

The Catholic Register.

PUBLISHED EVERY THURSDAY

THE CATHOLIC REGISTER PUBLISHING COMPANY

Subscription rates: City, including delivery, \$1.00 per annum; Outside, \$1.50 per annum.

OFFICE: 9 JORDAN ST., TORONTO.

Approved and recommended by the Archbishop of Toronto and the Bishops of the Province.

ADVERTISING RATES: Single insertions, 10 cents per line; Special rates for long-term contracts.



NOTICE.

City subscribers who do not receive their paper every week will confer a favor if they will notify us at once by Post Card or otherwise.

The Register should be received in all parts of the City on Thursday, or at the latest, Friday, of each week.

Telephone 489.

THURSDAY, JANUARY 17, 1901.

THE EVANGELICAL ALLIANCE

The Toronto branch of the above-named association, after a long period of inactivity, has a new job in sight. It is surely the growing time. At a meeting held on Thursday last under the chairmanship of Principal Caven, the Alliance registered an emphatic protest against the action of the Roman Catholic Hierarchy of Quebec in the famous Delpit case, in which a marriage has been annulled on the ground that the parties were both Catholic, and that this marriage by a Protestant clergyman was not a binding one.

Ontario bigots. The Evangelical Alliance had better mind its own business. Each of the Bishops has a properly constituted court to decide various questions, and amongst them matrimonial cases. Either party entering such court has a right to appeal to the Delegate and to Rome. Ordinary citizens might as well discuss the decisions of the Supreme Courts. No one thinks of doing that. But let the Bishops of the Catholic Church, or the foreign potentate, decide a marriage case, then all the little ears in the alley yelp and howl. Some say you are interfering with the rights of citizens. Others, you are practically advocating divorce. Neither one nor the other. The Church stands by the sacredness of the marriage tie in the twentieth century with the same fortitude she displayed when Henry VIII. in the sixteenth century strove to put away his lawful wife. We do not find in the case in question or in any other case the Church practically advocating divorce. Matrimony lies essentially in the contract. It was raised by our Divine Lord to a Sacrament, so that the parties contracting matrimony, in due dispositions, receive the graces attached thereto. And the Church has defined the substance of that contract, the circumstances under which it is valid, and the circumstances which invalidate it. This is perfectly and entirely in the power of the Church. In laying down laws beforehand upon the subject the Church is simply carrying out her divine mission of administering "that great Sacrament," and securing for the family the inalienable rights of children of God and legitimate members of society. In deciding cases, in which doubts have arisen, there is likewise no infringement upon the civil power. Our Blessed Lord in establishing His Church gave full power of judgment into the hands of the teaching and governing portion thereof. Had He not done so, it would have been foolish to establish a kingdom at all. Christian society would have had no stability, and the Christian family no guarantee.

We have stated that this report excites our contempt. And rightly. Why did the Alliance wait for a case? The law forbidding Catholics in Quebec, who wish to contract matrimony, to appear before any but a priest, is no new thing. It is as old as the Council of Trent. If the Alliance was in good faith—and what is more to the point—if its ignorance was not so deep and extensive—it would have attacked the law itself before any case appeared. It is no credit to such men as Principal Caven, although he has no reputation to lose upon this point; nor to the Hon. S. H. Blake, a leading lawyer—to show such ignorance upon canon law and Catholic doctrine and practice—or to have the names connected with the Alliance now that it proposes to enter upon a new religious war. True Mr. Blake was not at the meeting. But he is President, and must have known something about the report. Besides, when adopted, it would bear his imprimatur. The essential error in the report is the error of Protestantism, viz., of subverting the order, and placing the temporal above the spiritual. How are the liberties of citizens "challenged" by such a decision? Instead of being challenged, the liberties and sacred rights of Catholic families are protected.

LUCIFERIANIS.

The Christian world but more particularly the Catholic world of America, was shocked last week by an outrage perpetrated at Unaniport, New York. Vandals broke into the Church of the Holy Family in that place, and having forced open the tabernacle, extracted thirty-nine consecrated hosts therefrom. None of the sacred vessels was stolen, so that robbery could not have been the motive—it was something far worse. For years Paris has been the centre of a sect called Luciferians or Satanists, whose worship is centred around Lucifer, hence the name. These people have been guilty of the most shocking sacrileges, and many cases of the stealing of consecrated wafers from Catholic churches have been traced to them. They have been known to present themselves for Communion, and on receiving the host remove it immediately from the mouth that it might serve as part of their awful worship, of their "ghastly orgies. All manner of schemes have been resorted to to

obtain possession of our Lord in the Eucharist. That this sort of thing has been going on for years in Paris and in the larger centres of France, has been known, and the utmost care and watchfulness exercised to prevent so awful a sacrilege as the trampling of the Sacred Host which, it would seem, is a part of the ceremony gone through in this form of Devil worship. The existence of a body of people who have fallen into such a state of spiritual degradation seems almost incredible, and was long regarded in this country as a moral impossibility. That men could fall into such a mental condition as to their worship to Satan was looked upon here as something incredible. Devil worship was put down as a myth; as something of an old woman's yarn. Yet, the French clergy have known of its existence, and have made it known to the world. The practice seems to have been confined to France, and was not considered as being a danger outside of that country. The recent sacrilege, however, in the United States, will serve to awaken the Catholic world to a sense of its danger. How men, believing as the Luciferians do, in the Real Presence can bring themselves to such an utterly depraved and conscienceless state of mind and soul as to subject the consecrated wafers to so terrible a treatment, is beyond the comprehension of a sane man. There can be no other solution to the question than that of possession. If men were ever possessed by devils it is surely the members of this sect. It follows, as a natural consequence, that men who pay homage directly to Satan; men who worship him; men who subject the Body and Blood of our Lord to all manner of indignities out of a fiendish desire to please their master and acknowledged god, the Devil, must be possessed of a myriad of devils. Call it insanity, call it what you wish, nevertheless it is nothing more or less than possession by the Devil. These men, knowing that our Lord is really and truly present in the Blessed Eucharist; knowing that it is God himself that they are subjecting to the grossest insult that could be offered Him—for they know these things—are not fit to be at large. The idea is too fiendish to be conceived of the mind of man; it is, it must be, the product of the subtle mind of Satan himself. Such men are a danger to society, for evidently nothing will stop them in their terrible career of sacrilege. Hanging is too good for them, and although their punishment must needs be terrible in the next world, yet it would seem that they should be let down into hell with short shrift. If any one needs further proof of the necessity of a hell than the absolute certainty that such must suffer punishment for their awful crimes, he is hard to convince. Eternity is not too long to pay the penalty for the sacrilegious acts that these men perpetrate. In this country where the rights of the private citizens are respected, and where the law is their guardian against the attacks of evil-minded persons, there is no place for devil-worshippers and desecrators of our altars. If the law of the land is successfully invoked to safeguard the rights of our citizens, how much more so then should it not guard the Body and Blood of our Lord from the fiendish acts of the Luciferians. We were often at a loss to account for the temper of the American people that rendered lynching a thing of such frequent occurrence, but how we can readily understand it. The American Government owes it to its Catholic citizens, to the Christian community, to its God, to ferret out these desecrators and bring them to a condign punishment. There is no sane man who can view their action with anything but the utmost horror, or who can conceive of any reason why their punishment should not be as great as the courts of law can inflict. This sect must be rooted out of American soil, root and branch, and there must be no rest until every vestige of it has been wiped out. We have no place for such as they. There is no question of liberty of worship in this case.

We see that there is no better way for men to begin a century than by profiting abundantly of the merits of Christ's redemption. We have confidence likewise that our venerable brethren the bishops, and the whole clergy with their tried vigilance and zeal will cause these universal advantages, which we desire, to be realized in all their fullness. This is why, by the authority of Almighty God, by that of the blessed Peter and Paul, and by our own authority we extend by these letters to the whole Catholic world the great Jubilee which has been celebrated in our holy city, we extend it for six months, and by these letters wish that it should be regarded as extended. The conditions of the jubilee are then proscribed. As they are more definitely stated by each ordinary we would confuse our readers by any further quotation from the Holy Father's letter, awaiting the official promulgation of the Jubilee.

A NEW BOOK.

Some time ago we received a book written by Dr. Langtry of this city, entitled "Come Home." The work is intended as an invitation for all Christians to enter the English Church as the true Church of Christ, and thus put a stop to the unfortunate divisions existing amongst the various denominations. If the book was sent to us as an invitation to leave the faith of our fathers and go into the English Church as into our Father's house, we have simply to decline with thanks, and assure the author that we feel perfectly at home where Peter ruleth, and that we abide there in the full confidence of the true light and sacramental grace of Christ's kingdom upon earth. If the book was sent to us to review we accept the task. The author very rightly considers that the first thing is to get a correct notion of the Church of Christ. This description takes up the first chapter. We do not recognize it as a description of Christ's kingdom. There is not a single word about the Primacy of St. Peter. "Thou Peter being confirmed, confirm thy brethren," stares us in the face when seeking for the Church. "Thou art Peter and upon this rock I will build my Church, and I will give to thee the Keys of the Kingdom." "Feed my lambs, feed my sheep." There is one shepherd and there is one shepherd. The extension and devotion of the Church throughout the whole world and through all time require this unity which Christ placed in Peter by making him shepherd of the whole flock. The unity of faith required it. When therefore any one describes the Church for us we look for Peter: "Where he is there is the Church." The only mention of St. Peter in this first chapter of "Coming Home" is the following: "But though the Lord, when speaking to the Jews, describes the new society which he was founding under the title of 'the Kingdom,' it is to Him that we owe the name 'Church,' by which, at all times from the Apostles' days downwards, the Christian society has been most usually designated. Upon this rock (that is, of St. Peter's confession of His Deity, as most of the Fathers interpreted it), I will build my Church and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." This explanation cannot satisfy any earnest mind in search for Christ's Church. Admitting that some of the fathers give such an explanation, they do not do so to the exclusion of the ordinary Catholic explanation. Peter's confession of faith was the meritorious cause why he, thus instructed by the Father and confirmed by the Son in unfeeling faith, should have defended, administered and preserved the faith in the whole Church. A parallel occurs in the case of St. Peter walking on the water. Some of the Fathers say that the body of Peter did not walk on the water, but his faith. They did not mean that Peter did not really walk on the water, but the miracle was to be attributed to his faith. So the Fathers who state that the Church was founded upon the confession or faith St. Peter did not deny that the Church was founded upon Peter. We do not remember a point which is so frequently taught and referred to by our Blessed Lord and in the Acts of the Apostles as the primacy of St. Peter. To describe the Church of Christ by merely giving a minimized reference to him is to mislead the searcher for truth, and draw a wrong picture of that home where the Christian mind rests in the possession of the truth, where his will rests in the paternal rule of his Father's house, and

EXTENSION OF THE JUBILEE

The Supreme Pontiff has published a letter proclaiming an extension of the Jubilee to the Catholic world. After expressing his joy at the large number who availed themselves of the privilege of the Jubilee in Rome he says: "We wish that during half this coming year it shall be accessible to all the faithful in the Catholic world.

where he himself abides in the hope of one day passing through St. Peter's gates to his true and everlasting home. To lay the claim for the English Church that it is the Church of Christ and that Romanists separated from the Church of England as reformed under Elizabeth's reign is too much. Again we ask: "Where is Peter? No national Church is our home. Our home is Catholic. The utmost bounds of the earth are its inheritance. Its truth and formation were as perfect before England was a kingdom as it will be when Maoulay's New Zealand traveller shall sketch the ruins of St. Paul's. The misty story of England's conversion to Christianity before St. Augustine landed in Kent is in bold contrast to the uninterrupted chain of Pontiffs who occupy the apostolic primate's throne. First, last and always we say with St. Ambrose: *Uti Petrus, ibi Ecclesia*: Where Peter is, there is the Church—there is our home.

THE DIVORCE EVIL.

Recent developments in Buffalo have awakened the Christian world to a sense of the terrible lengths that the Divorce evil has run to. For years the Dakota Divorce mills have been a scandal to the world and a disgrace to the United States. Divorces have been granted for the most paltry reasons, and it is to be feared, only too often, for no cause whatever, except that of pandering to the vicious habits of those who have had recourse to the courts. Dozens of cases have occurred in which divorces were granted by the default of one of the interested parties who either could not or would not be present at such farcical proceedings. While Dakota has been thus disgracing Christianity, the mills have been grinding in Buffalo, but unlike those of the gods they have been turning the grindings out in big chunks. Recent investigations have brought to light a disgraceful state of affairs. A lawyer and a man and a woman are implicated. The man and woman, it seems, stood ready to swear to anything, to impersonate any absentee, and to make themselves generally useful where a divorce case might need evidence. As a result of this wholesale perjury, dozens of couples were divorced. Among the persons thus freed were two in Ontario. Many of the divorced married again, and now find themselves in a very bad position. It is a lesson to our Christian people. Divorce is a terrible evil, and this latest instance of its working is something that must make god-loving people think seriously upon the question of whether we are drifting. Apart from the religious aspect of the case, this divorce evil is terribly far-reaching socially. It does not require the mind of a philosopher to see that divorce cannot but be attended with evils that must be detrimental to not only individual peace, but must also grow into a national calamity. Where there is no divorce there are comparatively few family quarrels, for the partners in life's struggle know full well that they are bound until death, a fact that makes each strive to mould his life to fit into that of his partner. No sound argument can be brought to bear that can show not only the necessity but even the advantage of divorces at all. The Protestants are to blame for divorces, and it is they who must remedy the evil; they are suffering, but we too must put up with the evil consequences arising from the granting of divorces. The moment that the founders of Protestantism declared that marriage was not a Sacrament, which they did for purely personal reasons, that moment saw the beginning of the divorce evil, and it has grown apace. As a matter of fact, marriage is a Sacrament, and there is no such thing as a divorce morally speaking. A person divorced in the sight of the law is not so in the sight of God, and cannot be. No law in any land can sever the bonds of matrimony for any reason whatever. It does place such people beyond the law applying to bigamy, but it stops there. Because it was to the personal advantage of the founders of Protestantism (for if it were not for divorce and its reason for being—passion and lust—there would be no Reformation) because of this reason, marriage was declared to be no Sacrament, but that declaration does not make it any the less a Sacrament. If we take it into our heads to call the moon green cheese that does not make it so. There is no such thing as legitimate divorce as a separation by law

of man and wife before God. Once married, married till death. Canada, thank God, has not yet fallen into such an abyss of degradation in this respect as have the Americans, but Canadians are not slow to take advantage of the lax divorce laws across the line, and have been doing so for some years past. Such people secure divorces in the United States and re-marry, coming back to Canada with this second wife. These people have never rootined divorces according to Canadian law, and should be prosecuted for bigamy. This practice should be done away with, and that without delay, otherwise we might as well adopt the American Divorce laws at once.

THE POPE AND FRANCE.

In an interview the Holy Father exposes his anxiety about France, as regards the speech of Waldeck-Rousseau at Toulouse when he threatened war upon the religious communities. As Pope he "cannot consent to the French government turning aside the Concordat from the spirit which dictated it, and transforming an instrument of peace and justice into an instrument of war and oppression. This Concordat established and regulated in France the exercise of Catholic worship, defined the mutual rights and duties in regard to the Church and France." "Now religious communities," continues His Holiness, "form an integral part of the Church under the same title as the secular clergy. They receive their constitutions from the Holy See. They exercise a special mission, different from, but no less sacred than, that exercised by the pastors recognized by the State." To strike at them is to aim a blow at the Church. Nor is the Concordat silent about religious communities. It states that they do not participate in the special rights and privileges recognized by the Concordat as belonging to the secular ecclesiastical hierarchy. But this does not mean that the religious orders are excluded from the common right, and placed under the hand of the State. Nothing is asked for these communities than what they receive in other countries where there is no Concordat, viz. the right as ordinary citizens. In France they are directing against the orders a law which denies all liberty. They wish to exclude them not only from the right of proprietorship but from the right of existence. In China France is the protector of Catholic missions. The rivals of France accuse the Chinese missions of being the cause of the trouble in that country. Their purpose in these calumnies is to weaken and destroy the influence of France in the East. How can this contradiction between the internal and external policy tell for the good of the nation. France cannot persecute at home and protect abroad. "How," asks the Holy Father, "shall I make my voice heard? Do they wish the union of Catholics against the Republic? How can that be prevented if in place of a liberal, fair republic they substitute a narrow, sectarian factious one governed by laws of expropriation—a republic repugnant to conscience and the traditional generosity of France?" Offers have been made by rival nations, notably by Germany, to take the missions under their protection, and make compensation to the Holy See. The venerable Pontiff will find it hard to answer if these nations apply again for the protection of the missions.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

We are pleased to welcome a new weekly devoted to Catholic interests. "The Union," with headquarters at Ottawa, issued its first number with the new century. While, on the one hand, the Catholic weekly is being overdone in Ontario, yet there is always room on top, and we hope to see "The Union" succeed and prosper. The first number was a very neat one. The Canadian Baptist bemoans the fact that there are too many men who do not join some one of the Christian churches because none of them agree fully with them in their views. The paragraph then goes on to say: "If all were to act thus, no man could join in church relation with any other, because it is doubtful if any two men altogether agree." It is not at all necessary to state that the Baptist is speaking of Protestants only. We