

THE CATHOLIC RECORD.

The Catholic Record.

Published Weekly at 184 and 186 Richmond Street, London, Ontario.

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

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

Messrs. Luke King, John Nigh and P. J. Neven are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transact all other business for The Catholic Record.

Agents for Newfoundland, Mr. T. J. Wall, St. John's.

Agents for Advertising—Ten cents per line each insertion, adme measurement.

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

Correspondence intended for publication, as well as that having reference to business, should be directed to the proprietor, and must reach London not later than Tuesday morning.

When subscribers change their residence it is important that the old as well as the new address be sent us.

Agents or collectors have no authority to stop your paper unless the amount due is paid.

Master intended for publication should be mailed in time to reach London not later than Tuesday morning. Please do not send us poetry.

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

To the Editor of THE CATHOLIC RECORD, London, Ont.:

Dear Sir:—For some time past I have read your estimable paper, THE CATHOLIC RECORD, and congratulate you upon the manner in which it is published.

Its matter and form are both good; and its Catholic spirit pervades the whole. The editors, with pleasure, I can recommend it to be faithful.

Believe me, and wishing you success, Yours faithfully in Jesus Christ, D. FALGOUTO, Arch. of Larissa, Anost. Delez.

LONDON, SATURDAY, AUG. 15, 1903.

POPE PIUS X.

We already announced in our last issue that a successor has been elected to the late Pope Leo XIII., the new Pope being Cardinal Sarlo, the venerated and much beloved Patriarch of Venice, Italy, and now, the last testimonies of respect and affection to Leo XIII. having been completed, we may again exclaim "Long live our Holy Father the Pope. May God grant him many years of life and a prosperous reign over the Church of God." The new Pope takes the name of Pius X.

The Papacy is an institution of God Himself, and cannot die, though the personage who fills it for a time is mortal, and thus the plenitude of St. Peter's authority, which for so long a period dwelt in Leo, now rests in his successor, Pius X.

The Conclave, by which name the assembly of Cardinals for the purpose of electing a Pope is called, met on Saturday, July 25th. There are at present 64 Cardinals, of whom two were unable to be present owing to illness.

There were, therefore, 62 Cardinals in Conclave, which is a larger number than were ever before assembled for the purpose of electing a Pope.

Two ballots were made on the first day, neither of which resulted in an election, as a two-thirds vote exclusive of the vote of the Cardinal chosen is necessary for a choice. The statement has been made that on the first ballot 20 votes were given to Cardinal Rampolla, 12 to Cardinal Vannutelli, 7 to Cardinal Gotti, 5 to Cardinal Oreglia, 4 each to Cardinals Sarlo, Di Pietro, and Capeolatro, 3 to Cardinal Agliardi, while the other three votes were scattering. This statement is said to be reliable, but we believe that it is mere gossip or speculation.

Six ballots were taken on Saturday, Sunday and Monday, without a choice, but on Tuesday morning when the seventh ballot was taken, it is said that the vote was unanimous for Cardinal Sarlo. Cardinal Casetta as scrutineer was reading out the vote as it was given, and when the number 42 was reached for the Patriarch of Venice, he raised his zuchetto or small cap saying "Habemus pontificem." "We have a Pope," but the other Cardinals called out "continue," and the full vote was read, after which according to the usual form the Pope-elect was asked if he would accept the Pontificate. He trembled so that he could hardly articulate, but after an effort which was plainly visible he began to reply: "If this cup cannot pass from me—," whereupon the Cardinals asked for a positive answer "yes or no." He then answered more firmly: "I accept." From that moment he became the Supreme Pontiff of the Church. He selected the name Pius X. whereby he should be known, and while the official record of the election was being made out with its acceptance, the Holy Father was attended in his pontifical white robes, after which he was conducted to the throne where he received the first homage or "obedience" of the whole body of the Cardinals. Then a solemn Te Deum was sung by all with such touching effect that there was no dry eye among those present at the scene.

It is noted in the despatches that the Holy Father "bore himself with becoming dignity, and gave no sign of exultation in this the supreme moment of his life." When Mgr. Merry del Val as secretary of the Conclave presented to the Holy Father the Papal white cap, he placed it calmly on his head, and dropped his red cap lightly on the Secretary's head. This is understood

to be an indication that the Secretary, Monsignore Merry del Val, will soon be raised to the Cardinalate. Mgr. del Val is well known to Canadians, having spent some time in this country on a special mission entrusted to him by the late Holy Father Leo XIII., and his elevation will give great satisfaction and pleasure to the many friends and admirers whom he made in Canada by his dignified and affable manner while he remained in this country.

Pope Pius X. late Giuseppe (Joseph) Sarlo, was born in the Rieti, Province of Venice, on June 2nd, 1835, and is therefore sixty-eight years old. He was ordained priest at the age of twenty-three years, or in his twenty-fourth year, and from the beginning of his priesthood he was distinguished for humility, and for his solicitous care of the poor. In 1875 he was made chancellor of the Bishop of Treviso, later he became director of the Seminary, judge of the ecclesiastical tribunal, and finally Vicar-General. In 1884 he was appointed by Pope Leo, Bishop of Mantua, and in 1893 he was made Cardinal, and Patriarch of Venice, which is a dignity higher than that of an Archbishop, though its duties are very much the same. His Cathedral in Venice, the celebrated St. Mark's, was built in 977, and is one of the most beautiful edifices of medieval times.

The new Pope is regarded as the greatest preacher in the Church, and is a noted theologian and general scholar. He did not mix himself much with the political problems with which the Holy See was troubled in late years, and it was said at first that he would scarcely be able to grapple with them successfully, though he is admitted to be a most able administrator; but when on Thursday, the 6th inst., he was waited on by the diplomatic body who came to pay him homage, the diplomats were surprised to find that he had a very intimate knowledge of the politics of their respective countries. He also spoke to them in excellent French, which was another surprise.

The coronation of the Holy Father took place on Sunday, August 9th, in presence of a vast multitude.

The government of all the nations seem to be highly pleased at the election of Pope Pius X., as his well known character for piety, his benevolence, and his graciousness give promise of an era of international cordiality with the Vatican.

The Holy Father is greatly beloved by the people of Venice, and we are confident that he will also have the love as well as the respect of Catholics throughout the world. The Catholic Record wishes him a long and happy career.

THE IRISH LAND LAW.

No time has been lost, in the House of Lords in passing the Irish Land Bill through its various stages, for we learn by the cable despatches that it has already passed its second reading in that House, though it went through its final stage of a third reading in the House of Commons only on July 21st.

On behalf of the Government the Earl of Devonshire explained to the House that the bill should pass without serious change as it was a covenant between the three parties, the Government, the landlords, and the tenants, and that therefore any serious change might imperil the whole agreement, and delay indefinitely the solution of a problem which had been in the past a most troublesome question. The lords evidently assented to the Duke's view of the matter as the Bill has passed so far without change. This may be taken as an indication that the day of peace between Ireland and England has come at last.

It was feared that the consummation would be marred by amendments to the Bill while it was before the House of Lords, but these prognostications of evil have not been realized, and according to usage they are not likely to be realized before the Bill passes its third reading, as it is before the second reading that serious discussion on important points usually takes place.

Mr. John Redmond did not, from the beginning, entertain the thought that the Lords would spoil the bill by mutilating it, inasmuch as that House has many Irish landlords among its members, and he felt confident that in their interest the peers would assent to the compromise to which the landlords had willingly, and even gladly assented.

There is one feature of the debates upon the Land Bill to which Mr. Redmond called attention, and which is well worthy of special notice. "During the debates," says Mr. Redmond, "the English, Scotch, and Welsh members had absented themselves from the House of Commons, and Irishmen had shown that they could get on very well with Irish legislation in their absence. Mr. Wyndham, in fact, was the only Englishman who had taken part in the debates—and he is an Englishman who has a drop and a good drop

of Irish blood in his veins. The intricacies of this Irish Land Law had been debated in perfect amity by Irishmen of opposite parties, Unionists and Nationalists, representatives of tenants and of landlords."

Surely this is an evidence satisfactory enough that under Home Rule, Irishmen will be as able as people of any other nationality to pass good laws for their own prosperity."

Later reports state that notwithstanding the Duke of Devonshire's strong appeal to the Lords to accept the Land Bill as being a treaty of peace between the Empire and Ireland, it has been endangered in Committee of the Lords, and some amendments have been made to it against the express wish of the Government. It is still probable, however, that the Bill will not be so greatly mutilated as to cause its rejection.

THE CORONATION OATH AND THE ACT OF SUCCESSION.

To the Editor of THE CATHOLIC RECORD:—Sir—You say that Catholics regard as an insult not only the Accession Declaration, which certainly is insulting, but the very fact that English law excludes Catholics from the succession. I cannot see how. The King of England is by law Supreme Governor of the Church of England. Then, as Lord Macaulay remarks, it is not unreasonable that the law should require him to be a person who does not regard that body at the head of which he stands as being a heretical society.

The King of Spain is not the head of the Church of Spain, but is it an insult to Protestantism to require him to be a Roman Catholic? Would it become an insult if one fifth of the Spaniards were Protestants? Surely not.

Is it an insult to Calvinism that the law requires the King of Lutheran Sweden to be a Lutheran? Is it a joint insult to Catholics and Protestants together that the Czar of Russia must be of the Greek Church? Is it an insult to Christianity that the Sultan of Turkey must be a Mohammedan? Certainly not. Wherever, in any Kingdom, there is an established religion, surely it is not a grievance to religious sentiments that the Sovereign should be required to be an adherent of that religion.

CHARLES C. STARBUCK. Andover, Mass., U. S. A.

Our esteemed and respected correspondent is surprised at our statement that we consider it an insult to Catholics that English law excludes Catholics from succession to the throne. We are not greatly surprised that, being himself a Protestant, he should take an opposite view of the matter, but we regard it from a Catholic standpoint, and from our point of view there is one true Church of Christ, and one only. It is demonstrable that the Catholic Church is that one Church which Christ instituted, and which has continued to exist ever since its institution. Even Protestants in general admit this continuity while maintaining that she fell into error which made her cease to be the Church of Christ; but we maintain that the power of Christ and the guidance of the Holy Ghost make it impossible that His Church should cease to teach the truth.

This being the case, Catholics must hold that all antagonistic organizations are erroneous, being either heretical or schismatical, and we cannot admit that any other Church, so-called, which is of human origin, can possess the rights of the truth, or that there is any parity between it and the Catholic Church, whose origin is in God, at least from our point of view.

Our respected correspondent, the Rev. Mr. Starbuck, will see from this statement of the Catholic position that his argument, which is based upon a supposed parity of claims of Catholic and Protestant faith, falls to the ground. Error can never have the solid rights of truth, and man cannot give to a Church which he has organized the rights which belong only to the Church of Christ.

For these reasons we hold that the implication contained in the act of exclusion of Catholics from the throne of Great Britain is implicitly an assertion that the profession of the true religion is sufficient to render a person unfit to fulfill the duties of a king.

We are perfectly justified in maintaining that this is essentially an insult to Catholics, altogether independently of what may be law in other countries. Hence we do not deem it necessary to our purpose here to reconcile the position we have taken with the laws of Spain, Sweden, Russia, Turkey, etc. The Rev. Mr. Starbuck in appealing to these laws assumes that a Catholic can never grant, that the true Church should be in the same relative position to a state which false churches take. Nevertheless we shall add that there is this difference between Spain and England, that Spain has maintained the faith which she had for fifteen centuries, and her people are to this day almost all Catholic. In the British Empire the case is entirely different. The people of England were Catholics, and became Protestants only through persecutions of the Catholic Church, and the exclusion act was itself part and parcel of a persecuting code against the ancient religion.

It is true, as the reverend gentleman suggests, that Catholics are but a small minority in the British Isles, but before the depopulation of Ireland by repressive legislation, and before the persecuting laws in the three kingdoms, the disproportion was not so very great between Catholics and Protestants, so that that the insult was offered to a large percentage of the population of the country. Besides, the thirteen million of Catholics in the whole British Empire do not fall very far behind the number of members of the Established Church, of which alone the King is the Supreme Head. Why, then, unless for persecution's sake, should Catholics be singled out from among all manner of Christians to be not only excluded from the throne, but that their doctrines should be specially stigmatized in the Coronation Oath as idolatrous and superstitious, while the teachings and rites of Judaism, Buddhism and Mahometanism, and even of Agapemonism and Swedenborgianism, are treated with the greatest reverence under the law?

The Coronation Oath and the Act of Succession or exclusion from the throne form together an inseparable and insulting whole, and the Succession Act itself was passed only by a majority of one under terror of the Hessian troops of King William III. We consider, therefore, that we are thoroughly justified in regarding it as an insult, notwithstanding Rev. Mr. Starbuck's opinion to the contrary.

Nevertheless, as we stated in our article on this subject to which that rev. gentleman objects, we are not specially anxious that the insult implied in the exclusion act should be repealed. There is no Catholic in view whom we wish to see placed on the throne, and thus this grievance is rather a sentimental than a practical one. We confess that we should be pleased to see it removed, but we can endure it. But what we do earnestly desire as something practical is that the insult given in denouncing the Catholic doctrines every time a new Sovereign is enthroned, should be repealed. This will undoubtedly be done in the near future, in which case the sentimental grievance can be endured. Still we do not conceal our opinion that it is a real grievance all the same.

THE ENGLISH EDUCATION BILL.

A somewhat amusing debate is being carried on in some of the Montreal papers regarding the status of the Rev. R. J. Campbell, who is the successor of the Rev. Dr. Parker in the well known "City Temple" of London, England, the subject in debate being whether or not Mr. Campbell is to be regarded as occupying the position of "England's greatest preacher," the title which is given him by those who have interested themselves in introducing him to the Canadian public.

The Rev. Mr. Campbell preached or lectured recently in Montreal and Toronto against the London Educational Bill which is at present under consideration of the British House of Commons. He was heralded by advance notices of fulsome enthusiasm as the leader of the non-Conformist opposition to the Educational Bill, and he has been compared by some of his admirers with several of the noted preachers of English non-Conformity in the past to the disadvantage to them all. In fact one of the debaters in the present controversy declares that the Rev. Mr. Campbell "fills Dr. Parker's pulpit more adequately than ever, and the ideal of a Spurgeon, Beecher, Punshon, and Parker, rolled into one (all being non-Anglicans) is practically realized in Mr. Campbell. The evangelical directness of Spurgeon, the intense moral emphasis of Beecher, the power of popular appeal of Punshon, combine with Parker's superiority to the pomp of ecclesiasticism in the recognized leader of the London pulpit."

The Rev. Dyson Hague objects most decidedly to such a description of the rev. gentlemen who came from England to enlighten the Canadians on the dangers to be feared from the passing of the English Educational Act, and he has brought upon himself a storm of abuse for his attempt to belittle the estimation in which the Rev. Mr. Campbell is held.

We are not disposed to take either side in this dispute, but as the rev. gentleman is regarded by so many as the mouthpiece of English Dissenters, we consider that what he has to say on the English educational struggle will be of interest to our readers, especially as the matters in dispute regard the question of religious education, in which Canadian Catholics are deeply interested.

The Rev. Mr. Campbell set out in his Toronto lecture by declaring his loyalty to the British throne, and especially "to King Edward VII., whom he would not exchange for any Sovereign or President on earth, yet he feared that what he would have to say might detract slightly from the eulogium he had just pronounced on British institutions."

He admitted that previously to 1870 the various denominations of England had almost a monopoly of teaching the youth of the kingdom; but in that year "Mr. Gladstone's Elementary Education Act revolutionized the educational system of the country by the establishment of undenominational schools to supplant the Church schools."

We are next told that the schools of the British and Foreign School Society, the only undenominational educational body in England, left the field to the Board schools, but the sectarian schools remained and extended their influence. Premier Balfour in introducing the new Educational Bill said that the fact that the Church schools were attended by 3,000,000 children, while the Board schools had only 2,600,000 scholars showed that the people favored the former. It is easy, continues the Rev. speaker, "to understand the disparity when it is remembered that the Board schools could not be established where Anglican schools already existed. In rural districts, too, the Vicar or Rector was absolute master in educational affairs, and the Nonconformist laboring classes were in no position to object."

Here we must say that the Rev. Mr. Campbell does not state the case quite fairly. It was, as we understand the matter, made quite free to the people to establish Board schools wherever the Anglicans did not or would not agree that non-Conformist children should be exempt from the religious teaching given in the Anglican schools. Any one in Mr. Gladstone's place might have supposed that this provision would have been a sufficient guarantee against any interference with the religion of the non-Conformist children; for have we not been told over and over again that Protestantism is but one faith amid all its diversities? And this being the case there could be no great hardship—in fact, no hardship at all, nor violence to conscientious convictions so long as the children were well protected against any special teaching which might be construed as peculiar to Anglicanism, or to the High Church forms of Anglicanism, which we are told is the only form of Anglicanism which is objectionable to non-Conformists.

The case is quite different with Catholics, who wish for special religious teaching in the doctrines of the Catholic Church; but the desire of the non-Conformists appears to be now that they should have no religious teaching at all. It would seem that their desire was fully met by exempting their children from the religious teaching given in the school whenever they expressed their wish that this should be the case.

But to understand the case fully, it is necessary also to remember that the religious schools were to have, under Mr. Gladstone's law, only one half the sum necessary for their maintenance, while the Board schools were maintained entirely at the cost of the rate-payers in general. This is admitted by Rev. Mr. Campbell, who states this fact in his address, and that the other half of their maintenance was to be met by voluntary subscription.

Such an arrangement does not account for the larger attendance at the voluntary or denominational schools. It imposed on the supporters of the religious schools the burden of one half of the expense of maintaining the schools in which they educated their children, while they contributed their full share to the education of the non-Conformist children, in schools from which they derived no benefit whatever. We hold that this was a great injustice, and it accounts fully for the efforts they made to have the voluntary schools placed on the same footing in regard to Government aid as the Board schools.

We contend that laboring under such a disadvantage, it would not result as the Rev. Mr. Campbell maintains, in increasing the number of pupils in the voluntary schools. Its tendency would be to make the Board Schools more efficient, and better supplied with school furniture and apparatus. This fact would naturally make the Board Schools more desirable, and would help to swell the number of their pupils. If, therefore it is a fact, as it undoubtedly is, that the voluntary schools flourished, and had a larger attendance than the Board Schools, it was because a large majority of the people were in favor of giving a religious education to their children. The injustice would have been great if even a minority were thus treated; but it is almost inconceivable how Mr. Gladstone, in all his wisdom and desire to do justice to all classes, should have inflicted so grievous a wrong upon a decisive majority of his countrymen. We feel assured that he did not foresee the results which would follow from such legislation. He made a mistake by fathering such a law, and the only way we can account for it is that he thought that the whole people would have rejoiced to send their children to schools

in which no religion should be specially taught, when once these schools could be established.

As Rev. Mr. Campbell states, the efforts of the Voluntarists by the year 1899, brought it about that five sixths of the cost of education in the Voluntary schools was borne by the Government. But even this was not sufficient to satisfy justice. It is to remedy this, and to place the voluntary or religious schools on an equal footing with the Board schools, that the present Educational Bill was passed under the auspices of Mr. Balfour's Government, and not for the purpose of inflicting any injustice on the non-Conformists. Still less should he hold that Catholics have supported the Bill for the purpose of inflicting any injustice. The Catholics of England are in favor of the new law because they are included in the benefits conferred by it upon the large majority of the people of England, and because they are convinced that the law is just.

Rev. Mr. Campbell speaks of the heroism of the non-Conformists who have resolved to refuse payment of school rates under the recent law. He says that "thousands will refuse payment, and their goods will be seized. In one case, a farmer's cart worth £20 had been sold for £3. The non-Conformists mean to make a positive resistance by putting the Government to the trouble of collecting the rate by force. They do not object to paying the whole rate, but keep back that portion of it which will go to support the denominational schools."

That is to say, they are willing that the general public shall contribute towards maintaining their schools, but they do not wish to contribute a half-penny for the education of the children of the general public whose views of duty differ from their own. It is not such a disposition of injustice that constitutes a real martyr, but even the martyrdom these non-Conformists have decided to endure is a very cheap martyrdom. We have no doubt that the farmer who had his cart sold at a loss of £17, if he is a real soldier, bought it in himself at the bailiff's auction, so that he would only have the costs to pay in reality. At least this is what he would have done if he were thrifty, as we presume he was from his having property of such value. He will now have the glory of martyrdom in the estimation of his brethren, at very little expense to himself. The early Christians endured a martyrdom of a very different kind from this.

To these considerations we must add that Mr. Gladstone's law treated very scurvily the religious denominations which had been, as Rev. Mr. Campbell admits, the pioneers of education, in attempting practically to close their schools. This was as ungrateful an act as the French Government has been guilty of in closing by violent means the schools and benevolent institutions conducted by the religious orders.

A CASE OF RETRIBUTION.

A telegram from Algiers states that a body of 500 Moors of the Berber tribe recently attacked a French force of 50 native sharpshooters who were guarding 190 camels at Side El Jady. There was a brisk fight and the Berbers lost heavily, but for a civilized force armed with the best modern weapons fighting against a barbarous tribe with poor weapons, the French loss was remarkably large, 10 of the sharpshooters and 2 French corporals having been killed. The Berbers carried off all the camels.

This defeat has the appearance of being a retribution sent by Providence in punishment of the French soldiery for the share they had in suppressing the religious orders. And, further, the soldiers would not have been so readily overpowered were it not for the incompetency of the Government or in its officers leaving so weak a force exposed to an attack by a powerful force of Moriscos. This a parallel case to the defeat of the Italians some years ago by the army of King Menelik. These are not the only occasions on which the two anti-Catholic Governments have shown their incapacity to rule their respective countries. The French particularly have lost their ablest army officers by their want of religion, for many of their best and bravest officers resigned their commissions on account of the un congenial work in which they were asked to participate, namely, the closing of the religious schools, and the driving away into exile of unarmed monks and nuns who were engaged in the management of the benevolent works of the nation.

Essence of Worship.

Thanksgiving is of the very essence of Catholic worship. We thank God because we love Him, because His love of us touches us, surprises us, melts us, wins us. We must thank Him, too, that He gives us pains and crosses to draw us nearer to Him.

THE THEATRE

The Rev. Cyrus the Protestant Ep York City, was pres the Women's Press the assertion was that the theatre already taken as the teacher of that more people in the theatres of who is himself an ence that the way of educating churches.

The Rev. Mr. terminated to test education which giving, and for twenty-one play leaving aside vaudeville which very objectional and in most moral.

The results of investigations Bazaar, for J following: These twenty best class theatres, and view, eight we of these eight cent., are des dull." Two o of the most dis of neither orig of dialogue, no sort, save for and some be gowns and see

The acting even good act within the cat esting drama plays, and w crowds of pe

Of the dul two were m historical nov are in themse matization w neat contem

Four plays exceptional seen and he instances the kind which ences in the however inst matter of p character.

Julius Cesa two had fro Civil war fr en points of fourth was Middle Age

It thus ap ford a min when the m in: a min and in them from morals.

But the simply abou Eleven had tion, and could not society, an feature of in the Uni

Among o peras," a rest. The that they which mo understand even if the scarcely them. Bu stood, and they had was so ba

The sto wickled. And th pabulum to be the of the pe in the th nished by not to be morals h not only through the story were som make the Mr. Bra

"There was used ing the dur during ages, plays a entirely people of pa purified plays v conveye were r novada worst theatre because Mercet discov