

The Catholic Record

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

Editor: REV. GEORGE R. NORTHGRAVE. Author of "Mistakes of Modern Infidels."

Publisher and Proprietor, Thomas Coffey. Rates of Advertising—Ten cents per line each insertion, a rate 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 residence 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. Mailer intended for publication should be mailed in time to reach London not later than Monday morning.

Obituary and marriage notices sent by subscribers must be in a condensed form, to insure insertion.

Agents: 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.

Agents for Newfoundland, Mr. James Power of St. John's. Agent for district of Nipissing, Mrs. D. D. Reynolds, New Leno, Ontario.

When subscribers change their residence it is important that 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 stoutly 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 Catholic families. With my blessing on your work, and best wishes for its continued success.

Yours very sincerely in Christ, DONATUS, Archbishop of Episcopus, 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.

The 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. FALCONO, Arch. of Larissa, Agent, Belise.

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."

SPOLIATION 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 of foot 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 poverty-stricken 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, slight 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 chivalry 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, not separation but spoliation.

NEW THEOLOGY.

When a vessel cuts away from its moorings and drifts to sea, it is hard to say how far the winds and waves will carry it.

Something of the same kind, only with far more disastrous results, has taken place in religious thought.

If we try to find out what is the form of belief outside the Catholic Church, we are given something so indefinite that it seems a shadow, and something so void that an enquiring mind will turn from it in despair.

Let us take a concrete case. The Rev. Mr. Campbell is the Minister of the City Temple in London, Eng. This is one

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 her 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 over 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 rails laid down by the eminent Cardinal.

One characteristic of

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 consecration 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 40,000,000 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.

Napoleon 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 his 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 his 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 gods.

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 Newman's advice we would characterize that stuff as it deserves.

The Papacy was neither an alien power, nor did it interfere in French affairs.

The only act that ever had the semblance of interference was when Leo XIII. urged the French Catholics to be loyal to the Republic.

That does not look like requiring a call to self-defence.

But any kind of stone will do to throw at the Vatican.

Is Vaticanism incompatible with the Republic of the United States? But what is Vaticanism anyway? Here was a Concordat, a sacred, bilateral contract.

It was no question of the political views of the French people on the one hand and of the Vatican on the other.

The Concordat had passed through several forms of Government.

Why should it be broken? Whatever views some monarchical adherents held never originated from the authority of the Vatican.

The French Republic never had a truer friend than Leo XIII.

Yet the Republic embittered his latter days.

Athletic in its inception, it carries on a systematic policy of undermining religion and rooting it out of the nation.

The attacks upon the educational communities were the beginning.

These were followed up by the expulsion of the other religions.

We have not yet seen the turn; for the Separation Law is by no means the finale.

The trend is along the same line. It is the hatred of Christ and His Church.

What is the use of men talking like children or chattering like magpies? Listen to Mr. Hague: "It is said," he remarks, "by those who know, that the State, though often vexed and tempted, loyally kept by the compact, but that the Vatican by its folly precipitated the climax."

The two acts which he quotes are President Loubet's visit to Rome when the Holy Father refused to receive him; and the summoning of two Bishops to Rome.

For the enlightenment of Mr. Hague we add a third—the refusal of Pius X. to accept some of the Government nominees to vacant French sees.

None but prejudiced minds can see in these acts anything but honor, dignity and the love of religion.

The French Government knew the etiquette of its chief magistrate when it sent him on a visit to the robber King of Italy.

Had Pius X. received him every Catholic in the wide world would have felt the humiliation.

In calling the Bishops of Laval and Dijon to Rome without consulting the Government the Sovereign Pontiff was simply doing his duty—with courage—looking after the honor of the episcopate and the discipline of the Church.

We hurry to Mr. Hague's anomalous conclusion, in which he blames the atheism of France, and volunteers the hazardous statement that within the last hundred years not twenty new churches have been built in the land, "so little hold has the old religion had upon the people."

Notwithstanding the objections to which a state-paid Church may be exposed, not even notwithstanding the severe strictures put upon the Church by the organic articles, notwithstanding the frequently unjust way the Concordat was interpreted, the history of religion during its hundred years of existence was one of glory, sacrifice and success.

So far from Mr. Hague's statement being true there was hardly a single diocese in France in which twenty new churches were not erected.

Look at the shrines of Lourdes, Notre Dame de la Garde, La Salette, Fourvière, Sacred Heart at Paris, the cathedrals of Marseilles and Moulins, and many other monuments of devotion.

The churches built by the religion of France are not confined to its borders.

Wherever the propagation of the Faith has sent its funds—to Canada in the West or India and China in the far East—there will be found the same lasting contradiction to the fabrication and gossip of men like Mr. Hague.

We do not deny that there are dark lines in the spectroscopy of France.

But there are many bright ones, in which we see chivalrous faith, generous devotion and deep religion multiplying their good works and maintaining the truest traditions of the Eldest Daughter of the Church.

All in France have not bowed the knee to Baal.

Back of the noisy aggressive atheists, angels are fitting to and fro upon their errands of mercy.

We do not think that Mr. Hague has studied the question with care or has stated it with a due regard to justice and charity.

THE "HISTORIC EPISCOOPATE" 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

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: Bishop, 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 without mincing 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 Pres