

## THE CATHOLIC RECORD.

## The Catholic Record

Published Weekly at 454 and 456 Richmond Street, London, Ontario.  
Price of Subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

EDITORS:  
RAY GEORGE R. NORTHGRAVE,  
Author of "Mistakes of Modern Infidels,"  
THOMAS COFFEY,  
Publisher and Proprietor, Thomas Coffey

Rates of Advertising—Ten cents per line each insertion, space measurement.

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. Approved and recommended by the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa and St. Boniface, the Bishops of London, Hamilton, Peterborough and Oshawa, N. Y., and the clergy throughout the Dominion.

Subscribers who change their address should notify this office as soon as possible in order to insure the regular delivery of their paper.

Agents or collectors have no authority to stop your paper unless the amount due is paid. Matter intended for publication should be mailed in time to reach London not later than Monday morning. Please do not send us poetry. Obituary and marriage notices sent by subscribers must be in a condensed form, to insure insertion.

Members: Luke King, P. J. Neven, E. G. Broderick and Miss Sarah Hanley are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transact all other business for THE CATHOLIC RECORD.

Send for Newfoundland, Mr. James Power of St. John's.  
Agent for district of Nipissing, Mr. D. D. Reynolds. New subscribers change their residence to a new address, please send the old as well as the new address be sent us.

LETTERS OF RECOMMENDATION.  
Apostolic Delegation,  
Ottawa, June 13th, 1906.

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

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 strongly defends Catholic principles and rights, and stands firmly by the teachings 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 it will do more and more, as its wholesome influence reaches more Catholic homes.

I, therefore, earnestly recommend it to Catholics.

With my blessing on your work, and best wishes for its continued success,

Yours very sincerely in Christ,  
DONATUS, Archbishop of Ephesus,  
Apostolic Delegate.

UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA,  
Ottawa, Canada, March 7th, 1907.

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

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 matter 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. FALCONI, Arch. of Larissa,  
Apost. Delegate.

LONDON, SATURDAY, FEB. 23, 1907.

## TEMPERANCE IN IRELAND.

A brief account of the various temperance enactments for Ireland is given in the Irish Rosary Magazine, by Father Aloysius, director of the Father Mathew Hall in Dublin. As evidence of the success of Father Mathew he points out that, whereas in 1838 the number of public-houses in Ireland was 21,326, six years after, in 1844, there were only 13,514. This success was due, not to legislation, but to the devotion of Father Mathew. Nor was there any legislation at all during this period upon the subject. And during the famine which followed not long afterwards drink-temptations were multiplied in connection with government relief works. Father Aloysius answers the objection that legislation will not make a man sober. That may be, but it very materially has smoothed the way to drunkenness by a want of sympathy and even criminal connivance of the laws with the forces in opposition. The article regrets that no government or party has yet dealt with the question of drink-control by a really comprehensive and statesmanlike measure. Good has been effected, the number of public-houses has been reduced, and the amount per capita of the drink bill. But while this satisfactory progress is going on, "our wise rulers," adds the good priest, "have arranged that the deficit shall fall on the Intermediate Education grant, so that the schools suffer for a sober Ireland."

## SPOILATION NOT SEPARATION.

The action of the French Government in destroying the Concordat is spoliation and not separation. It is just and important to emphasize this point so as to put the case in the proper light before the civilized world. Deceit and suppression of truth have been, and remain still, throughout the crisis, a usual method of warfare for the French ministry and the French press. Nor should this common plan astonish us, for the French ministry is composed largely of journalists. The ministry deludes the country and the press deludes the world. Premier Rouvier claimed that the design of the bill "was to affirm the neutrality of the State in all religious matters and to guarantee liberty of conscience to all religious faiths." This is the interpretation of an American newspaper—the Cumberland Presbyterian, of Nashville, Tenn. So quickly does falsehood spread, and so slow about is truth in the chase. Where is the neutrality of this State? Where the guarantee of Catholic faith, even as one of the religious faiths of France? If the State wished to be neutral, then it should have left the buildings to the Church and told the Church to carry on its affairs of religion, education and charity. On the contrary, the State takes these

buildings and their contents. What is their history? Some of the property was there originally when the Concordat was signed. Some was since acquired. Then there were the earnings of devout men and women who gave up their work and lives to build and support institutions of education and charity. There were legacies bestowed and gifts for purposes of religion. All these are confiscated. An evil tree cannot bring forth good fruit. The goods which formed the basis of salaries to be paid by Napoleon had been alienated—and their return was only partial and nominal. No point in the history of the Concordat shows so clearly the magnanimity of the Holy See in restoring religion to a distressed country. Nor does any point display more forcibly the craft of the First Consul in his too successful endeavor to make the Church the salaried servant of the State. So far as thousands of country priests are concerned, whose poverty the mere pittance given by the Concordat scarcely relieved from destitution, as a salary it was a mockery, and as a suitable treatment of those who could not supplement it, it was a disgrace to those who offered it. But, alight as these salaries were, they kept the lamp of religion burning in the lonely mountains where dwelt generations of faithful peasants. We are not called upon to admire the Concordat, though we admire the noble clergy, who, in spite of hardship, poverty and loneliness, did such noble work. Much of this must end: or wait with doubtful prospect for a new order. The peasants in many of these districts cannot, nor are they accustomed to make sufficient offerings to support their pastors. When the Concordat was under consideration, Rome, wishing a free clergy, proposed that they should be paid out of the ecclesiastical goods which had not been alienated. Napoleon did not care to bind his own hands. As a consequence, the support of the clergy was guaranteed, at least partially, by the State. This was acknowledged as a perpetual national debt. As long as France remained France and the Catholic Church subsisted so long would the obligation remain. It was a continued rental for property to which in justice the State had no right, but in which the Church gave the State undisturbed possession. For France, therefore, to cancel this debt, and practically say, we will hold the property and pay you no more, is spoliation, not separation. Furthermore, when France broke the Concordat there was spoliation of the very contract itself. It is the act of a highwayman, who, after signing an agreement, binding himself to pay an annuity, steals the paper and says he will not pay any more. There was a third act of spoliation on the part of France, which is, if possible, more scandalous and disgraceful than even destroying the Concordat. It is the expulsion of Mgr. Montagnini, the Secretary of the Papal Embassy at Paris, and the outrageous seizure of his papers. In no civilized part of the world would one Government dare to insult the official of another in such a way. But because the Pope had no army, it could be done. And not a single nation with civility enough to protest! The excuse was that he was receiving instructions from a foreign power to break the laws of France. The very contrary was the case; for the Holy Father had directly counseled abstention from violence. Throughout the whole crisis—long before the expelling forces of irreligion had reached the last part of the Concordat—through the years when innocent, hard-working religious were expelled and driven into the streets to starve or to die—throughout these dreadful years there has been but one plan of action—spoliation and plunder. Why call it separation? It is the separation which the wolf gives the lamb. Is this neutrality? It is the neutrality which the armed landlord gives his evicted tenant. Let no one think that this policy of spoliation is going to stop with France or with the Catholic Church. It is the turn of our poor co-religionists now. After us, if the sects are worth plundering, the guns will be pointed at them. Let them cant as they will, and exult in the trials of the old Church as they always do—their turn will come. They will call the spade a spade, and see with us, eye to eye, no separation but spoliation.

of the great Congregational Churches of the Metropolis. Here was a preacher giving out theories which have set religious circles all astir. According to some critics it is a victory for Unitarianism. According to others his new theology is a hash of Buddhism, Spiritism, Christadelphianism and Unitarianism. His leading errors affect the Incarnation, the fall of man, the atonement. These things do not astonish us. When we consider that these men, active-minded many of them, are trying to sail the drifting ship without compass and without rudder we must expect such wanderings. The wonder to us is that they do not stray farther. No doubt they are far from home, so far they are never likely to return; but no restraining authority stands over them to hold them in check or bid them return. What can these people know, who, Bible in hand, constituted themselves judges of God's great secret mysteries and man's darkest problems? Outside of the Catholic Church we do not see how Unitarianism can help gaining. It was Peter who testified to his Master's divinity. It is Peter's rock-founded Church which, through the centuries, has borne the same unerring testimony. She has never wavered, whether in a first century against the half converted philosophers of Antioch and Alexandria, or in the third and fourth centuries against Manichee and Arius. Her voice has never changed or faltered: "Thou art Christ the Son of the living God." Systems of philosophy have risen and fallen since the beginning of the Christian era—some with might and pride of intellect, others with no strength of principle or force of argument. The Church has listened to what they had to say, and has accepted from them all the tribute of truth whenever it has been presented; but none of them have ever swerved from her course or driven her into error. To confound Buddhism with Christianity, to go to excess in Spiritism, to drift to Unitarianism are in perfect keeping with the new theology. It is useless to follow any extravagant meteoric thinker as he wanders hither and thither. A word, however, may be said about Buddhism. This may be appreciated by remembering that Buddhism is the incarnation of an idea rather than of a person. Its western and philosophical counterpart is Hegelian philosophy. It implies fatalism, and its organization is based upon classes and castes. Prophecy, type and figure were never its anticipating messengers, nor was the resurrection of the dead the olive branch of hope which it held in its hand. Individuality was swallowed up, according to Buddhism, in the continued wearing away of character. On the other hand, Christianity has exalted the individual. The Shepherd took more trouble about the one lost sheep than about the other ninety-nine. There is joy in the heavens above one sinner doing penance. Apostles wrote inspired epistles to individuals, and the Church has set the same unmeasured value upon each single soul. Mr. Campbell's errors seem to run to an excess of spiritism. But there is another point in it. The question is whether he will still hold the City Temple and preach the doctrines referred to. This is very similar to the Holy Father and the French Government. The Holy Father, standing for purity of doctrine and integrity of ecclesiastical discipline, insists that there shall be no public worship except by the authorization of the French Bishops. The Government, claiming the church buildings, wishes to exclude the Bishops, and thus pave the way for any novel teaching, or any unfrocked friar. What Mr. Campbell is teaching could for some time have been seen in the pages of magazines. Scarcely ever were the ideas voiced in a pulpit supposed to be Christian or held by one who claimed to be a leader in Israel. Such teachings could not remain closeted in the libraries of the learned; they were sure to filter through. Hence the tears and trouble of the City Temple and its new theology. Whither are the ships of religious thought drifting? We know not. One thing we know, and for which we are grateful. It is not the new theology, but the old, which is taught in St. Peter's Temple. Be it so forevermore.

## REV. MR. HAGUE ON FRANCE.

"No one," says Cardinal Newman, "would accuse a respectable person of deliberate falsehood." An awkward frame of mind took shape when we read in the London Free Press of the 22nd a report of the Rev. Dyson Hague's views of the situation in France. We presume that the report is correct and that he holds the views ascribed to him. From his calling and education we take it for granted he is respectable. No matter, therefore, what large holes we see in his new piece of tapestry we wish in our criticism to observe carefully the rule laid down by the eminent Cardinal. One characteristic of the

gentleman's notes bear, and that quite sufficient to weaken his statement, is the trivial inaccuracy with which he approaches the question. Flippant also is his method. And far from correct are the conclusions he draws. In undertaking to give a history of the Concordat, Mr. Hague starts with the revocation of the Edict of Nantes. What that has to do with the Concordat is incomprehensible. He might just as well have started with the fall of man. In fact, there is more direct connection between the disobedience of man in the first age, the confiscation of Churches by the revolutionists in the eighteenth century of the Christian era, and the subsequent agreement between the Pope and Napoleon, than there is between the revocation of the Edict of Nantes and the Concordat. But that is neither here nor there. History may be started from almost any point. It becomes, however, a prudent lecturer or writer to show the connection between his starting point and his subject. The origin and signing of the Concordat is given as follows:

"When Napoleon came into power he began to see that religion was a necessity to the State. With his shrewd foresight he determined as a matter of State policy to restore the Church in France. So he sent for the Pope, Pope Pius VII., and the Holy Father, as Guizot says in his history of France, came galloping to Paris. A conference ensued, which may be summarized as follows: 'We must have the Church back,' said Napoleon. 'Very good,' said the Pope. 'Your churches will all be restored,' said Napoleon. 'Very good,' said the Pope. 'You have been despoiled of much treasure. We will, therefore, give you 40,000,000 francs for compensation, and an annual endowment of 10,000,000 francs a year,' said Napoleon. 'Very good,' said the Pope. 'But in consideration of this,' Napoleon went on to say, 'you must agree on your part for your Bishops and clergy in France that the hierarchy shall take oath to be loyal to the Government, that a prayer for the Republic shall be inserted in the liturgy, that the Government shall control ecclesiastical appointments, and shall have the right to veto the embassy of any legate or nuncio.' 'Very good,' said the Pope, with a somewhat wry face, and a heart of misgiving. But, of course, he couldn't help himself; and so the famous Concordat came into existence. This was in 1801."

How flippant! How inaccurate! There is in it neither wit nor worth. The gentleman in his sneering style does justice neither to Pope nor Emperor, still less to his subject. The Concordat was the work of the great Cardinal Consalvi. He it was who had been Secretary and guiding spirit of the long protracted conclave of Venice, when Pius VII. had been elected to the papacy, who, after his coronation, appointed him Secretary of State. Although he was not amongst the first commission sent to negotiate with Napoleon, he soon took the leading part as the only one fitted to treat with the First Consul. It was Consalvi who signed the Concordat on July 15, 1801. Now Pius VII. did not go to Paris until 1804. The occasion had no connection with the historical treaty. It was at the time that Napoleon determined upon establishing an empire. He invited the Sovereign Pontiff to crown the work of the Concordat by journeying to Paris and consecrating him Emperor. The gentle Pius VII. went, performed the ceremony, and then expressed his wish to return to Rome. But the newly crowned Emperor had other designs: he wished to have the Holy Father reside in France. And he only yielded when he found that his design had been frustrated by the Pontiff's prudence. We are not admirers of Napoleon, though we should be sorry to treat him as unceremoniously as Mr. Hague does in ascribing to him no other motive than that of selfish ambition in his wish for the Concordat. Why Napoleon desired it, and what he thought of religion, is still a dispute in the study of the strangest character of modern times. Some have maintained that he looked upon the Church as part of the nation's police. Others quote the victor of Marengo and Austerlitz as saying that the greatest day of his life was the day of his First Communion. This is a view Mr. Hague may fail to appreciate. We claim that in this matter Bonaparte was actuated by the desire of restoring order and of laying broad the foundations of French dominion and greatness. He never sought his fame in religion. But he was Catholic enough to know that any glory his triumphs might offer to his soldiers or his people would be hollow mockery without the faith of their fathers. Nor was Napoleon the first after the French revolution to bring order out of the religious chaos. Priests had started, and things were ripe for a restoration of clergy, worship and goods.

Mr. Hague volunteers the statement that Vaticanism, so he terms it, and a Republican Government are incompatible—that this was soon felt, and that the State (France) realized that it had "to take measures in self defence against the political interference of an alien power." If it were not for Cardinal

distinctive doctrine of Anglicanism, according to the standards of belief of that body.

The Book of Common Prayer says as plainly as not to be misunderstood that, "From the Apostles' time there have been three orders of ministers in Christ's Church: Bishops, priests and deacons, which offices were evermore held in such reverend estimation that no man might presume to execute any of them, except he were first called, tried, examined, and known to have such qualities as are requisite for the same; and also by public prayer with imposition of hands were approved and admitted thereto by lawful authority and . . . no man shall be accounted or taken to be a lawful Bishop, priest or deacon in the Church of England, or suffered to execute any of the said functions except he be called, tried, examined, and admitted thereto according to the form hereafter following or hath had formerly Episcopal consecration or ordination."

The Prayer Book of the American Protestant Episcopal Church is equally explicit on this point, and the term "the historic episcopate" has come into general use among Anglicans as indicative of a fit subject to be boasted of.

Some years ago a deputation from the Presbyterian General Assembly of the United States attended a General Synod of the American Episcopal Church, held in New York, with a proposition looking toward a union of the two Churches, but the negotiations were wrecked on the reef of this "historic episcopate." It was made a subject of indignant ridicule in the Presbyterian General Assembly. It was said with outmincing matters that the Christian ministry consisted of but one order—Presbyters—and that never, even for the sake of a union, which would be secularly and spiritually of great advantage to both contracting parties, would the Presbyterians admit as a necessity the re-ordination of their clergy by a Bishop who claimed a historic succession from the Apostles, a succession which in reality the Episcopal Church does not possess. To submit to this would be an acknowledgment that for over three centuries they had claimed an authority to which they had no title. If the Episcopal Church required that they should make such an admission as a condition of union, there must be no union.

Similar conditions exist in Canada. The Church was not, in the first instance, invited to participate in the negotiations between the three denominations which proposed to unite into one great Church, in the Dominion of Canada: the Methodists, Presbyterians and Congregationalists, and consequently the Anglicans had no hand in the basis of doctrine which was adopted by the joint committee of these three denominations as a basis of union.

Some Anglicans are in favor of such a union, among whom are a considerable number of the clergy, and one or perhaps two or more Bishops. The three denominations in question had come to an arrangement whereby the chief difficulty, which was the Calvinistic belief nominally adhered to by two out of the three denominations concerned might be removed. It was thought at one time that the obstacle to union thus presented would be insuperable, but it was bridged over by the simple expedient that the Calvinism was quietly dropped, and an Arminian Creed agreed upon. Long ago the Calvinistic bodies had practically given up their belief in the distinctive articles of their Creed, and they were willing now to say this openly, so that the new Creed would be distinctly Arminian.

The Church of England is already decidedly Arminian, as Pitt long ago declared, and thus one obstacle to the union which was so much desired was removed, and the Anglican advocates of union conceived the thought that they, too, might be taken into consideration while the union movement was "in the air," and they even expressed themselves ready to sacrifice the chief Anglican doctrine which lay in the way, the absolute necessity of "the historic episcopate."

At the Canadian General Synod of the Church of England held in 1905, the Rev. J. Pitt Lewis declared against any further negotiations looking towards a union with the other denominations mentioned above, and the Synod, as a whole, seemed to approve his views. He said:

"Everything has been done by the Church of England which possibly could be done to bring about a re-union, but the other Churches have not reciprocated in the movement, but have attempted a union among themselves without inviting the Church of England to be present. When our Church goes beyond what it has done already, we throw away the dignity of the Church of England. I see nothing to be gained by holding every time in the Synod for the idea of union, when there is no tendency on the part of the other Protestant Churches to accept it, but rather the very opposite tendency. I know that no such union can possibly take place, and if it did take place it would be disastrous to the Church of England. The bringing of this matter

up from year to year cheapening the Church. There are certain Mr. Lewis's opinion, but others are of those of the latter regard the episcopate venient form of but not as essential thus they would episcopal ordination back in the Churches now new union.

But there are the absolute necessity order to the existence and the perpetuity. Thus, at the meeting Montreal, on Wednesday Bishop Carmichael, ly on the divinity Episcopate, quoted tallian, St. Cyprian, all of whom call of the Apostles calling them Apostles saying also that Bishops."

The Bishop of "To speak of e with the Church able institution, lent and useful Church, is an open, honest aving and a denial by the conferees orders."

He then settled point to Church of Eng Church must h points which b down by the B several occasions.

1. The Holy ard New Testam and Nicene C Sacraments, B of the Lord, pale.

We are comp historic episc England is a v sidering the de scription of Parker, the ori line of Archbis the other sees

## HOME RULE

## EDUCATION

The King's perial Houses last, made which have pe lies at the pre ference to the other to

The referer arises directl between the t on the educat passed by the very decisivel by the Lords tely, was so c Peers as to b ent bill from from the Com mons indigna it with the p It may be and amicable leaders in the ment, the pol settled in m the Lords agre while the gre of Commons would seem not really s conflict with for all, to a House of Co time the s British Em termed e ment to such an E acceptable Mr. Balf Twives in clared th against the overflowing of the C country to House of Commons. The pri which it second Ch country is hasty legi lature has It is a c may and bodies u utility; l ally ackn tive bodie Chamber ful consi Hence, in have a s provision as the many, et The H such a

## THE "HISTORIC EPISCOPE" AND CHURCH UNION.

It was William Pitt (Earl of Chatham) who said with as much truth as wit of the Church of England: "We have a Calvinistic creed, a Popish liturgy and an Arminian clergy;" and the aphorism is as suitable to the present time as it was when it was first uttered; for the garment of Anglicanism covers as many divers beliefs as the most fantastic mind can think of or conceive. Nevertheless, episcopacy is, at least, a