles, with all their piety, zeal and grace, could not have accomplished what they did without the help of the laity, how can we, ministers of the Gospel, who can not lay claim to their piety or zeal or eloquence, how can we hope to spread the light of the Gospel without your earnest concurrence?"

"How are you to co-operate with us? First by the open and manly profession of your faith, by 'being always ready to satisfy everyone that asketh you a reason for that hope that is in you.'"

"When you will cooperate that who differ in faith, by the right of expressing and maintaining their religious opinions, you must claim for yourselves the same privilege. You ask for nothing more. You will be content with nothing less. And surely if there is in this world anything of which you ought to be justly proud, it is this: That you are members of the religion of Christ. In the days of pagan Rome's imperial splendor, the Roman said with pride: 'I am a Roman citizen.' This was his noblest title. It was a title which even St. Paul claimed and vindicated when he was threatened with the ignominious punishment of scourging. The Roman was proud of the Republic because it was venerable in years, because of the vast extent of its domain, and because of the valor of its soldiers and the wisdom of its statesmen."

WE SHOULD GLORY IN THE CHURCH.

"And if the Roman was proud of being a Roman citizen, if you are proud of claiming the title of American citizen, how much more should you glory in being citizens of the republic of the Church."

"Do you seek for antiquity of origin? Nearly two thousand summers have already rolled over her head, and she is to-day as fresh and vigorous as when she issued from the cradle of Jerusalem. Time writes no wrinkles on her heavenly brow. She has seen the birth of every dynasty of Europe, and it is not impossible that she may witness the death of them all and chant their requiem."

"Do you seek for wide expanse of territory? Her spiritual dominion extends over the surface of the globe."

"Where will you find a wisdom comparable to that of her saints? There is a wisdom born not of man, but of God. And where will you find a heroism so sublime as that of her martyrs? There is a heroism not aroused by the sound of martial music or by the clash of arms on the battle field, or by a lust for fame, or by the emulation of comrades, but a heroism inspired by a love for God and their fellow beings."

"Above all, you can co-operate with us by the rectitude of your private lives and the influence of your example, 'having your conversation good among the Gentiles, that whereas they speak of you as evil doers, considering you by your good works, they may glorify in God in the day of visitation.' When God visits them by the light of His grace and removes from their eyes the scales of prejudice, your virtues will shine resplendent before them. 'Let your light then so shine before men that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father Who is in Heaven.'"

SUBSTITUTE FOR RELIGION.

"Religious therapeutics," is the latest fad devised to cure life into the decaying Protestant sects. Two Episcopalian clergymen of Boston first tried the scheme last fall and now Bishop Fallows of the Reformed Episcopal Church of Chicago has taken it up as an aid in church work. We are surprised that Mrs. Eddy is not out with an injunction to prevent infringement on her patent method of healing by suggestion—the so-called Christian Science.

Bishop Fallows is going to make cures of functional diseases as distinguished from organic—a distinction not recognized by Mrs. Eddy and her followers—a feature of his church. He is going to cure the body as well as the soul, or rather, the body instead of the soul. He says that he has had already thousands of applications for cures. "We don't doubt it, but we wonder how many of those who have applied care to begin the cure by putting their souls in order, and how many are more anxious about their souls than their bodies. It would be interesting too to know how many of them are suffering from diseases that are purely imaginary."

We are far from denying that the condition of the soul has an influence on that of the body or that functional diseases can be benefited through the soul. Catholics are frequent witnesses of the good effects that follow a worthy reception of the Sacraments. In many cases of grave illness these effects seem almost miraculous. A good conscience is frequently the best medicine.

But it is sad to see these attempts to substitute healing for real religion—to reduce theology to a science of health. Physical health is a good thing, but religion has to do primarily with higher things. "Religious therapeutics," as expounded by Bishop Fallows differs little from the un-Christian science and health of Mrs. Eddy. It is a sop thrown to the Cerebrus of modern craving for novelty and magical performances in place of religion. True Voice.

CATHOLIC NOTES.

It is currently reported that the Rev. Joseph T. Roche, LL. D., pastor of St. Mary's Church at Nebraska city, Neb., will succeed the late Rev. Thomas Judge as editor of the New World, the official organ of the archdiocese of Chicago.

It is rare that such extraordinary charity comes to light as that of the Right Rev. Bishop Spalding. For years no collection was taken up in the diocese of Peoria for the orphans. This year one was announced and then it developed that the gifted Bishop had been supporting his literary labors all the orphans of his diocese. Bishop Spalding's books make interesting reading; but every word he wrote will be autographed and sweetened by the memory of his wonderful charity to the orphans. His writings have now a new meaning for every human heart.

A roster of converts to the Church in this country, compiled by D. J. Scannell O'Neill, and published by E. Herder, St. Louis, had just been issued. It includes about 3,000 names. Of Protestant clergymen, 372 have gone over to Rome in this country, four of whom became prelates and 135 priests. Among army officers, 125 became Catholics; also 126 lawyers, 115 doctors and 86 occupying prominent official positions. Among authors, journalists and artists there were 206 converts.

The growth of the Catholic population within the Archdiocese of Chicago has made the creation of another diocese within that territory practically certain for some time. The new See will be at Rockford, Ill.

The chapel car which Bishop Hennessy has had in service in the diocese of Wichita, Kan., for the past eight months will be taken to North Dakota where it will visit new towns in Bishop Stanley's diocese. Bishop Hennessy returned last week from Chicago where he left the car for repairs preceding its trip.

At the marriage of John Kemper and Miss Anna Cook, both of Trenton, N. Y., the officiating priest was the Rev. Joseph Kemper, the father of the bridegroom. On the death of his wife in 1882, Father Kemper began his studies for the priesthood.

Rev. Charles L. Kearful, for nearly forty years a Catholic priest in Missouri and Kansas, has been notified by the state department at Washington that he is heir to a fortune of \$500,000 left by his uncle, Karl Kirkegold, a prominent wool merchant who died recently in Sidney, Australia. Father Kearful will start at once for Sidney to claim the estate, going by way of Rome, where he will visit the Pope. As he has a fortune of his own he intends to devote all of his inheritance to charity work in the St. Joseph diocese.