

The Catholic Record.

Published Weekly at 484 and 486 Richmond street, London, Ontario.
Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

EDITORIAL:
REV. GEORGE R. NORTHGRAVE,
Author "Mistakes of Modern India,"
JOS. MAC COFFEY,
Publisher and Proprietor, Thomas Coffey.

Members: Luke King, John Nigh, P. J. Neven and Miss Sarah Hanley are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transmit all other business for THE CATHOLIC RECORD.
Rates of Advertising—Ten cents per line each insertion, scale monies remain.
Approved and recommended by the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa and St. Michael's, the Bishops of London, Hamilton, Peterborough, and Oshawa, N. Y., and the clergy throughout the Dominion.
Correspondence intended for publication, as well as that having reference to business, should be directed to the proprietor, and must reach London not later than Monday morning. When subscribers change their residence it is important that the old as well as the new address be sent us.
Subscribers when changing their address should notify this office as soon as possible in order to insure the regular delivery of their paper.
Advertisers have no authority to stop their paper unless the amount due is paid.
Editorial intended for publication should be sent in time to reach London not later than Monday morning. Please do not send us material of a sensational or sensational nature. Ordinary and marriage notices sent by subscribers must be in a condensed form, to insure insertion.

LETTER OF RECOMMENDATION.

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

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

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

In matter and form are both good; and a truly Catholic spirit pervades the whole. Therefore, with pleasure, I can recommend it to the faithful.

Believe me, and wishing you success,
Yours faithfully in Jesus Christ,
D. FALCONIO, Arch. of Ottawa.

LONDON, SATURDAY, JULY 16, 1904.

PRACTICAL DREAMERS.

Some writers are fond of admonishing us to be very practical, that is, to get one's tentacles into a block of stock. To dream or to indulge in reveries is an unpardonable sin. Building air castles with fragments of the imagination as inhabitants and iridescent with the sunlight of hope, must be eschewed. One must be on the alert, geared up for the race for the dollar. But after all, perchance the most practical is the one who has dreams—who, poor in things earthly, owns the things that are worth while, the earth and the sky and the flowers, and who goes leisurely to his place. The money king who has his hands in the pocket of the public, or is endeavoring to get them there by means of tricks and double finance, is—and we are not allowed to forget it—very practical. So is the man who never permits conscience to come between him and worldly advancement and whose life's horizon is bounded by the greenback. But we have never been able to fathom the why of it. The world, however, would be a pretty gray place if there were no dreamers in it. Their dreams are sometimes transmuted into book and poem and picture which abide long after the practical ones are forgotten. And if they reserve them for personal decoration, they are happier and saner than they who fret and wear themselves out for the baubles of the world.

LIFE'S DRAMA.

We, however, must play our little roll as best we may. Not for many of us the lime light and the middle of the stage. But we can contribute our quota to the success of the grand drama of our lives and business take birth in a kindly heart. The play that is prompted by envy or hatred never has permanent success. It may flourish for a time. The praise of the interested may fall tunelessly on those who daily with this kind of drama, but little by little its fair seeming disappears and we see it unsightly and base as are the things fashioned by the powers of hell. And the actor is paid in disappointment and emptiness of spirit. The applause falls upon him after a time, for he knows that his work is bad. For he who mars the beauty of living is no artist but a careless and criminal bungler. And he who is content to do this will have a terrible awakening at the dress-rehearsal in the Valley.

TOURISTS' EXAMPLE.

Some good people hereabouts dread the hot season, and for various reasons. One of them is that their villages are usually invaded by a horde of tourists who demand a coat of tan, good provisions, lodgment and various other things recommended by the magazines, at a nominal figure. To visit the rural districts at all shows condescension on their part; but this unfortunately has no market value.

Another reason is that some of these pleasure-seekers give anything but good example. For instance, they play tennis, go on tours of exploration, etc., during the week, and on Sunday are seen at Mass. The villagers—and some of them are four and five miles from the church—are never absent, while these people give fatigue as a pretext for not living up to one of the most serious obligations of the Christian life. As we said above, these tourists give bad example to the inhabitants of

the village, to their children whom they thus "sacrifice to devils," and they certainly do not preach their faith to the non-Catholic residents. Thinking about it may induce them to come to the conclusion that the man or woman who pretends to be a Catholic and is recreant to a duty which title entails, is a mighty small human. Why, a politician will obey his chief, though he may not have any hope of a berth, but these people will not follow the Captain Christ though they are by so doing sure of an eternal recompense. God's patience is a great mystery.

TRUSTEES AND TEACHERS.

The trustees in some of our districts should decide upon the quality of teaching ability requisite for the efficiency of their schools. During the year we heard that a few of the teachers were more intent in trying to get into the matrimonial wagon than in instructing the young confided to their care. The trustees' views of the dignity and responsibility of the teacher are correct. They object—and especially when they have unmarried daughters on their hands—to attractive young pedagogues angling for a home of their own, and landing it. They state other things which need not be recorded in these columns, but they can settle the question if they remember that a teacher has rights as well as duties. She has a right to a living wage. She has a right not to be made a target for the officiousness of the trustee. She has a right not to be adjudged guilty of neglect of duty in charges, which, if not manufactured outright by the village gossip, rest on flimsy foundations. In a word, the school that is governed by parsimonious and nagging officials will fail to procure good teachers.

COMMON SENSE NECESSARY.

The young woman should keep her common-sense in working order. She cannot afford to take risks with her reputation. The sensible girl is well aware of this: the other kind may be aware of it, but she does not convince the observer of that fact. She may take pride in her soul's whiteness, but she would find it difficult to get an endorsement to that effect from the citizens who see her talking gaily in outings to men who are credited with having little respect for the honor of woman. The "rounder" and "dead game sport" should be left to herd with their kind.

THE MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE QUESTION.

A despatch from Sarnia, Ont., informs us that the ministers of Sarnia and Port Huron, Mich., have joined in taking a stand on the marriage and divorce question, having adopted a resolution "to adhere to the Scriptural teaching in regard to remarrying of persons who have been divorced."

This resolution, so far as is quite clear in meaning, is very good; but when we come to examine what is the real Scriptural teaching on the point, we find that there is considerable diversity of opinion among the parties who have come to this agreement.

The rule laid down by the Westminster Confession is that, "Nothing but adultery or such wilful desertion as can in no way be remedied by the Church or civil magistrate is cause sufficient of dissolving the bond of marriage."

And further, it is provided that in such a case, only the "innocent party can sue out a divorce, and after the divorce, to marry another, as if the offending party were dead."

These provisions have been adopted very generally recently by the Protestant denominations, and are founded upon a wrong interpretation of St. Matt. v. 32, which allows indeed a man to put away his wife on account of infidelity to the marriage obligations, which means that he may separate from her for such a cause, but which gives no leave for either husband or wife, either the innocent or the guilty party in the case, to marry again.

That this is the correct interpretation is clear from St. Mark x. ii., and St. Luke xvi. 18, which declare that in no case can divorced parties marry again. This is also admitted by the Church of England to be the correct interpretation; for in the form of solemnization of marriage of the Church it is twice expressly stated that the marriage shall hold "until death do us part."

The Prayer Book of the American Protestant Episcopal Church makes the same provision, though the wording is slightly changed. It is clear, therefore, that the ministerial agreement will be interpreted differently and was intended to be interpreted differently by the ministers themselves who agreed to it.

We must here also remark that the purpose of the Conference was to mitigate a scandal, and this is admitted by the very fact that the conference was held at all. And what was this scandal?

It was evidently that hitherto these ministers did not adhere to the Scrip-

tural teaching on this point. And yet these are the very men who persist in calling the Catholic Church corrupt on the plea that it has departed from the teaching of Scripture!

If this were really the case, the Catholic Church would be no worse than their own sects. But it is not the case. The Catholic Church has always adhered strictly to the rule laid down by Christ Himself in regard to marriage: "What God hath joined together let no man put asunder." There is not one instance in the whole history of the Catholic Church, wherein a marriage duly contracted and consummated has been dissolved by the Catholic Church.

On the other hand, both divorce and polygamy have been solemnly ratified by Protestant Churches. Two marriages of Henry VIII. were ratified by the Church of England after two divorces; and in the case of Philip Landgrave of Hesse, bigamy was permitted by the whole council of Protestantism in an official pronouncement to this effect, signed by Luther, Beza, Melancthon, and others of their colleagues. Surely these were corrupt doings in the Church which professed to restore the Christian religion to its primitive purity; and we are justified in regarding the Sarnia resolution as a mere sham.

FRANCE AND THE POPE.

The anti-Catholic press of both hemispheres have been for some time in an ecstasy of delight owing to the decided breach of cordial relations between France and the Holy See.

While acknowledging that the present situation of the Church in France is deplorable, humanly speaking, as it is the evident desire of the Government utterly to destroy religion, and while from the decisive majority given at the general elections to this Atheistic Government it would seem that the French nation is already hopelessly lost to the Catholic Church and to Christianity, we have never lost the confidence that the attachment of the French people as a whole to their religion is still strong notwithstanding the apathy with which they have looked on while the Church has been ruthlessly persecuted, and religious education of the children has been destroyed, so far as the Government has been able to destroy it, and we firmly believe that the day is not distant when the people will rise in their might to assert that the nation is unalterably Catholic.

In the recent studied insult to the Pope, when President Loubet went to Rome to visit officially King Victor Emmanuel III. in the Pope's own city, which has been seized and held by the Italian Government as the capital of the new kingdom of Italy, M. Combes and his Government, no doubt, believed that they were giving the death-blow to the Holy Father's hopes that the estates of the Church, and especially the city of Rome, shall ever be restored to their lawful sovereign the Pope.

There is no doubt that this was the meaning of the visit. As the protest of the Pope declares, "public opinion, both in France and Italy, made no mistake as to the offensive character of this visit, which was intentionally sought for by the Italian Government with a view thereby to weakening the rights of the Holy See. Public opinion perceived the offence to the dignity of the Holy See—a dignity which it regards as its main duty to protect and defend in the great interest of Catholics all over the world."

And why should not the Holy Father have made protest?

France has possessed special privileges in its intimate connection with the Church, and has been the power to which, more than to any other, a large share in the Government of the Church throughout the world has been committed. The Concordat also, it is true, was a benefit to the Church, but the benefit was reciprocal and France as a nation derived even more real benefit from the Concordat than it received.

From the days of Charlemagne and Pepin, the rulers of France have felt it to be their greatest glory to protect the Church and to be regarded as the eldest and most devoted sons of the Church, and princes of the Church have been the ablest administrators of the affairs of the French nation, and even to this day the French nation enjoys a special prestige over all Asia owing to the fact that it is the authorized protector of Catholics in all the Asiatic countries.

The French Government was warned beforehand that the visit of the President to Rome to visit King Victor Emmanuel would be regarded as an act of hostility, but Premier Combes found it would be an excellent means to precipitate a conflict between Church and State, and he was resolved to force the conflict, and the visit was made.

The Pope had informed the French Government also that on the occasion of such a visit, the French President could not be received by him in audience. No Catholic ruler had up to

this time visited the Italian King in Rome, for the reason that such a visit would have been equivalent to an acknowledgment that the Pope's right to independence, with Rome for his capital, had lapsed. Such a lapse could not take place without the Pope's consent, which has never been given, and will not be given; and it is a disgrace to the head of any Catholic Government that he should push himself forward to make such an acknowledgment before the world. France, in fact, is disgraced by having been the first, and we hope the last, to make it.

The Pope's protest was a noble and heroic act. It was given in the face of the French Government's threats to carry on a war of extermination against the Church, but the long line of Popes have never been terrified by such threats from the line of duty. The Emperors of the West, the tyrants of Europe, have been faced by Pontiffs, and rebuked for their rapacity and other evil deeds, as well as the leaders of the barbarous hordes which devastated Europe and Africa during the transition period preceding the middle ages and on all these occasions, the Pope's have shown themselves firm in the maintenance of truth and justice.

There have been, indeed, disasters arising out of these embroilments, and schisms and heresies have been established in certain countries as a result from them, but the Church has in each case come forth from the ordeal without scathe, but purified by the trials through which she has passed, and never were the children of the Church more devoted to their faith and to the venerated Head of the Church than they are at the present day.

In their troubles with the French Government, both Leo XIII. and Pius X. have shown unequalled equanimity of temper, and an earnest desire to reach an amicable understanding, and have submitted to both insult and injury through a desire to imitate their Divine Master, Whom, when He suffered, He threatened not, but delivered Himself to him that judged Him unjustly.

But when the principles of divine faith were attacked, these great Pontiffs, hesitated not to tell the princes of the earth who raged against them that the sacred deposit of truth and justice, the guardianship of which was committed to their care, would be guarded unto death, as so many of their predecessors had done before them.

It has been said to the Church by the prophet of God "Kings shall be thy nursing fathers, and queens thy nurses." And the prophecies have been fulfilled in such monarchs as Pepin, Charlemagne, St. Louis, St. Edward, etc. But kings and princes have also attempted to destroy religion. The end was their own destruction. Such was the case with Batassar, Antiochus, Herod, Nero, Diocletian, etc. With the promise of Christ in view, that the gates of hell shall not prevail against God's Church, we have confidence that M. Combes and President Loubet have entered upon a losing battle, and already the mutterings of the storm are heard in the air betokening, as we believe, that their day of doom is at hand.

We are not at all surprised that the maintainers of the robber Government of Italy have shown some indignation against the Pope for this new declaration to the world that he still holds his claims to the territory of which he was deprived by violence thirty-four years ago. The Italian premier Giolitti declared that Italy will not interfere in regard to the Pope's protest, as the Italian Government had not received a copy thereof. France had answered itself, but he added the threat:

"It will be worse for the Church on the day when she illegally interferes in the affairs of the State." It is, therefore, in his estimation, an illegal act for the victim of a highway robbery to demand justice from the highwayman. But the Pope will continue to do so notwithstanding these threats; and we doubt not the day will come when for the sake of the world's peace, and for the guaranteeing of the independence of the Supreme Head of the universal Church, the nations will restore at least a part of the Church's patrimony, with Rome for its capital, and that France itself will be the most forward notwithstanding present appearances to the contrary, in demanding that the Head of the Church shall have full freedom in the management of its affairs, with territorial independence. It will certainly be, as it is now, to the interest of the nations, Protestant and schismatic, as well as Catholic, and even Pagan and Mahometan, that the Universal Church should be free from interference on the part of any single nation, and this can be accomplished only by the independence of the Church. Justice also requires this, as the States of the Church came into her possession by right of succession, as the only power which was strong enough to rule the people equitably when the old Roman empire was broken

up more than twelve centuries ago, when Pope's donation was given.

The French Government, to signify its anger against the Holy Father for having asserted his right, withdrew its ambassador to the Vatican. But this does not trouble the Holy Father very much. He would be better pleased to have a peaceful settlement with the French Government—but if there must be war, it will be found that he can strike some hard blows too.

A telegram from Rome dated June 13th stated that the Papal Nuncio at Paris believes the trouble between the Holy Father and the French Premier will settle itself very soon, by the overthrow of the Combes Ministry. A few days later another telegram, of date 21st June, stated that in all likelihood M. Combes will fall on the question of the bribe looked for by Edgar Combes, who promised on behalf of his father, for a million or two million francs, to allow the Carthusian monks to remain in France.

Such is the patriotic disinterestedness of an Atheistic government.

A COLLAPSE AT LAST SAID TO BE IMMINENT.

We have several times given expression to our conviction that the Catholic spirit of the French people would before long call a halt to the persecution which the Combes Government is engaged in carrying on against the Church, and in fact against Christianity. We must admit, however, our disappointment that the day of retribution which we expected has been so long delayed that there may still be some reason for doubt that it will come as expected.

From the present Chamber of Deputies it is vain to hope for any solid manifestation of religious feeling; but there are assurances that the Catholics of the nation are awakening to the obligation of unmistakably asserting their faith; but they will have no opportunity of making themselves felt very effectively until the next general elections. Yet if the reaction against the existing Government is a reality, it may be that even the present Chamber may take time by the forelock, and anticipate the verdict of the coming elections by defeating the Combes Government at once.

We have stated in another article in this issue that the Nuncio at Paris has expressed the opinion that the Combes Government is near its end. Such is, at least, the statement made in several despatches recently received from Paris. While we are not over-sanguine that anticipations to this effect shall be realized, we must say that there are strong signs that this will be the case. It would seem that the Deputies are aware that events are occurring which must culminate in the overthrow of the Government, and as many Deputies are already ready to go with the current, it is quite a likely thing that though there have been recent votes of confidence passed in the Government, even the present Chamber may change all this by voting non-confidence within a few days; and it now appears highly probable that this will be the case.

An unexpected issue has suddenly come to the front in the Chamber according to recent despatches from Paris. Thus, one dated June 10th states that the Premier had an acrimonious dispute with M. Miller, the Socialist ex-Minister, during which some one on the right shouted out, "what about the Carthusian millions?" The allusion was here to a statement made by M. Bisson a short time before the expulsion of the Carthusian monks from France, to the effect that M. Edgar Combes, the Premier's son, had attempted to extort a million francs from the Grand Chartreuse monastery, which is equivalent to \$200,000 of American money, for which sum authorization of the order would be obtained from the Government.

M. Bisson made this charge in an article published in the Petit Dauphinois, and declared that he was prepared to prove it if a libel suit were brought against him.

M. Edgar Combes could not be induced to bring the libel suit, but asked that he should be tried by a jury, in which case the public prosecutor would conduct the case against him.

The public prosecutor is an appointee of the Government, and if he were to conduct the trial, M. Edgar Combes, who was Secretary of the Minister of the Interior when the bribe was offered, would have the influence of his father, the Premier, and of the Government in his favor, and would undoubtedly have been whitewashed by the investigation, which, as it would have been farcical, was repudiated by M. Bisson as the medium for the inquiry into his charges, and the investigation was not made.

But when the matter was recently referred to in the Chamber of Deputies, Premier Combes put on a face of injured innocence and said:

"That is one of the most painful recollections of my life. I sacrificed

certain proof of an infamy committed against me to high political considerations."

A deputy here asked leave to put a question regarding an alleged bribery, whereupon M. Combes expressed satisfaction that an opportunity was afforded him to reveal a secret which had weighed upon him, and made a statement to the effect that "the Secretary of the Ministry of the Interior had informed him (the Premier) that he had received a visit from a person who offered him two millions if he (the Premier) would bring in a bill authorizing the Carthusian monks to remain at the Grande Chartreuse."

His indignant reply was, according to his own story, "the person had better not enter my room unless he wants to go out through the window." He had paid no further attention to the incident until he had afterward brought in the bill refusing authorization to the Carthusians, and some newspapers had then said that the Secretary (the younger Combes) had asked one million that his father should make a speech in favor of the Carthusians. The intermediary was Mr. Lagrave, the Commissioner of France to the St. Louis Exposition.

The Premier's explanation was not accepted by the Chamber, and several Deputies demanded that a thorough investigation be made either by a Parliamentary Commission, or by the judicial authorities. It was finally decided by an almost unanimous vote of the Chamber on June 21st that a commission of thirty-three members should make the investigation.

M. Legrave has already given his testimony before the Commission, and being confronted by M. Edgar Combes, mutual recriminations were made, each one accusing the other of lying!

It is now stated that a majority of the Commission are against the Combes family compact, which is to say that the Premier's patriotic denunciations of the religious orders, as being the enemies of the French Republic, were but shams, and were dictated by self-interest, as through the influence of a million or two francs he could be induced to allow the monks to remain in the country, notwithstanding that he had so many times declared with the greatest vehemence that the safety of the nation required they should be expelled. And his indignation expressed in the Chamber a few days ago against the man who would attempt to bribe him was all a piece of theatrical display.

It is stated that the evidence brought before the Commission so far has been very damaging to M. Combes, and if the brief news on the subject sent by cable be only one half true, the Combes Government must collapse within a few days, leaving behind it a stench of hypocrisy, duplicity, tyranny and criminality such that a parallel to it could not be found except in such countries as Turkey and China, or in the Roman Empire in its worst days—or in France itself during the reign of terror.

The Commission, it is said, has done its work so rapidly that it will make a report of its proceedings so far to the Chamber of Deputies within a few days.

So intense was the excitement produced by the facts so far ascertained that partisans of the opposing factions fought with inkstand and fists at the meeting of the Commission.

From all this it will be seen that the determination of the Pope not to hold any further negotiations with the Combes' Government, on the matters in dispute between them, but to await its downfall, was based upon a full knowledge of the situation.

ANOTHER.

We are pleased to see in the last issue of the Canada Gazette a notice of the appointment of Edward O'Connor, Esq., Barrister, to be Surrogate Judge in Admiralty of the Exchequer Court for the Provisional District of Algoma. After a decade of service on the Bench it must be most gratifying to Judge O'Connor to have his merits thus recognized. We doubt not he will merit the confidence of the Government and the people with whom he may come into contact in his official capacity.

Time was when the appointment of a Catholic to a prominent position in Ontario would be a nine days' wonder. But since the Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick became Minister of Justice there has been a remarkable change in this regard. That gentleman and his colleagues in the Ministry are actuated with the same noble ideal as their leader—to stamp out class, racial and creed prejudice, and treat all with equal justice.

Miss Mary Rice, daughter of U. T. S. Rice, a prominent business man and superintendent of the Methodist Sunday school, on June 7th, took final vows at the Convent of the Visitation at St. Louis. Her parents and two sisters, who objected to her step, returned to-day from St. Louis, where they pleaded with her to reconsider.

DEATH OF

The diocese of recent years number of its mable priests. To record the death of John O'Neil, parish priest of St. John's, after an illness of several months, during which he suffered with and fortitude, be the will of God.

Father O'Neil, vatt, County Kildare, 1820, and five years of age death. He was in the year 1820, year of his priest the Diocese of Rev. Bishop Mo was appointed of British soldier he went to Canada where, for eleven work together duties as chaplain diocese of London for two years Stratford as assistant of Hamilton. His parish priest remained till thirty-six years.

Father O'Neil amiable and kind much beloved fellow priests many years he Bishop's Council great influence sound advice while assisting tion of diocese

THE HAGUE

From Rome telegraphic will which are represented. constituted in the posed that the sented, and Ru favorable, but owing to the of the Pope's re to the bringing question of the It has been agreed with the of the P order to obtain excluding the sented, as the when the Pea tuted. But no has been sent the two South Britain will not motive for rec Italy, and it m she will recog can be exercis ferest of peace now to the contentive.

The Rev. R died recently eighty-three, his life at the the North-West conversion and Mrs. O. L. Malet") who worthy fiction Church. She late Charles K for the Cathol connected with pression in hi et" had long step.