

Advertisements for teachers, situations wanted, etc., 20 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 Ogdensburg, 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 to tell the clerk to give them their Catholic Record. 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. Agents 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, 1900.

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, that it is 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 promoting the best interests of the country. Following these lines it has done a great deal of good for the welfare of religion and country, and I will do more Catholic homes. I therefore, earnestly recommend it to Catholic families. With my blessing commend it to your work, and best wishes for its continued success, Yours very sincerely in Christ,
Dionatus, Archbishop of Ephesus,
Apostolic Delegation.

UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA,
Ottawa, Canada, March 7th, 1900.
My 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. FALCONIO, Arch. of Larissa,
Apost. Deleg.

FRANCE DISILLUSIONED.

France is not prospering. Its policy of war against religion is not meeting with the desired success. The sword of the State cannot reach to that point which the Apostle calls the division of the soul. Persecution feeds rather than kills truth. The workmen of France, and more particularly the vast army of Government employees, are realizing that they are fooled by the politicians in their anti-clerical movement. They do not see the promised billion of confiscated church property. It does not exist in such a large lump. What remains is finding its way not into the treasury, for the benefit of the working classes, but into the pockets of the politicians themselves. When all the property shall have been sold and the sale expenses settled the balance will be pitifully small—and when, besides, a portion of this balance is spent for the support of the feeble and aged monks and nuns who owned this property very little will be left. Primary and secondary schools have to be built and maintained at a much greater cost. Various other educational and charitable institutions have to replace the former. From this it may be seen at a glance that considered as a financial enterprise the law against religious is a flat failure. In that greatest work of charity, the hospital care of the sick, laicization has brought about the most painful consequences. The gentle religious sisters have been replaced by lay nurses who are described as ignorant and brutal. Disasters have overtaken both agricultural and industrial education. As early as 1847 agricultural instruction was introduced into colleges, and the religious were the first to apply the discoveries of science. About half of these farm schools have been closed without any provision for replacing those which are suppressed. The prospect is worse in the industrial schools. The most successful of the French institutions for the development of the working people were, in the year of the World's Fair in 1900, Catholic establishments. Enough of these have been suppressed to deal the cause of manual and industrial training a severe blow. It is, as the correspondent of the Boston Traveler claims, a case of suicide. Carthage must be destroyed even though Rome perish with it. Another characteristic of this anti-religious war is the increase of crime. According to the statistics for a number of years preceding 1904, there was an annual increase of five thousand crimes. Since 1901 the increase was 80 per cent. And if the last five years alone are considered the criminal figures are more appalling. The worst and most alarming feature is that the average age of criminals is becoming younger and younger. Whatever other causes there may be for this increase of crime amongst the young, the lack of religious instruction in the schools, the increased truancy and juvenile vagrancy due to the war and the inadequate accommodation provided by the government, are accountable for the state of affairs. A government which has maintained that its people should not have religion must gather what they have sown. They have sown the storm. They must reap the whirlwind.

INTEREST.

There appears in the current number of The Catholic Fortnightly Review an able article upon this subject, from the pen of Dr. Ryan, of St. Paul's Seminary. As it is a critique of a German work it touches special points. The writer promises to give a series of articles upon the subject, which, without introducing a pun, cannot fail to be doubly interesting. Historically, usury, or the taking of money for the loan of money, whilst ordinary to-day, was at first forbidden by the Church. "Lend, hoping for nothing again," was to be a part of the duty of fraternal charity amongst Christians. Church discipline did not always prove strong enough to practically uphold it. Clergy corporations were first controlled. Individuals were reached indirectly. The wills of unrepentant usurers—those who did not make restitution—were declared invalid. Clement V. in 1311 boldly declared all secular legislation in favor of usury null and void, and branded as heresy the belief that usury was sinful. St. Thomas Aquinas takes up the question, upon which he reasons as follows: It is in itself unjust to take usury for a loan of money. Usury sells what does not exist, which is an inequality, and therefore an injustice. Two things there are in external goods—the things and the use of the things. Some things are used by consuming them, others by enjoying them. Bread is an example of the first, a house typifies the second. When any of the first kind of things are lent complete ownership is given. He who is given the use of the thing is thereby given the thing itself. If a man wished to sell wine and the use of the wine separate, he would be selling one element which did not exist, and would therefore be acting unjustly. The lender cannot seek a double reward. It is different with a house the use of which is to dwell in it, not to destroy it. The use and the ownership of the house are separable. Now money has been devised for the making of exchanges. Thus the first and chief use of money is its consumption or spending. Wherefore it is in itself wrong to receive (besides the return of the money itself) a price for the use of the money. This argument is sound in the circumstances of money being unproductive. Money has got far beyond the primitive stage of exchange-maker. It is the governing force of all modern industry and commerce. Instead of being barren as it was in the time of the Angelic Doctor, it is the most fruitful producer man has. Whether things are better because this is the case, whether society will be forced to return to the medieval view of money, we leave others to decide. The problem has become much more complicated. Finance has taken a middle place in society. Its leaders are mighty—both their hands busy taking from producers and consumers. It is no longer a question of charging any interest but of controlling the market and keeping the money-lender within reasonable bounds.

AN EXAMINATION PAPER.

Whilst students in nearly every educational institution are wrestling with examinations the CATHOLIC RECORD has received one. It is quite enough. It covers the whole field. Its form may not be as delicate and non-committal as the average examination paper; but its matter makes up for all other deficiencies. No one would think of putting any but a Catholic journal to this test or word his questions with biased coarseness if his aim were to gather information rather than wound the feelings of the newspaper and its readers. This examination paper consists of twenty-two questions, many of which are worded in vulgarity, and all of which carry with them the venomous spirit of malign insinuation. We give a couple as a sample:
1. "Why do contemplative Orders languish in the air of hustling Yankeeedom and flourish in the atmosphere of sleepy Spain?"
2. "Why do ecclesiastics in workaday America, from Cardinal Gibbons to Father Lambert, spend all their waking hours in literary, sociological, humanitarian, civic or parochial activities instead of mainly restricting themselves to their duties and functions in the sanctuary as with their European confreres?"
This second question is in contrast with the 16th: "What percentage of the European clergy devote their spare moments to writing books, essays or editorial articles in defending the faith against Rationalism?" If our correspondent finds room for criticizing men of Cardinal Gibbons' rank and age or of Father Lambert's ability, we are not going to be mixed up in it. If Cardinal Gibbons had done nothing more than write "The Faith of our Fathers" it would have been more than sufficient to ensure for himself rest and glory, and from all English speaking Catholics eternal gratitude. If Father Lambert had written no other book than "Notes on Ingersoll" he has the satisfaction

THE CATHOLIC RECORD

of saving religion from the blasphemous insults of atheists. Let these great men spend their time as they choose. They have borne the heat and burden of the day: they deserve the evening of life for themselves. Spending it as they are in the work of writing they are enriching our Catholic literature and providing explanation and defence of Catholic truth. Nor can we help saying that if our correspondent would spend his time as well as these great churchmen he would not be able to waste it in preparing foolish questions. Why complain? Any one can ask more questions in five minutes than a wise man can answer in a whole week. There is no use trying to explain the difference between Southern Italy and Northern Italy, or between Italy in general and Belgium, or Sunday customs in Quebec and Ireland. In the working out of Catholic ideals due regard must be had to national proclivities and characteristics. The Church has always avoided interfering with these attributes and customs unless they run counter of sacred principles. Our correspondent should not take scandal. Zeal may be wanting in some quarters, and the missionary spirit may be duller than should be, still these defects do not militate from the general devotion manifest throughout the Church. We cannot close without protesting against the sneering tone which, like a dark line, pervades his questions. An examination paper of this character is returned with thanks. The CATHOLIC RECORD is never going to lend itself to sarcastic criticism or a discussion more likely to produce ill will than effect good. We are not blind to things. We have always maintained that newspaper controversy upon these subjects does much more harm than good. No attempt to answer these questions would satisfy even our correspondent. Is it better to let the examination paper go by default or request examiners to revise their phraseology.

THE CORONATION OATH.

At long last the unreasonable disabilities of Catholics as well as the insulting passages of the coronation oath are likely to be removed. A bill to this effect was introduced into the British House of Commons by Mr. John Redmond. Although not a government measure, it advanced through two readings. It received the cordial support of the Premier, the Hon. Mr. Asquith, who considered the exclusion of Roman Catholics from the Lord Chancellorship of Great Britain and the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland as unjustifiable. The coronation oath he also regarded as a flimsy and unnecessary safeguard of Protestant succession, dating from the worst period of English history. It is not easy to see how the insulting clauses of the oath can be regarded as a defence of anything. Unless it be the old legal view that a briefcase case requires abuse of opposite side, we do not find even flimsy protection. A sovereign's denial of Transubstantiation stands in strange contrast with that title, Defender of the Faith, which, when bestowed, appointed the king of England protector of the doctrine. The king testifies on oath that "in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper there is not any transubstantiation of the elements of bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ, at or after the consecration thereof by any person whatsoever." He swears, moreover, that "the adoration or invocation of the Virgin Mary or any other saint, and the sacrifice of the Mass, as they are now used in the Church of Rome, are superstitious and idolatrous." There is the rub. The king of England is no more called upon to testify upon these points than he is asked to pronounce Buddhism idolatrous and superstitious. If he has Roman Catholics amongst his subjects he has multitudes of others. Another crucial point is the non-interference of the Pope. Anglo-Saxons may be brave enough as a general thing and lovers of freedom. They are childish and cowardly at the very sound of the Pope's name. They are the slaves of national insular prejudice. The coronation oath specifies that the candidate makes it "without dispensation granted by the Pope or any other person or authority and without any hope of such dispensation." His Majesty is not even to think that he is or can be acquitted before God of the declaration, although the Pope should declare it null and void from the beginning. Notwithstanding the irritation which such thought would be sure to arouse, the Catholic subjects have been consistently loyal. In these times, when religion is left more to the individual conscience than ever, justice demands the expurgation of all invidious clauses. It takes England a long time to change. The attempt has often been made before. It never got so far as to pass the second reading. A Canadian member of the House of Commons thought he would win glory for himself by referring to the Jesuits' Estates Bill of Canada. Being a Canadian, he might be expected to

know something about this old question which did not in fact bear upon the point. He showed inexcusable ignorance. In seconding the rejection of the bill Mr. Boulton said that the Pope, in the sale of the Jesuits' estates, had granted permission for the sale of land belonging to the Crown. Mr. Boulton either knew better or he did not. That statement is absolutely false and utterly misleading. Neither did the land belong to the Crown nor did the Pope give permission to sell it. All that the Pope did was to arrange equitably the allotment amongst various religious and educational bodies the amount of the sale. There is no parallel between the Jesuits' Estates Act on the one hand and the removal of the civil disabilities of Catholics and the useless insulting clauses of the Coronation Oath on the other. As a defence of Protestantism they are a failure. It is only as a stigma upon the Catholics of the British Empire that they can claim any success whatever.

CANDID SCANDALOUS ADMISSION.

Freemasonry is seldom given to candour. Its purposes acquire power and cause fear by its steady, systematic concealment. Now and again, at rare intervals and in quarters quite distant from one another, some ill-trained member, whose instinctive candor is naturally strong and impulsive, gives the lodge methods to the world. Such a case occurred in Montreal lately in connection with the civic scandals of that city. A witness told the commissioner that he was a Freemason, and that his oath as a Freemason "took precedence with him in testifying, or, in other words, he would not injure a brother Mason." There it is in plain dark lines across the wall of modern society. That is the very reason for the prohibition of the Church against secret societies. Since the report briefly explains this precedence, by its being an unalterable pledge never to injure a brother lodgeman, it must go farther. Suppose this witness, standing between two neighbors, one a fellow Mason, the other not: he is to decide some matter between them. He is prejudiced. More than that: he is enslaved by his secret oath. The case is already decided. Justice is insulted and charity ignored. He who should be impartial cannot do his part. He unblushingly admits the relation between his Masonic oath and that administered by legitimate society. The former takes precedence: the latter depends upon it for its equity and patriotism. Were this an isolated case no conclusion could be drawn from the distortion it implies, nor could it inspire anxiety for the public weal. This is the spirit animating Freemasonry, whose secret machinations place the lodge first and foremost. If the country will wheel into line with the society, things will be smooth. If not, every opposing obstacle must be removed by right if possible, and when not possible, by wrong. Hence the opposition of the lodge to the Church whose uncompromising stand bids defiance and warns society of the dangerous viper it nurses. A straw will show the way wind blows. So does this witness give away the system. These are times in which respect for truth and reverence for oaths are not too common. Men call upon God to testify to what they themselves know to be untrue. Bad enough. But what about the members of lodges who deliberately set one oath against another? Society cannot protect itself against them. The hidden weapon is intended less for society than for the Church—more against Christ's kingdom than the kingdoms of this world.

RELIGION AND MORALITY.

If this article requires a text we take it from the remarks of a Chicago agnostic. He says that "Morality is independent of religion; indeed, morality is better than religion." The world is certainly ungrateful. Whatever morality it has practised has been due to religion. No law has been promulgated without the sanction and encouragement of religion's deeper and more sacred authority. Virtue cannot be its own reward. Nor can any external sceptre sway the moral forces of man's wounded soul or lead to their highest destiny the yearning desires of his immortal spirit. In such a question as the relation of religion and morality no discussion could be started about a decapitated religion or a truncated morality. We are in the fulness of time. The plenitude of religion is in our hands. Figures and types have passed away to leave in their place not their shadows or foot-prints but to make way for their reality and the descent from heaven of Him Who was to be forever religion's great worshipper and morality's profoundest sanction and most exalted ideal. Religion is to our mind only one. We know it only as we find it in the Church and see it exemplified in the lives of the saints. It is no mere makeshift, nothing artificial or human device. It is the worship of the Eternal Son of God, the praise of Him Who was the one worship-

per in spirit and in truth, the atoning retribution of His Holy Blood, the prayer of God's anointed Christ Who was heard for His reverence. He came to crown religion. He came also to fulfil the law. Morality was no longer to pride itself in external observances or to boast of its superiority over offending repentant sinners. It would, religion's lamp in its hand, search Jerusalem, the city of the soul, read just the mainsprings of human conduct—inspire the heart with strength and hope, and reorganize society in its fundamental element, the family. Morality alone, without the aid of religion, would have looked in vain from Calvary's Cross for the betterment of the world. All the morality that makes for the healing of man, all the message which gives comfort to the poor and smoothes the pillow of the suffering and the dying are from religion's High Priest and Benefactor. We do not count these sets whose founders broke with the Church of Christ, dried up the fountains and denied the sacramental system. Without these religion has no bread to break to its children, nor has the House of Wisdom anything but broken pillars. There is no food or shelter. Religion must be taken in its true, full, adequate sense. Taken thus it has been the guardian and protectress of morality, reaching out in its gentle mercy over the hearts and homes of multitudes. Religion has been the teacher of law. Morality without it would have been blind, inefficient and stunted. The two may, under modern opinions, be divorced, for divorces are common-places now-a-days. What the loss will be to mankind it will be hard to reckon. Man will fall still lower, for his darkened understanding will be without light, his weakened will without strength and his wounded heart without religion's balm.

PAPAL INFALLIBILITY.

We have been asked to publish "the circumstances leading up to the vote being taken on the infallibility of the Pope in 1870." The only doubt which the question presents to us is whether we are to examine Papal infallibility prior to the Vatican Council, or whether we may take this last Ecumenical Council as the initial circumstance not of Papal infallibility but of the discussion and vote upon the subject. To most reflecting minds it was evident that when in 1854 Pius IX., of happy memory, declared the dogma of the Immaculate Conception, the formal decree of Papal infallibility was not far away. When some fifteen years later the same Pontiff, on the eighteenth century of St. Peter's martyrdom, announced his intention of summoning an Ecumenical Council, it was understood that the dogma of Papal infallibility would be the chief object of the synodals. A storm immediately followed. Pamphlet succeeded pamphlet pretending to show the theological absurdity and the historical contradictions of the proposed dogma which threatened the State and all human liberty. An address was sent by Hohenlohe, the Prime Minister of Bavaria, to all the governments, requesting these self-appointed judges of religious questions to co-operate in preventing a definition of Papal infallibility. The cabinet of the Piedmontese usurper joined the anti-Catholic concert. The French brigade was to be withdrawn from the Eternal City under the pretence of securing the freedom of the Council. All these efforts defeated their own intention. The effect was to insure the proposing and passing of the definition. It was seen at once that not only the truth of a doctrine but the independence of the Church was at stake. If in the face of newspaper and governmental opposition the Church should hesitate or yield its influence as Teacher of Revelation, it would be shaken to its very base. It was not the Church at large which needed the definition. It was a small number of noisy disputants who doubted that the head of the Church can err in faith and morals who needed an authoritative declaration of the truth. The Vatican Council met. What we are asked were the circumstances which led to the vote. In the first place four hundred and fifty fathers of the Vatican Council sent to the committee receiving questions a petition that the doctrine of the infallibility of Christ's vicar should be discussed in the Council. They considered that the public good of Christianity required that the Council should define clearly that the authority of the Roman Pontiff is supreme, and therefore exempt from error, when in matters of faith and morals he decrees and ordains what is to be believed and held by all the faithful of Christ and what to be rejected and condemned by them. When the debate came on a division took place, not about the infallible authority itself, but concerning the opportuneness of passing a decree upon the subject. Many discussions ensued. At length, on July 18, 1870, the question was settled for all time. A few days before war had been declared by France against Prussia. It was important that the labors of the Council should be concluded, as delay

would jeopardize matters. Ample freedom had been accorded for the full consideration of the doctrine and the phraseology of the decree. Circumstances forbade postponement. Nor would the Council permit any modification in the words it proposed to employ. On the morning of July 18 the members of the Council to the number of 535 assembled. The Mass of the Holy Ghost was celebrated, after which the Holy Father entered the hall to recite prayers and litanies. At the close the decree was read, and the question put: "Most Reverend Fathers, do the decrees and canons contained in this Constitution please you?" When the scrutineers announced the vote it stood 533 in favor of the Decree and only 2 giving non-placet. Only on two occasions, Cardinal Manning tells us, were the ordinary calm and silence of the grave assembly broken. In its sessions no applause was ever permitted, no expressions of assent or dissent allowed. They are now of one mind and one heart in the worldwide unity of infallible faith. Subsequent events have justified the wisdom and need of the decree.

RELIGION IN MODERN CITIES.

One of the hardest problems for religion to solve is how to keep its disciples faithful and practical in the busy marts of crowded cities. Notwithstanding all that is done by a zealous clergy and devoted communities increasing difficulties present themselves. The struggle for existence becomes keener. Labor is less easy than formerly. When we consider the high rents and prices, it is underpaid in comparison to wages of the last generation. A materialistic age is reaping the fruits of its irreligious seeding. Some reflecting minds are scandalized no less at the present corruption than at the future prospects. A lady writing of Religious Education (Chicago) severely indicts the efforts made in cities for the young. "How serious the indictment," she remarks, "which might be brought against a generation of moralists, publicists and clergymen who had neglected this duty." Practically the whole machinery in Chicago of the grand jury and the criminal court is, according to this critic, maintained and operated for the benefit of youths between thirteen and twenty-three. Their crimes are greater in number and more heinous than the crimes of older men. They are marked by recklessness, bravado and horror—the sudden outburst of youthful energy all the more dangerous because it is sudden and misguided. The only safeguard is to capture the imagination and the deep emotions of youth by religion. Religion, this lady claims, has lost its hold. She thinks all the efforts, first Communion as well as others, poor and feeble. The moral guide which the majority of these erring children seek is not the sacraments of the Church, but the flimsy, unprincipled teaching of theatrical plays. Undoubtedly modern cities are a severe test of religious zeal and activity. These conditions are not those of the single sheep straying from the path of virtue, but of the ninety-nine breaking down all barriers and leaving the one in the fold. Discouraging things may appear. Love's labor may often be entirely lost or produce unsatisfactory return. The fisherman casting his net upon the wrong side and catching nothing the whole night long, may and does repeat itself. The failure is not religion's fault. First Communion and, for the matter of that, every other communion, is much in the moral protection and edification of the individual and of society. Sacred and efficient as Holy Communion is, it is not everything. It cannot do the impossible. Its reception, however frequent, will not preserve the soul of the youth or the man who habitually violates the law of that Master Whom he welcomed and Who would give him the necessary strength to rise from his life of sin. Religion can have remedy for those whose surroundings are in themselves proximate occasions of sin. What citizens in these modern Babylons need most, so far as religion is concerned, is a much larger number of priests and a division into smaller parishes. Even if this double multiplication of religious forces took place so that for each family there was a priest detailed, the work would still be herculean and the obstacles insuperable. Associations operating in the very opposite direction would paralyze the influence. Amusements are hostile. Education is the worst enemy. Sensuality reigns. People love the world and the things which are in the world. This very thing the Apostle condemned. With desolation is the earth made desolate because none have considered in their heart. It is to-day as it was when the cities of the Roman empire were hot-beds of luxury and sinks of iniquity. A few went out to solitudes, there to pray and to save society. They did not look so much to their own generation as to the future. They made no direct attempt to lighten society as it was in their day and in the crowded centres.