

THE CATHOLIC RECORD

Published Weekly at 64 and 66 Richmond Street, London, Ontario. Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

REV. GEORGE R. NORTHCRAVES, Author of "Mistakes of Modern Infidels." REV. WILLIAM FLANNERY, THOMAS COFFEY, Publisher and Proprietor. MEMBERS: DONALD CROWE, LUKE KING and JOHN NICHOLSON are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transmit all other business for the CATHOLIC RECORD.

Catholic Record.

London, Sat., Jan. 19th. 1889.

CHURCH AND STATE.

The Toronto Mail of the 8th inst. has rather an amusing reply to a "French-Canadian contemporary," thought intended to be quite serious. The Mail says:

"A French-Canadian contemporary challenges the Mail to disprove the fact that the Catholic Church has always, from the beginning until now, asserted her divine right to be supreme over the civil power in all matters which she may define as being within her purview."

To this the Mail replies that the controversy would be fruitless; nevertheless it asserts that "as a matter of fact the Church's assertion of her supremacy is a growth, and a growth which from its inception has been opposed by portions of the Church." It continues by quoting declarations of the English and Irish clergy and laity to the effect that the Church and the Pope have no right "directly or indirectly to affect or interfere with the independence, sovereignty, laws, or constitution of Government of these realms," and that the Pope has "no temporal or civil jurisdiction, directly or indirectly within this realm."

This is quoted to prove that the claim of the Church to be supreme in her own purview was opposed by the Church in England and Ireland.

It is almost unnecessary to state that there is no contradiction between the declarations of the English and Irish Catholics, and the assertion of the Pope's or the Church's supremacy in those matters which pertain to her jurisdiction. It is the province of the Church to define faith and morals, that is, to tell us what we are to believe, and what we are bound by the law of God to do. Within this limit the authority of the Church is supreme, and the Pope, as Head of the Church, exercises this supreme authority by divine right. The supreme spiritual and supreme temporal authority are perfectly distinct from each other. The Mail has from time to time stated or insinuated in various forms that the Church claims the right of interfering with the State in the administration of its temporal concerns, but no such claim was ever put forward by the Church. Pope Leo the Great, in his letters to Emperors Theodosius, Marcian, and Leo, constantly declares that the Imperial authority is from God, and Pope Gelasius writes to the Emperor Anastasius: "August Emperor: there are two by whom the world is chiefly ruled, the holy authority of the Pontiffs, and the royal power." Pope Nicholas wrote to the Emperor Michael still more clearly: "Inflict no injury on the Church of God, for she inflicts no injury on your Imperial authority. . . . the same mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus, made a distinction between the duties of both powers in their own spheres and distinct dignities, so that Christian emperors need the Pontiffs for eternal life, and the Pontiffs, in temporal matters only, make use of the Imperial laws." It was by a natural consequence of this principle that Pope Alexander the Third wrote regarding the rights of legitimate children: "It pertains to the king, and not to the Church, to judge of such rights."

These principles are held universally by Catholic theologians, and those who represent Catholics as holding any other belief on the subject misrepresent us, whether they do so by design or through ignorance. As this unjust representation is not confined to the Mail, but is frequent among Protestant controversialists, it may be useful to add some further explanations on the subject.

Cardinal Bellarmine, who is certainly one of the most ultramontane among the illustrious theologians of the Church, lays down the thesis: "The Pope is not the ruler (dominus) of the whole Christian world." His meaning will be rendered clear by his proofs of this proposition. Among these proofs are the following from fathers of the Church:

"Hugo of St. Victor says: 'The temporal power has for its head the king, the spiritual power has for its head the Supreme Pontiff.' More clearly, John Driedo says: "When Christ placed St. Peter over the universal Church as its shepherd, he did not at the same time give him temporal rule over the whole Church, nor did he take from emperors and kings their royal domains, nor did he wish that all royal power, equally with ecclesiastical power, should be derived, and should descend

from the power of Peter' Treatise on the Roman Pontiff."

The same great author cites many other testimonies to the same effect. We shall only add the following:

"If it were so (that the Pope possessed universal temporal sovereignty) by divine right, it should be certain either from the Scriptures or from tradition of the Apostles."

He then shows that no such power is derived from either of these sources. He further confirms his thesis by quoting the hymn of Sedulius, which is recited from the 6th to the 13th of January, by all priests using the Roman breviary:

"Cruel Herod, why dost thou fear the coming of Christ? He takes not away mortal kingdoms who bestoweth heavenly ones."

We have adduced sufficient evidence to show that it is no doctrine of the Church, nor will it ever be, that the Pope has authority to rule or command the State in temporal matters. But we may be asked, why may not the Church possibly define that she has such authority, and thus acquire it? This is substantially the position which the Mail and other Protestants take in arguing the question against Catholics; and even Mr. Gladstone, in his celebrated essay on "Vaticanism," fell into this error. We answer, simply, that it is not possible, because the matter which can be defined by the Church or the Pope is limited to that which has been revealed by God either explicitly or implicitly. A doctrine is revealed explicitly "when it is contained in its own or in equivalent terms in the deposit of revelation." It is revealed implicitly, "when it is contained in a revealed doctrine, though not expressed in Revelation in its own or equivalent terms." But, as Cardinal Bellarmine makes manifest, the doctrine of the Pope's supremacy over the State in temporal matters is not contained in the deposit of Revelation, whether explicitly or implicitly; wherefore it can never be defined by the Church.

We acknowledge that the Church is the authority which must define her own powers, and the Protestants say that, as she is infallible, if she would claim the authority we are here discussing, Catholics would be bound to believe in it. But this very infallibility of the Church would debar her from laying claim to an authority which is not given her by Revelation, attested either by Holy Writ or Apostolic tradition. However, apart from this reasoning, it ought to be enough that the Church does not, in fact, claim any such power. The Protestants defend the doctrine that all events occur in accordance with the absolute decrees of God. From this it would follow that mankind cannot be restrained by human law. Yet the public do not infer that Presbyterianism must be suppressed by the laws of the country, lest its adherents should, in accordance with their principles, set the laws at defiance. As a matter of fact, they allow their conduct to be regulated by law, and with this the rest of the public is satisfied. Why should not Catholics be treated with equal charity? Even if it were possible that the Church may in the future define that she should control the State in civil matters, ought not the Protestant public to be tolerant in regard to us, inasmuch as we are just as willing as themselves to submit to the just laws of the country, without reference to what might possibly be defined by the Church at some distant future time? The Church has not, during her eighteen centuries of existence, defined that Catholics may set at defiance the laws of the country. Will it not be time enough, therefore, to adopt suppressive measures when the Church will so define? But Protestants may make their minds easy on this score. The Catholic Church will never make the decree of which they seem to be so much in dread, and Catholics will be as good subjects and as loyal to their country in the future as they have been in the past. Why, even the Mormons would be willingly tolerated here, if they consented to hold their polygamist doctrines as a mere theory, without putting them into practice. Why then should Catholics be constantly threatened with suppression, merely because some Protestants imagine that we may become believers in a doctrine, which at present we repudiate, and which, we declare, never will be a part of our belief? Catholics, however, do maintain that the State is subject to the laws of God, and as it is the duty of the Church to say what the law of God is, the State is undoubtedly bound to obedience when the Church proclaims this law. The Church of England, which makes the State the supreme judge even in religion, cannot consistently ask the State to submit to her decisions in this case; yet, as a matter of fact, even the Church of England does so. The Presbyterians, Methodists, and all other denominations, however, do insist, equally with Catholics, that the State should obey the divine law such as the Church defines it to be. The chief difference between the Catholic Church and the sectaries is this, that the Catholic Church, being one in continuity with the Church established by Christ on His apostles, can pronounce authoritatively: "It hath seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us;" while the other Churches acknowledge that they may be mistaken in their doctrinal decrees. It follows,

therefore, that the Presbyterians and other sects will claim the submission of the State to their merely human opinions, whereas the Catholic Church will only call upon it to submit to the Divine Law.

That we have not exaggerated the position of the Protestant Churches in this regard will be evident from the following extracts from the Presbyterian Standards of doctrine:

"It belongeth to synods and councils ministerially to determine controversies of faith . . . which decrees and determination, if consentant to the Word of God, are to be received with reverence and submission, etc." (Conf. chap. 31)

"It is his (the civil magistrate's) duty that unity and peace be preserved in the Church . . . that all blasphemies and heresies be suppressed . . . and all the ordinances of God duly settled, administered and observed." (Chap. 23)

The National Covenant of 1640 declares this to be "ever styled God's true religion . . . a perfect religion; and all who do not adhere to it are to be 'punishable as rebellers and gainstanders of the same.'"

FALSE PRETENCES.

It is instructive to find that the Protestant religious press, which are always loudest in their protests against the supposed aggressiveness of Rome, are most exultant at the temporary success which has been achieved in Boston by the ultra-aggressive Baptist and Methodist parsons of that city. The case of this party of aggression is most clear. The question to be decided at the Boston election was whether the faith of Catholic children attending at the High School is to be virulently attacked with impunity or not. The parsons led the battle for this aggression, and the voters sustained them. Under this policy Swinton's Outlines will be introduced again into the schools, and Catholic children will be told, and will be required to admit what they know to be a lie, that "an indulgence in the Catholic Church means a permission to commit sin, granted for a money consideration." This is the state of affairs in which the loud-tongued advocates of civil liberty and religious toleration unfeignedly rejoice, under pretence that the Catholics are making an attack upon the Public School system.

The Catholics made no such attack. They merely defended themselves against the open effort to force sectarianism down their throats. When we find such journals as the Christian Guardian openly approving of the aggressive stand taken by the Boston bigots, we can readily understand what kind of treatment Catholics might expect in Canada, and especially in Ontario, if we were in the power of the agitators who are endeavoring to undermine the Catholic School system here. Here is what the Christian Guardian of last week has to say on the subject:

"Further particulars in regard to the victory over Jesuitical interference with the Public Schools of Boston show that success was attained by the co-operation of the Republican party, which selected its candidates from the list submitted by the Citizens' Committee. Men of sterling Protestant convictions were agreed upon, and the canvass was conducted on the main line of opposition to any priestly interference with Public School matters henceforth. The patriotism of the women voters was beyond all praise. Not only did they brave the stormy weather of polling day, but they actively exerted themselves to convince many of the truth of their position, and worked hard till the close of the poll. Another factor which made for success was the untiring efforts of the evangelical ministry of Boston. They were the leaders in this movement, and their work told with splendid effect. It is intended to keep alive the public spirit called forth by this contest."

The desire to arouse the latent bigotry of extreme Protestants is evident through every line of the above, and to attain this end the writer does not hesitate to tell unvarnished falsehoods. "Jesuitical interference!" The editor of the Guardian knows the potency of the cry "Jesuit!" to excite the hatred of the class to which he is appealing; but as a matter of fact the Jesuits had nothing to do with the action of the Boston School Committee. A secular priest, not a Jesuit, called the attention of the School Committee to the gross injustice inflicted upon the Catholic children; and he certainly had a perfect right to do so, and to demand reparation.

But at least was there not Catholic "interference" with the schools? Undoubtedly there was, as Catholics have votes in Boston equally with Protestants, and "interference" of both Catholics and Protestants was necessarily proportioned to the number of voters who belong to either denomination in the city. Interference of Catholics and Protestants is an essential part of the public school system; but the undue interference is solely the work of Boston Protestants, especially of the "Evangelical ministry," whom the Guardian acknowledges to have been the leaders of the anti-Catholic movement. The schools of Boston have been openly Protestantized; but the Catholics will know how to protect themselves, and we much mistake their spirit if they do not do so effectually.

The parsons of New York, encouraged by the success of their brothers in Boston, intend to imitate the latter in their intolerant course. We must, however, in justice, state that there are many Protestants,

both in New York and Boston, and throughout the Union as well, who have no sympathy with that narrow-mindedness which would rob Catholics of their dearest rights. We may mention the Philadelphia American, which, while it is thoroughly Republican in its sentiments, represents the views of the less excitable, but more respectable and thoughtful section of Protestants than those who have placed for a year or two the dictatorship over the Boston schools in the hands of an anti-Catholic clique of parsons. The American states that Swinton's history was "very properly excluded" from the public schools, and warns the people of New York and Boston that it was just such a movement as the bigots in those cities are now inaugurating, that by its reactionary force brought into the bosom of the Catholic Church many of the master minds who have contributed most towards rendering the Church illustrious at the present day: such as Brownson, McMaster, Mgr. Preston and many others.

The Divine Providence which brings good out of evil will, under the apparently adverse circumstances which are operating against the Church, continue to protect His institution, against which, according to the promises of God, "the gates of hell shall not prevail."

The Philadelphia American does not at all think that what has been effected in Boston by exciting the fanaticism of the women will be permanent. It says:

"The Boston experience was somewhat anticipated in Cambridge in 1884. Several women had been elected members of the School Committee, whose husbands were prominently identified with the Mugwump bolt from the Republican party. In the next election they were defeated and men put in their places. And now in Boston the excitement over the very proper exclusion of a school history from the public schools brings the women of Boston hurrying back from the mountains and the sea-shore to register themselves for the exercise of a right which they have had for years, but never thought worth so much trouble. With women as voters the special extortions of excited elections would be greatly intensified, but the watchfulness over public interests at other times would not be increased."

PROTESTANT MISSIONS.

Within a brief period of time the attitude of heathen nations has very much changed towards Christianity and Christian missions. In China and Japan they were previously regarded with intense jealousy, and Catholic missionaries were subjected to cruel persecution wherever they were discovered. The authorities in these countries seem now to regard them with an amount of indifference which manifests itself by the toleration which is extended to them. The Catholic missionaries, who are for the most part Jesuits or members of other religious orders, have taken advantage of these circumstances, and have flourishing churches through both empires. In Japan, as soon as religion became free, thousands of native Christians made themselves known to the missionaries. These were the descendants of the Christians who more than two centuries ago were thought to have been exterminated in the dreadful persecution which then took place, and now there are about 250,000 native Catholics, many of whom are recent converts.

Protestant missionary societies are supporting a considerable number of missions, but though they claim to have had very encouraging success, it is known that the want of unity which keeps apart the missions of the various sects is an insuperable obstacle to any real success in securing converts. They do not even use the same version of the Bible, nor give the same names to God and the divine attributes. These sects are very jealous of each other, and this jealousy is of course a great obstacle to their gaining sincere converts. The various Methodist sects have formed a species of union by means of which they hope to attain greater vitality, but as it is "God who gives the increase," and as they lack the blessing which Christ gave to His apostles when He sent them to their missionary work, "So, I am with you all days even to the consummation of the world," it can scarcely be expected that they will make a permanent impression on the country.

Canon Taylor, in a recent number of the Fortnightly Review, reveals the fact that in Palestine, Persia and Arabia the Church Missionary Society "has made absolutely no progress. In Palestine there was only one convert in 1886, a Moslem orphan girl, for whom prayers were asked throughout England, and she has since become a Catholic and is now in a nunnery. In the three countries we have here named the Society employs 119 agents, and has spent in two years £28,545, 4s. 7d."

In Egypt there were two "enquirers," a negro and an Egyptian, but the enquirers led to no results. In Arabia there was no result further than that a robber who was sick, and was doctored by a missionary, promised to abstain for ten days from the procreation of his procreation.

The Canon further states that in the Presidency of Bombay thirty-six adults and ninety-two children were baptized at a cost of £9,441 7s. 1d. This is but small work when it is considered that

there are ninety-eight missionaries engaged in the territory. He states that in the same Presidency the Catholic priests are converting and educating thousands, the cost being only nominal; whereas during the sixty years during which the Protestant missions have been established, less than 2,000 have been converted.

It has been frequently proclaimed by Protestant controversialists that the want of unity among the different sectaries is one of the beauties of Protestantism. It is, in fact, an evidence of the glorious liberty which exists under the gospel! But where missions are established among the heathens, it certainly does not tend to give the latter confidence in the truth of the gospel which is preached to them. The heathens frequently ask the missionaries why it is that the different sects do not teach the same doctrine, if, as they pretend, the religion of Christ is the truth by which alone they can be saved.

Canon Taylor makes it known also that the missionaries of the various societies try to counteract each others efforts, and enter as keenly into competition with each other as if they were agents of different commercial firms. One of the missionaries, Mr. Hall, complained that a missionary of a rival society "had deceived and baptized one of his enquirers." He also states that inquirers take advantage of the rivalry to "put themselves up at auction." Mr. Bell had been paying £1 a month to an inquirer, who afterwards struck for higher pay, and went as an inquirer to another society. Cases of this kind occur frequently, and some make a practice of going from one society to another, being baptized on each occasion when they thus transfer themselves. These peregrinating converts are reported by each society as so many fresh converts.

Canon Taylor adds that the natives look upon a missionary as "a charitable Englishman who keeps an excellent cheap school, speaks the language well, preaches a European form of their old incarnations and triads, and drives out his wife and children in a pony-carriage."

The Presbyterian and Methodist journals say that the stated failure of the Protestant missions is true of the Church of England missions, but not of those of their denominations. The facts stated, however, from their very nature, apply to their missions, in a great measure, even if they concern the Church of England in a greater degree.

THE ANTI-JESUIT CRY.

There is no institution of the Catholic Church which has to bear up against more persistent attacks than the Jesuits. We are told that they are a plotting association, aiming solely at the aggrandizement of their order, and that for the attainment of this object they seek political supremacy in every country in which they are established. They are even accused of having been the cause of the murder of no less than three kings in France and Germany, and the code of morals which they teach is asserted to be so lax as to be subversive of the first principles of Christianity, and to endanger the social fabric. The doctrine that "the end justifies the means" is attributed to them, and is understood to mean that evil may be done that good may come from it. By this it is meant that any crime may be committed, provided that its commission will benefit the Jesuit Order or the Catholic Church.

It is almost needless to say that these accusations are all false. On some former occasions we had reason to enter upon the pages of history which show that the Jesuits had nothing whatsoever to do with the political troubles of Europe which resulted in the murder of the kings referred to. It is not our purpose to enter upon these matters now, nor to deal fully with the proofs that the Jesuits do not teach that "the end justifies the means." We will quote, however, a passage from the favorite elementary theology used in Jesuit and other Catholic seminaries by students for the priesthood, to show that Jesuits by no means teach the doctrine attributed to them. This passage alone should suffice to settle the matter, for the author of the work is himself a Jesuit. Gury says, "on Co-operation." "It is never lawful to ask what cannot be granted without sin, as the violation of any obligation: for instance, a lawyer cannot be asked to do what is contrary to his duty."

Again "on Human Acts," the same author says: "It is never lawful to do an evil, however light, to procure any good whatsoever: for according to the well-known axiom derived from the Apostle (Romans, lii. 8.) 'Evil must never be done that there may come good.'"

From these quotations the doctrine of the Jesuits is evident, and the example given makes the meaning still more clear. Yet it frequently happens that they who are loudest in accusing the Jesuits of teaching that "the end justifies the means," themselves find circumstances under which they deem it lawful to do what is intrinsically evil for a supposed good purpose. We may instance the formal decision given by the united Episcopacy of the Church of England to Charles the First,

that for State reasons he might do what was morally wrong, even to signing the death warrants of innocent persons, when the difficulties of his position seemed to oblige him to do so. Such a permission as this was never given either by the supreme authority of the Catholic Church or by any Jesuit theologian. This we may further illustrate by a second example given by Gury. He adds, after teaching the doctrine quoted above: "Thus it is not lawful for you to lie, even to save a man's life."

This is, as it has always been, the Catholic doctrine, and Jesuit doctrine in no way differs from the teaching of the Catholic Church.

Owing to the tardy act of justice lately done to the Jesuits in Quebec by the legislature of that Province, the accusations against the order have been very frequently renewed during the last few months by the Protestant press and in Protestant pulpits. We have been over and over again told that it was on account of their immoral theory above repelled and because of their political machinations that they were expelled from nearly every country in Europe, and were suppressed by Pope Clement the 14th, in 1773. The Mail and other journals, and Protestant clergymen in their lectures, never tire of telling us that there must be in the principles of the order, and in the general conduct of its members, something opposed to the well-being of society; otherwise they would not have been so expelled, and that the Pope would not have suppressed them. Appeals are even made to Catholics as believers in the doctrine of the Pope's infallibility, that the action of the Pope is equivalent to an infallible decree that the existence of the society is essentially an evil.

It would occupy too much space to insert here the Brief of Pope Clement XIV., by which the suppression was declared, or even to give a synopsis of it full enough to show all the circumstances which led the Pope to take this extreme measure. Before stating these circumstances very briefly, therefore, we will explain how different is this Brief from a document which is to be regarded as an infallible pronouncement.

The decree of infallibility defines that the Pope is "an infallible teacher in all doctrines concerning faith and morals, which he defines as Pastor and Teacher of all Christians." It is perfectly clear that in the act of dissolving a society there is nothing touching any doctrine, whether of faith or morals, and that he acts simply as a superior who has authority over the very right of existence of the society. It is therefore evident that there is no connection between his Brief dissolving the Jesuits, and his prerogative of infallibility. He exercised an act of administration, having jurisdiction either to permit or to forbid the association, which only claimed its right to exist by virtue of a permission granted before by another Pope. In fact the matter had no more to do with the Pope's infallibility than would an order given by Pope Leo XIII. to have an asphalt pavement laid on the piazza of St. Peter, instead of the stone pavement with which his predecessors have been satisfied. The question is not one affecting the unchangeable deposit of Faith which Christ has committed to the keeping of His Church.

In the Brief itself the Pope does not say that the Jesuits have even been guilty of any fault. He states that there have been dissensions between the Jesuits and the secular clergy in divers places, and enumerates the accusations which were brought against the order, but he does not say that these accusations are true. He states, however, that disturbances had been caused by the existence of the society, and that persons high in civil authority urged him to suppress it, and he acknowledges that it is in consequence of these sollicitations that he issues the Brief.

All this makes it clear that the Brief was issued for peace sake, and not as a condemnation of the principles or conduct of the Jesuits. It was a sacrifice made to appease the intense hostility with which several governments regarded the order. These governments made a combined attack upon it, which unfortunately resulted in its suppression by the supreme authority of the Catholic Church.

But, must not the Pope, at least, have been convinced that the order was intrinsically evil, whereas he took such a step?

We answer, No. England, and several of the German States had already thrown off their allegiance to the Church, and had broken the Unity of Faith which had till then characterized Christendom in the West. In France, Spain, Portugal and Naples the great mass of the people were thoroughly Catholic, but the rulers of these States were inoculated with infidelity. The monarchs were nominally Catholics, but their Prime Ministers were infidels, who formed part of the great conspiracy of the age whose object was to destroy the Catholic religion. The Jesuits were the most able and successful upholders of the faith, and it would be a sore blow to the Church if they could be annihilated once for all. Hence, these

men made a supreme effort to their destruction.

That the Pope did not destroy the Jesuits from many evidences, among others a Brief which he issued on 1769, in which he gave several privileges to the order, and granted their apostolic zeal. This Brief offence to the powers we have named, and made them the more bringing their designs to a success. Clement XIV. said in answer to representations of Choiseul, the French Government:

"As for the Jesuits, I can neither destroy an institution which of my predecessors have protected as it has been confirmed by Council of Trent; and secondly French maxims, a General above the Pope." He then assembled a General Council of accusations against the Jesuits discussed, and that the Jesuits heard in their own defence.

"Moreover, the Polish nation, kings of Sardinia and Prussia had to me in their favor. I should be destroying them, only to deprive myself of pleasing others." From this answer it is evident that the Pope unwillingly took step, but that the European powers far from being unanimous in to the society. In addition to named by the Pope, the S Russia was also strongly for them; and to such an extent she obtained that the suppression should be limited not to apply to her dominions. Theresa of Austria and the electors of Treves and Cologne, the Counts of Switzerland, and the of Venice and Genoa, for example. But of these Austria alone was powerful influences were brought to the Empress to induce her to join Jesuit League. She did so thus the chief support of the his maintenance of the order from him.

When the Pope endeavor diplomatic relations with was told by Pombal, the Pr that the suppression of the necessary before a recon possible, and Manuel de R declared that Spain would unless the suppression were Pope Clement's offer to matter to a General Council favor from the hostile Pr. They knew very well the Council would not decree ment of the Church's most and the Pope finally yield avert the danger which was threatened, that the nations would follow the ex others powers and reconqu ity altogether. The popul at once become Protestant easily seen by the state which threw off the auto Pope in the sixteenth cen time they too would be E. It is clear, therefore, that Pope Clement is by be interpreted as a con that order which has a the front in fighting the the Church. More evid might be given, but we w that the Jesuits accept blow given to them with ity and obedience which been characteristics of the ing that a great blow was them, they made no eff and when the blow fell, to it without a murmur, however, in better times, tice to the illustrious o restored it to its former illeges. Its re-establish by Pius VII. in 1814 on 7 which time successive creased its privileges, do happily reigning, who rights it formerly enjoye.

It is highly important should be well acquaint circumstances which bro event which is wrongly enemies of the Church w representing them in a l to the great order which bulwark of the Church's turies.

THE ATTITUDE OF PEAN POW.

It is a remarkable fact loan, which was thrown market for the purpose means to put that count of readiness for war, has scribed in France to the million dollars. Not imagined which the ext demonstrate the exist sympathy between the t all existing Republics, F democratic, while Rus most absolute, and bet could scarcely expect exist. That it does exi countries feel that the same quarter; and no of France, especially, a