

The Catholic Record

Price of Subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

THOS. COFFEY, L.L.D., Editor and Publisher.

Advertisements for teachers, situations wanted, etc., 50 cents each insertion. Remittance to accompany the order.

Approved and recommended by the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa and St. Boniface, the Bishops of London, Hamilton, Peterborough, and Oshawa, 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.

When subscribers ask for their paper at the post office it would be well for them to tell the clerk to mail it to them. We have information of carelessness in a few places on the part of delivery clerks who will sometimes look for letters only.

Messrs. Luke King, P. J. Neven, E. J. Broderick, M. J. Hagarty 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. John. Agent for district of Nipissing, Mrs. M. Reynolds, New Liskeard.

LETTERS OF RECOMMENDATION.

Apostolic Delegation.
Ottawa, June 13th, 1939.

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, imbued with a strong Catholic spirit. It strenuously defends Catholic principles and rights, and stands firmly by the teaching and authority of the Church, at the same time presenting the best interests of the country. Following these lines it has done a great deal of good, and it will do more and more, as its wholesome influence reaches more Catholic homes. I therefore, earnestly 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,
Apostolic Delegate.

UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA,
Ottawa, Canada, March 7th, 1939.

Mr. Thomas Coffey

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 manner and form are both good, and a truly Catholic spirit pervades the whole. Therefore, with pleasure, I can recommend it to the faithful. Blessing you and wishing you success, believe me to remain,

Yours faithfully in Jesus Christ,
D. FALCONE, Arch. of Larissa,
Apost. Deleg.

LONDON, SATURDAY, JUNE 19, 1939.

ANSWERS.

We continue the questions of our correspondent. The third question concerns the difference of discipline between Canada and the United States as regards marriages:

"Why should the facilities for a quick and easy marriage be so much greater in the United States than in Canada? It is not as if the United States and Canada were 'foreign countries.' It is a fact that Catholics can marry non-Catholics with practically no questions asked—across the line. Some priests ask the non-Catholic if he (or she) has been baptized—and they say 'yes' and no proofs needed. A dispensation is refused here and they go across the border and are married at once. Is this a good thing for Catholics?"

The difference in the practice of the two countries should not scandalize any one. Uniformity of administration can only be secured by removing the power of dispensation. Now the bishops have a large power for dispensing which they exercise to the best of their judgment and according to the ordinary circumstances of their diocese. We are not prepared to admit that the U. S. and Canada are annexed. Notwithstanding the close social and other relations existing between the Republic and the Dominion we think they are wide enough apart to have different policies. If the Catholic ecclesiastical authorities adopt in each country gentle or rigorous discipline, according as they see fit, why should we be criticizing each particular case? Some rulers are mild, others severe. Which class does most good it is hard to say. In countries where marriages are more easily performed than ordinary contracts of purchase we wonder how any discipline is possible. If a priest refuses to marry them they go next block to the magistrate, where no questions but the fee will be asked. Whatever laxity may appear in Church quarters is due to the condition outside. Particular cases which being refused in one country were freely dispensed in the other we decline discussing.

The fourth and last question our correspondent proposes concerns the right to Christian burial: "Under what conditions are those who have not practised the Catholic religion for years allowed to be buried in the Church? Is it sufficient for the Catholic relatives to say so-and-so was a Catholic and it is all right?" At first sight the evidence is sufficient—provided one condition is, as it frequently may be, placed. The Roman Ritual in its list of those who are to be excluded from Christian burial enumerates "open and public sinners who have died without penance; and also those of whom it is publicly known that they have not received the sacraments of Confession and Communion at Easter and who died without any sign of contrition." In both these classes there is a clause of mercy; for few of our careless Catholics are without some sorrow for their neglect. They put off, less through malice than thoughtlessness. They promise a wife or a sister or the priest. They cannot be said to be without some contrition. If however they have lived in public sin the doubt instead of being in their favor is against them. We are of the opinion that more evidence is before the priests than our correspondent would lead us to think. In modern cities it is almost impossible for pastors to have personal evidence.

He has to rely upon the relatives or neighbors of deceased people.

CHURCH UNION.

The General Assembly of the Presbyterian church has been in session. The report of the joint committee upon union was submitted. "The eyes of the Protestant world are upon us," declared the chairman of the committee, in bringing his report before the Assembly. Although not belonging to the aforesaid peculiar world, we do not mind taking a glance at the proposal; for nothing is so much needed as union. Nor have we anything so keenly at heart as that there should be again one fold and one shepherd. The simple desire for it is most commendable. What fault we may find with the method by no means touches the ultimate aim and end of an all embracing Church union, one in faith and doctrine, one in sacraments and sacrifice, one in jurisdiction and government. Any union to command respect can be no human framework. Still less can it be an aggregation of carefully digested private judgments—one more conciliatory than another, all together no stronger than each one individually, and none possessing jot or tittle of power. A union of this kind may take place for other than Church purposes. It may attain numerical magnitude and acquire political importance. Christ's Church can never be. Nor will federation bestow that organism which is the innermost attribute of the living Church, or that unity of faith which conciliation may imitate but which it can never create. The branch must abide in the vine before bearing fruit. No one branch can be the vine by itself, nor can any number of branches be stalk and stem through which the life-giving sap extends. Kind words will not unite the divided members of Christianity. Far be it from us to say a single unkind word. But the union must be deeper than mere speech, broader than mere platitudes and longer than modern ideas. Otherwise it will fall in ruins at the first storm. Higher criticism would shatter it before any other generation. Irreligious philosophy would undermine the sandy foundations and science dance in mockery at the temple's fall. Much as we desire union we do not see that the sects are going the right way about it. They may themselves come to see that at a certain point. They will have to come all the way. Out in the wilderness these poor tribes may be kept wandering about, for they refuse the guidance of God. They are a guide to themselves. A few will enter the land of promise flowing with the milk and honey of our Saviour's merits and grace, where the peace of one faith and the joy of one Lord reign, and where the city of Jerusalem is built in strength and durability. The report of the Committee in the Presbyterian Assembly touched upon the Anglican position which seemed to require episcopacy "in the ordinary sense of the term as a prior condition of negotiations for union with the Church of England in Canada." There is a stumbling block. The Committee is to stand in the hope that a different interpretation may be given by some authoritative source in the Anglican Church, and that the Lambeth Conference meant episcopacy in an extraordinary sense. In plain language, the Committee wanted an Episcopacy in a Presbyterian sense, which is no Episcopacy at all. A few soft sentences follow. Their pleasure will be doubled when they gain that point, because they concur with Lambeth in the "sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper." Happy concord! They cry Peace: and there is no peace. What will the High Church people say to this? Extraordinary or Presbyterian episcopacy, Sacramentalism null and void, concurrence in the Lord's Supper! Hollow sham! It is pitiful trifling with Christianity's most sacred interests. The Committee is now five years at work. The net result of their labors spells hope. Principal Patrick, the chairman of the Committee, frankly admitted that the Church in Canada "was not the Church of the New Testament, nor was it the Church of the first century and first half of the second century." In those days the Church was one. Now it is many. Furthermore, the Chairman acknowledged that there was no one Church in Canada which could solve this or the home mission problem. What then is the purpose of union? In our simplicity we thought it was to get back to the first century and start over again. It is no such thing. It is not to strengthen the whole body, but to combine against the supposed common enemy, Roman Catholicism. Principal Patrick desired "to see a union of Protestantism in Canada in order that they might meet the unrelenting vigilance and energy of the Roman Catholic Church with a vigilance and energy equally unrelenting." That is candour. Let us unite, says this college head to his Methodist brethren, not for our own people's sake, or for truth or the love of Christ or any other

lofty motive, but that we may do up these restless active Catholics. We cannot beat them separately. As long as there is a wall of division between Presbyterianism and Methodism we can not work efficiently. Let us break down the wall. Never mind the principle involved. It is not a question of principle. It is not a question of the Mystical Body of Christ. It is one of conquering our common enemy. The bubble is burst. The cat is out of the bag. Five years—five milestones—and the Marathon competitors fall fainting—beat the Roman Catholics—upon their lips. What earnest man can desire union, or expect it, when malignity prompts it and hypocrisy cloaks its uncharitable aims? Bishop Mills, of the Anglican Church, does not look for it. But then His Lordship has before his mind "a united Christendom to witness the truth." That is not the united Christendom Principal Patrick and Principal Falconer are seeking. They want not a witness but a phalanx, not peace but war—not a flag of truce but a standard of battle—combined Protestantism against Roman Catholicism. The Protestant world certainly should keep its eyes on this committee, which has betrayed and sold it. The committee is a spectacle to men and angels. Church union, however desirable, should be started on other lines before it will gain respect.

SUMMER RESORTS.

The "good old summer time" is near at hand. Families are debating where to spend it. We are a restless generation. How few can pass a whole year at home. No sooner does school close than the scene is changed. Some balmy, sandy beach with a shack, politely called a cottage, higher up among the cedars, and the waters slowly deepening—and a couple of esnoes drawn up on the shore—half a dozen youngsters lying around more like Indians than whites. There you have them. Mothers did not see much of the children at school. They can hardly be expected to bother with them in summer when the weather is hot and the children crosser than usual and all looking for enjoyment. This is all very well. There is another part of the summer programme too carelessly glossed over or entirely neglected. It is attendance at Mass. Provision is made for most of the natural demands which regard health and pleasure. Nothing is spared to give the family a good time, to let the children run wild and to be free and easy. Hardly a thought is entertained as to convenience for hearing Mass. There is no holiday from the mild command of the Church requiring attendance at Mass every Sunday. The worship of God is a pleasant duty which follows us everywhere and which is with us in the leisure of summer vacation just as in the business of other occupations. Parents who take their families to resorts or solitudes which are far away from Church, so that attendance at Mass is practically impossible, do a grievous wrong. They seriously neglect God's interest, they set at naught the law of the Church and teach the children by example the insignificance, instead of the importance, of Holy Mass. Children become imbued with these ideas too readily without parents helping them. The remedy is not far to seek. There are many pleasant spots by lake shore and river side and in the country, where religious services are regular. Then if some Catholic neighbors combined and settled near together they could easily have a chaplain who for a couple of months would give them Mass. Our neighbors are setting an example in this respect. Their clubs and associations are to be found all over accompanied by religious services. No command imposes upon them the attendance at Church. Our own people are too often intoxicated with pleasure and too forgetful of the ever pressing debt they owe to God and His Church.

DR. OSLER ON SHRINES.

This eminent physician, now regius professor of medicine in the University of Oxford, Eng., delivered an address on the 3rd inst. to the Ontario Medical Association. A journal like the CATHOLIC RECORD would, generally speaking, have little to do with the professor's discourse upon a technical subject to his fellow physicians. But Dr. Osler more than once has said things which were mere rhetorical exaggerations. A gentleman who thinks people ought to be chloroformed at sixty can hardly be taken at his word. Nor can he feel flattered at a vote of thanks moved by one over eighty, even though he was the lecturer's professor. The doctor's remarks, therefore, however we may regard his medical ability and learning, should be heavily discounted. His last address in Toronto is in worse taste. He is rough and rude when he was expected to be considerate. His subject was the treatment of disease. Historically speaking, disease had first been considered as the outcome of sin. "For long centuries," said Dr. Osler, "under this

view the treatment was the readjustment of the relations of the man to the power which inflicted the scourge." "I am told," he continued, "that more people frequent the shrine of St. Anne de Beaupre than go to the hospitals of Canada." Again: "The outbreak of the practice of faith healing seems to have the people of this continent in its grip." It was an old story and one in which the speaker took an interest because scientific medicine began with faith healing. "The shrines of our Lady of Lourdes and of Ste. Anne de Beaupre in Quebec were direct prototypes of these temples of the ancients." Surely that report is not exact. We cannot think that an Oxford professor would deliberately put the cart before the horse by calling St. Anne de Beaupre or anything in the new world a "prototype" of ancient Europe. Had he put it the other way it would have been a less awkward appearance. Scientists are always trespassing upon hallowed ground. Never willing to admit the spiritual, and still less the supernatural, they fail to appreciate such centres of devotion as Lourdes and Ste. Anne de Beaupre. Their attempts at explanation are lame, illogical, and discredit their learning and ability. Dr. Osler has shown himself no exception. The view he takes of these shrines is most incorrect. Neither in their origin nor in their subsequent popularity has either Lourdes or St. Anne de Beaupre been sought solely as religious hospitals where by prayer the sick might be cured. The devotion which characterizes the shrines of the Church is very different. Thousands visit these holy places without needing, without seeking and without witnessing, cures. From time to time the prayer of the sick who do go, in prayerful hope that they may be relieved of their suffering, receive the answer they desire. Medical science baffled in all attempts to heal them, has given testimony to the miracles. It has been slow to acknowledge the effects; but it has yielded. The evidence is too convincing. Scepticism cannot stand before facts. And no one unless he closes his eyes wilfully can be blind to the miraculous cures at these shrines. Medical skill has no cause for jealousy. In nearly all cases it has been tried to practically the utmost. It is not as if the believers in Lourdes left natural means alone, or refused the physician's aid. Dr. Osler would have all healing given over to medical science. Freedom, religion and resignation would then bid humanity adieu. Medicine has no doubt advanced. As a science, however, it is still in swaddling clothes. It serves mankind well; yet it is likely to run amuck. What with hospitals and nurses and supplementary help of one kind or another it will, even if it cure a man, handicap him for life. At no time is poverty so likely to enter ordinary homes as with the physician. We cannot take from the poor the right of prayer, or close the door against God's condescending omnipotence. Till medical science shall come from the grave with the assurance well founded that she is the resurrection and the life, the suffering and the poor will turn to prayer and sacred shrine for relief and resignation. Dr. Osler exacts confidence as a condition in the relation between the patient and the physician. What he claims for his own profession he ought not to refuse to the higher virtue of religion. Men will be paradoxical in spite of protests, and notwithstanding the fact that they come from great seats of learning. Scientists must remember that if such mistaken movements as Christian Science and Emmanuelism are receiving impulse they are greatly to blame themselves. Scientists have been too dogmatic and excessive in their materialism. These opposite theories are a protest, uncontrollable and tending to extremes. Under these and many other circumstances it will become a scientific scholar to select two Catholic shrines to be branded as "prototypes" of ancient pagan temples or to be confused with modern fads of spiritualism. What the regius professor of Oxford should cultivate before addressing another association is consideration for the religious convictions of his audience or a respectable portion of them. Dr. Osler may know pathology, but he is ignorant of politeness.

A MATRIMONIAL CASE.

The following case has been sent us with a request for solution. In offering our solution we protest against being regarded as authoritatively appointed defenders of matrimony. This is the first case of the kind we have had put to us, nor are we anxious to have others. Few of them are of general interest sufficient to warrant the CATHOLIC RECORD in preserving space for them. The ecclesiastical magazines are the ordinary examining board upon these questions, at least so far as having an opinion from the press. A more official solution may be had by the writer applying to his parish priest. Here is the case: "Two non-Catholics marry.

After several years the wife runs away with another man and afterwards secures a divorce. Her former husband in course of time becomes a Catholic. If neither were baptized at time of marriage, or if only one party had been, would the marriage hold binding? Again, considering the circumstance of her leaving—divorce, etc.—if she repented and wished to return to her husband, who is now a Catholic, would it be right for him to take her back as his wife or would it be necessary for them to go through a marriage ceremony? What would be the husband's duty in the case?"

Let us take the case in which neither party is baptized. The marriage is in this instance a natural contract. It is indissoluble, so that the supposed divorce does not really affect the question. The former (?) husband by becoming Catholic may enjoy the Pauline privilege. This signifies that if the other party refuse to live peacefully with the converted party, or lives with them only to the injury of God and the contempt of the Christian religion, or continually endeavors to make the faithful party sin, then the convert may, on the approval of the Holy See, have the first marriage dissolved. As the Apostle puts it: "If the infidel depart let them depart." In the case granted that the infidel is gone, so that any interrogation as to her willingness to live with the husband now baptized is not possible, the dispensation from this examination must be obtained from the Holy See, unless, as in some particular cases, bishops have the faculties. The converted party can contract a new marriage only with a Catholic—supposing the dispensation obtained, and it has been officially declared that he can avail himself of the Pauline privilege. Supposing he does not contract a second marriage before the wife returns, or for a year after the dispensation about the examination has been obtained, he must seek another dispensation. The wife returns willing to fulfill the conditions in regard to religion. If the man has not entered upon a new marriage the old remains, so that it would be perfectly right for him to take her back. Since the former marriage is only annulled in case of the converted party actually entering upon another marriage, and since he did not do so, there is no room for a second ceremony. As to the question of duty and many alternatives which should be introduced for a full solution, we must refer our correspondent to theologians. We cannot spare more space, even though we feel the case has other aspects than those presented by us.

AND NOW WE have a member of the Baptist sect crossing lanes with Mrs. Eddy. Dr. J. A. Haldeman scores the aged maker of this new cult because it teaches that marriage is a material and sensuous mistake. He has written a book on the subject entitled "Christian Science and the Holy Light of Scripture." Mrs. Mary Baker Eddy, upon hearing of the book, telegraphed at once to her followers, commanding them, on pain of excommunication, not to read it. It will now be watched with eagerness what degree of independence they will assume.

THE REV. S. TREVANA JACKSON, a Methodist pastor in Arling, New Jersey, pays a compliment to the Catholic Church for the manner in which it takes care of its little ones. In this respect, he claims, it is a thousand years ahead of all other denominations. The reverend gentleman appreciates the light made by the Church for Catholic education. In this it stands upon solid ground, and coming generations will recognize its wisdom. The number of grown up persons who never care to enter a Church of any kind gives us a striking picture of the results of godless education. As the twig is bent the tree will grow.

THE EDITOR of the Asino, Rome, Italy, has just died. Some of the newspapers say he was one of the worst men in Europe. He has been represented as a hater of God, a hater of God's Church and a hater of all the beautiful and true in life. A few moments before death he shouted to his attendants that he wanted to see neither cross nor priest. Luigi Mongini was his name. His funeral was as he wished it to be. The banners of Masonry, Socialism and Atheism were strongly in evidence in the procession. Not a semblance of Christianity! It was truly a pagan gathering and those who have described it as a dog's funeral told the truth. Poor humanity! To what depths of degradation may it not descend!

AN AMERICAN PAPER tells us that during the past year fifty-two miles of saloons were closed in the United States. This allowed twenty-five feet frontage for each grog shop. By a popular vote of the people there were eleven thousand saloons put out of business. This is very encouraging. There is every need in the country for well kept hotels, and

we think these places of business could be made to pay without the bar-room attachment; but there is no possible excuse for the existence of the little dens where the minds of the bone and sinew of our country, the honest hard-working toilers, are set on fire by villainous compounds, and the money which belongs to their wives and children squandered.

FREQUENTLY THERE is unseemly buffoonery at weddings. Vicar General Cassidy, of Fall River, Mass., very truly says that matrimony is not a vaudeville show. Some people, he continues, undertake to make it a circus parade with clowns, forgetting that it is a ceremony of the deepest solemnity. What the Vicar General of Fall River says of Massachusetts may apply with equal force to some of our Canadian parishes. The doings at certain weddings may be called excusable hilarity, but this hilarity is not excusable and should be discontinued. The throwing of confetti and rice and the indulgence in various other horse plays on the occasion of a wedding, has nothing to commend it, and the sooner it is discontinued the better.

IN A RECENT SPEECH by one of the Irish members in the English House of Commons, a bitter reference was made to the increased taxation on Ireland, a taxation altogether out of proportion to that imposed upon England and Scotland, and entirely regardless of the solemn compact entered into at the time of the union over a hundred years ago. The hon. member stated that the manufacture of whiskey was one of the most important industries in Ireland and that the added tax would be a severe blow to it. For our part we consider that it is a distinct misfortune that the manufacture of whiskey in Ireland should be one of its chief industries. We would rather see the people employed in some other kind of commercial activity. The manufacture of whiskey means the drinking of whiskey and the drinking of whiskey promotes crime, poverty, squalor and degradation.

WE ARE PLEASED to be able to announce that the remarkably able letters of Mr. Starbuck, a Protestant theologian, which have been printed weekly in the columns of the Sacred Heart Review of Boston, for seven or eight years, will shortly appear in book form. They will make a volume of eight hundred pages, large octavo. Mr. Starbuck, the Review tells us, not being a rich man, can hardly afford to invest much money in such an enterprise. The Review very generously agrees to take a certain number of copies. As soon as the work comes from the press the CATHOLIC RECORD will also take pleasure in ordering a goodly number. A wide circulation of this valuable book will tend in a large measure to dispel a vast amount of ignorance concerning the Catholic Church and to uphold that bigotry, amounting in many cases to unfriendliness between neighbor and neighbor, caused by reading the literature of characterless mountebanks who trade on Protestant credulity.

SINCE THE DEATH of the Archbishop of Ottawa newspaper prophets have been working overtime. The man who makes copy usually starts out in this fashion: "It is rumored," it is asserted, "We have it on the best authority," "A gentleman in close touch with the ecclesiastical authorities," etc., etc. Then he makes up a little program of what he thinks Rome is likely to do or ought to do in the matter of making appointments. As to the Bishopric of London a contemporary heads an article in this wise: "Father Hand's name again to the fore." This would lead one to suppose that there was a warm contest going on, that there was canvassing and committee rooms and all that sort of thing. Truly our modern newspaper man is a strenuous individual. For the last twelve months he has been sorely puzzled about the Pope's action in regard to the London diocese. He has picked out a dozen or more priests for the place. He has watched their movements. He has canvassed what the people say about them. He has pictured the situation as a sort of Marathon race and he is feverishly peering into space to find who is to be the winner. In a friendly way we desire to whisper into his ear: "The Catholic Church has a quiet, dignified way of transacting business, and those whose business it is to transact the Church's business mind their own business."

THE LATEST PRESS despatch—commenting on the death of Ottawa's beloved Archbishop—tells us that "the whole situation," whatever that means, "has been changed." "For some time," it continues, "it was thought that Father McCann or Father Hand would receive the appointment to London." But the vacancy in Ottawa comes along and arranges the plans of the local editor. He states that "those who are supposed to know declare that Bishop

O'Connor, of Pet. Ottawa, and that he be appointed to part of the situation," he adds, "We would be the receiver the app. We verily believe have spent a stren. Ramme of what He ends up th. ing that word will come from R. Delegate. He m. the 1st of Janu. Year's day. But, pity that our p. ducted in a m. quantity of read. day, only to be c. is increasing all

IT IS DEPLORABLE to be endowed common sense such exhibition tolerance as ap. tance after the men lately in themselves upon ers of the Cor. answer Dr. Sp. through the mo. fellow citizens. London Advertis. tion Outh is a when Protestant lished by law, bigoted as any man's religious editor, "should ing any office i. is otherwise f. Catholic alone. Christianity and the average men troubles himself first named the latter. O. the same as I. ago, when L. that "the pe. reign was oppos. objects for the his people we and bigotry of lin." Referring Lord Pl. is a mischiefv mind the peop. they are a co. mischiefv m. tion of his o. brate in the n. the annivers. (Plunkett's sp. Lord Plunket, staunch Prote. more of our C. like the edito. courage of the plainly to the rank and file. to blame as I. They are en. should be re. citizens of C. Papal aggress. cox their du. tions of promi.

CHEVALIER died on that we should sad event—in. conveys a lea. character to who is imbu. carve out fo. in the commu. tions ago ar. Heney arrive. In those day. this country them a noble. of a pur. men to make comfortable well-nigh in from which as it was pride and proof again. Heney was men. In the man was mo. ness he was. did his wea. those means a-days—whi. science. H. Chevalier J. kind word fo. for the need. of him glow. appealed to. aspirations was not on. interested i. tent of wor. large and g. tismism. Canada, too. the faith of his very lo. age of eight. Ottawa ha. well as one. priests and his whole li.