

Advertisements for teachers, situations wanted, etc., cost each insertion. Remittance to accompany 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 5 cents.

When subscribers ask for their paper at the post office it would be well were they 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 and Miss Sara Hanley are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transact all other business for the Catholic Record. Agent 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, 1905.

Mr. Thomas Coffey. 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.

Donatus, Archbishop of Ephesus, Apostolic Delegate. University of Ottawa, Ottawa, Canada, March 7th, 1900.

Mr. Thomas Coffey: 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. Falcosio, Arch. of Larissa, Apost. Leg.

LONDON, SATURDAY, OCTOBER 17, 1908.

CHILDLESS AND GODLESS.

We have before us an interesting and forceful letter addressed to the Star Journal by the Rev. Mr. Ker, Anglican Rector at St. Catharines, whose stand upon many questions we have often admired and whose discussions upon France we have always respected. We cannot quote this able letter at full length. The opening sentences contain the gentleman's fidelity to the truest principles of Christian family morals and an honorable protest against those who rejoice in the separation of Church and State in France. "I am," he writes, "one of those who believe firmly that a Godless and Childless nation cannot long survive. Many ill-informed people, misled by an unreasonable spirit of bigotry, worked themselves into a high state of enthusiasm when it was announced that France had broken with the Papal concordat. Such jubilation was discreditably and, apparently, as now appears, premature."

ceive the tradition of faith or to wave the country's flag. When we reflect upon the decreasing birth-rate in France we may rejoice that the Church is free and no longer the paid servant of a State whose law is atheistic and whose social fabric is worm-eaten with the most dangerous and suicidal crimes of nation-destroying sins.

THE GREEK CHURCH.

We take up the second point to which a correspondent referred, as given in last week's issue. He wishes to know how to answer those who deny that the Greek Church was ever subject to Rome. Let us see. Supposing a blind man was to tell us the sun did not shine, what would be our reply? There would be little use in contradicting him. We might try to find out his idea of the sun and also what he meant by translucency and other optical terms. The cases are not dissimilar. Here is the bare, bald proposition: "The Greek Church was never subject to Rome." What do those who deny it mean by the Greek Church, for it is indefinite in time and extent of space? The predicate is also obscure. What is clear is that subjection to the See of Peter is an historical mark of all the churches of the east. Now the fault we have to find with the proposition lies chiefly in the subject. The term Greek Church has a meaning at the present time in contrast with the Roman Church. There was a time—the first three centuries—when the term was impossible, incomprehensible. The centre which first attracted that group bearing this title was the imperial court of Constantinople. Before the fourth century the centres of Eastern ecclesiastical groups were Asia Minor, Egypt and Antioch. When the Roman Empire definitely settled down and Constantinople became the political capital of the civilized world it withdrew from Alexandria and Antioch the glory which had clustered for centuries around the very churches. The city of the emperors soon eclipsed these other centres, and assumed in ecclesiastical affairs a role unwarranted by Divine institution and sacred tradition. Constantine and his successors were able to establish a new political Rome. To create a second Roman Church, to invest it with the powers of the old, is beyond the power of emperor or bishop or council. It comes from a higher source. A Byzantine Church thus grew up, leaning more upon political support than upon apostolic authority, tending towards separation and fostering a spirit of schism which had, and could have, but one termination. Even so, even with all the subtlety of the Greek character, with all the intrigue of a corrupt and corrupting court, with all the disastrous policies of iconoclastic emperors, the Roman primacy was acknowledged. This primacy was furthermore considered not a mere form. Greek authors and Greek councils recognized the right and duty of the Pope to exercise a general supervision over religious affairs. In questions of dogma and ecclesiastical communion the papal assent was deemed necessary for a definite solution. The Greek Church might for a shorter or longer time withstand Rome. It always concluded by conforming itself to the Holy See. Supreme authority in doctrine, the Papacy was also the final court of appeal. To follow the divisions and heresies which rose and fell upon the Byzantine Church, from Arianism and Semi-Arianism in the fourth and fifth centuries, down to the Fourth Council of Constantinople in the year 869, and the quarrel between Ignatius and Photius, would take not a newspaper column or two but a whole volume. Strangely like Modernism does the Greek Church stand out in history. The authors of this great schism are to be found in those who opposed the Council of Nice upon the great question of the divinity of Jesus Christ. It was by Eusebius of Nicomedia and his accomplices that the autonomy of the Byzantine Church first showed itself. This autonomy manifested two dangerous tendencies. At the beginning of its history this Greek Church struck the war-note against all Catholic tradition upon the absolute divinity of our Lord. Secondly, it coquetted with imperial despotism. Whatever other conflicts may have characterized its history from that beginning down to the final rupture with Rome, all might have been arranged amicably—peace and union might have prevailed. But Arianism brought blindness, and court-courtesy brought corruption. All this is ancient history. There is no Roman Empire to-day; hardly a patriarchate of Constantinople. Hellenism is long ago past. The guardian of unity and truth is the same Rome of St. Peter. We have kept the best of the Greek sanctity, Greek learning and Greek patology. There can, when we untangle the many threads, be no doubt that in the beginning and before Arius the Greek Church was one with Rome. Through the disputes which followed Rome's authority was still acknowledged. We conclude that the Greek Church

was subject to Rome. As for the Russians, some have claimed that they were converted to Christianity by missionaries from Constantinople after the schism. This is not correct. They were converted while the Greeks remained in communion with the Holy See, and were very good, zealous Catholics. Indeed the Russians did not separate from Rome when the patriarch of Constantinople did, nor till long afterwards. It was not till the reign of Ivan the Terrible, (1553-1584) that the schism in Russia was complete.

ANGLICAN SYNOD.

In the General Synod of the English Church held at Ottawa last month, amongst other questions a resolution was introduced "providing for the adoption of a prayer in the administration of the sick." The resolution did not carry. The debate preceding the vote was interesting, for it showed how woefully deficient the lopped and lonely Branch is in consistency of doctrine and practice. Another point was largely in evidence: the cleavage between the High and the Broad Church. They did not forget to give the erring Sister of Rome a cut—as a satisfaction for their own contradictory attitude towards Extreme Unction. What is troubling Anglicans is that Christian Science is taking some of its members, chiefly the sick, the blind and the lame. Some provision must be made to stop the leakage. Here is the very thing—the anointing of the sick with oil. It is a wonder they never thought of it before. Nor would they have thought about it then had not the novelty of Christian Science started to ensnare the unwary. The mover "urged that the original purpose of anointing the sick was the restoration of health, and contended that the Roman Church had erred since about the ninth century in holding that anointing was for the forgiveness of sins, and only in rare cases for the healing of the body." Steady, Canon Scott, not so fast. Your prejudices are running away with you. Truth is a virtue worthy of every man, to be practised in theological arguments as well as in daily conduct. We fail to see the connection between Roman doctrine and the Anglican demand for Extreme Unction. It would have been, to say the least, more dignified to leave Rome out of the questions. Since, however, Rome has been made to figure in it we protest against the plea about our Church. We are happy to assure the Canon and the General Synod that what Rome held in the ninth century she had held in the first and other centuries preceding the ninth. Let us examine Rome's case more at length. Every sacrament is for the soul—to blot out sin or to increase sanctifying grace. No matter how often we may read in the Fathers about the unction doing good to the body, their expressions never exclude the spiritual effect. Nor can we entertain for one moment the idea that Our Lord did anything, performed any miracle or established any rite, except for the benefit of the soul and with the soul positively in view. By this we mean that He intended the sanctification of the soul. At no time did the Church regard Extreme Unction as a mere ceremony intended simply to benefit the body. From the beginning the Church has held it to be a sacrament established by Christ. Origen, St. Chrysostom, St. Innocent and St. Augustine, without mentioning others, speak of the effect most directly as remissive of sin. In the works of St. Gregory the Great the mode of administering this sacrament is prescribed. Liturgical works of the seventh century state the rite to be used. We have the testimony of the Greek Church, which in the Council of Florence subscribed to Extreme Unction as one of the seven Sacraments. Hieremias, Patriarch of Constantinople, replying to the Confession of Luther, remarks that there are no more, no less than seven sacraments. Amongst these he places Extreme Unction, which he calls a Divine Sacrament. We pass on to Canon Cody, whose position in the Synod was one of non-committal prudence. It was according to this Toronto Canon unwise for the Synod to deliver an ex-cathedra utterance on the question of divine healing. Quite right. He might as well have included all other questions of divine subjects. The Synod has no cathedra from which to deliver utterances of any kind. It may express opinions: authoritative declaration, none. So far, so good. How does the Canon maintain "that too much definition is not good for a living, growing Church?" All depends upon the power invested in the Church. If this refers to the Anglican Church the less definition the better: no authority, no definition. "It seemeth good to the Holy Ghost and to us," can never issue from an Anglican Synod or a Lambeth Conference to solve present doubt or provide for future contingencies. Anglicanism itself needs the unction and prayer of sacerdotalism to save it from disruption and its temporizing Canons.

BAPTIST DISCOLORING.

The Canadian Baptist undertook lately to give an explanation of Corpus Christi, or La Fete Dieu. Whether by evil intention or perverted judgment, the comments passed by this journal upon Catholic matters are more calculated to insult the children of the household than to instruct strangers. This is no exception. It may be that the Blessed Sacrament is the centre of attack, as it is the centre of faith and devotion. What pride will not admit, this it turns into greatest scorn. Ceremonies appeal no more to some than pictures to iconoclasts. It seems that "B"—whoever that is—a bright genius no doubt—stood last Fete de Dieu upon the steps of Molsons Bank, Montreal, and saw the procession of the Blessed Sacrament pass. "B's" spirit was aroused, although he kept it in check for a long time. We dare say that had it not been for the Eucharistic Congress in London "B" would not yet be heard from. He says with more sarcasm than truth: "This is the most important festival in the Romish church and is intended to inspire the faithful with zeal and the unbelieving with terror." How absurd and misleading. That "B" does not understand the spirit of this or any other feast of our Church is no surprise to us. That this magnificent festival should fill him with terror is an unexpected witness of his cowardice and prejudice. Triumph, says Father Faber, is the character of the Feast of the Blessed Sacrament—the triumph of faith over reason, spirit over matter, of heavenly truth over doubt and heresy. It is the most public profession Catholics can make of their faith—in the public streets and before the world. It is not any national victory. It is the triumph of the supernatural. Because triumph is its special character, procession is its special expression. There is less thought of prayer than of praise and thanksgiving. It is more the thought of the joy of home than the trying shadow of exile. Wherein lies the terror to the unbeliever? It is not surely the real presence of God which gives such tremendous solemnity to the whole and makes Catholicism so distinct from any of the so-called forms of Christianity. What terror can there be in the Blessed Sacrament—which is not one thing out of many, but all things—Odor of His name, sign of His Cross, fringe of His garment—Jesus Himself? He is terror to none save to those who, closing their eyes, see Him not as He passes by. Bigotry may feel its unreasonable fear in Montreal or prevent the procession in London. Truth remains. For seven hundred years the Feast has repeated its annual sermon of the Real Presence and the devotion of the living Church to its Lord abiding in her tabernacles.

"We cannot," says "B," witness this imposing spectacle without being overwhelmed with the sense of the great difficulties of Christian work among a people so blind in their devotion, and so given away to the spectacular in religion." Practical, if not courteous, and ignorant, if not considerate, "B" mistakes the circle for the centre, the honors bestowed for Him to whom they are offered. It is a gratuitous statement to speak in general of the blind devotion of a procession in whose ranks are numbered the learned and the elite of a large city. Yet "B," and all the B's—bumble, big and little, may as well stop their buzzing. Deeper down than their prattle can ever reach, stronger than their sneering or their bribes, lies the faith of virtuous and learned piety in the Real Presence. "B" knows no politeness when he speaks of that which Catholics hold most dear. His religion is easily defined. It is typified in the ancient Pharisee—replete with self-righteousness and contempt for Catholic faith and practice.

AUSTRALIAN CHURCH UNION.

The Anglican Church must feel its solitude most keenly. It is always making an effort towards extending its borders: Romeward if possible. Falling this, it manifests a disposition to turn in the opposite direction. In this as in so many other matters the Anglican Church does not act as a unit. How could it? Its action in the present case is local, and concerns the Australian branch. Away off in that southern continent Episcopal Anglicanism is now wedded to Presbyterianism. The Primate of the Church of England in Australia and Tasmania extended to the Moderator of the Presbyterian Church of Australia the right hand of fellowship, as a sign and token of the union of the Church of England with the Presbyterian Church of Australia. Then after the members of the two bodies are presented to the heads, the Primate and the Moderator, each holding the right hand of the other, say that this union is now consummated. The understanding is that all future candidates shall receive episcopal ordination. Comment upon the whole affair is unnecessary. To make Church Union consist in mere

handshaking, to trifle with matters which all people regard as sacred, is descending lower than we would even expect Anglicans to fall. This new union is very well named the Kangaroo scheme. The rocks of Protestant Federation are close, and Anglicanism is breaking to pieces upon them.

THE SORT OF WORK DONE by so-called missionaries in Catholic countries has little to commend it to those who are sincere Christians. It would appear as if the desire of these people were more for the purpose of creating hatred in the minds of Catholic youth for the Church of their ancestors than for making them good Protestants. This is what a correspondent of the London Times says of these well-salaried officials of the missionary societies:

"The boys they educate go away to drift into religious indifference. . . . Some missionaries have come to the conclusion that all they do is to unsettle such Christian faith as their pupils have, and are drawing back from the work. . . . It is highly doubtful, to say the least, whether either the Iglesia Espanola Reformada of Bishop Cabreria or the Evangelical of Don Cipriano Torros, or the Plymouth Brethren could exist without foreign help."

And so it is all along the line. The character given by the London Times to the Spanish missionaries would fit perfectly those gentlemen who receive bulky salaries from certain Canadian denominations to "carry the tidings" to those whom they call the "benighted French-Canadians" of the Province of Quebec. Surely who supply the funds must surely recognize the futility of the work the colporteurs are engaged in. When motions are brought up at the annual meetings to cut off the supplies a spirit of pride procures a majority against them. There is a "hold-the-for" cry, and the waste of money goes on.

IN LAST WEEK'S ISSUE we made reference to a despatch from Rome in which it was stated that Cardinal Merry del Val was about to resign his position because of displeasure with the action of English and American prelates. Archbishop Ireland upon being interviewed stated that "the story is a falsehood made out of whole cloth. The Avanti is the chief representative of the 'yellow press' of Italy: it is an avowed enemy of the Vatican; invented stories, deliberate falsehoods, are its stock in trade, when facts, or even appearances of facts, are wanting. As to the statement that English and American prelates sent to the Pope complaints against the cardinal because of his war on modernism, nothing could be more viciously false." The Archbishop further assures us that "the war against religious modernism is the Pope's own war, as it is the war of every good Catholic—indeed, of every sincere Christian. Modernism is, in its arguments and tendencies, the denial of the supernatural in the Christian religion—the elimination of that divine element in the Christian revelation, in the Scriptures and in the Church. A strange accusation to bring up against the Cardinal Secretary of State—that he was too strongly against modernism." Is it not time that the managers of the Associated Press brought to book those news-gatherers who quote from the Italian yellow papers.

WE ARE PLEASED to see in an American exchange that during "the past summer a notable feature in the industrial life of Nova Scotia has been the return to their homes of many of the young men and women who had gone to the United States during the past four years in search of employment. One express train from Boston which ordinarily has only eight cars arrived one day recently with seventeen cars, and though many tourists were on board, the bulk of the passengers were natives of Nova Scotia, who had decided on States to come back home and work on the farms." This is pleasant intelligence indeed. The opportunities for advancement in the Dominion of Canada are every year becoming more marked, and it is to be hoped that we will now not only hold our own but bring back those who strayed away a generation ago when life was a struggle, particularly amongst the industrial classes. Furthermore, we would like to see Canadians bring Americans with them. We have a great country.

THE 5TH OF OCTOBER brought us a despatch from Rome, the intelligence conveyed in which is quite characteristic of those in whose hands has been placed the government of the city. The mayor is what is known as an "anti-clerical," and also a Jew. The posting of bills and advertisements on the walls of Rome is a municipal undertaking. Heretofore a private firm secured these contracts, but the usage of all ages prohibited the placarding of the churches. The mayor has over-ruled this custom and bills of all sorts will soon cover places of worship. It cannot be expected that the mayor of Rome would have the same respect for Catholic

churches as he would have for Jewish synagogues or Masonic temples. Doubtless he is possessed of the same hatred for the Church as that which actuates the enemy of mankind. We hope to hear that he will ere long be voted out of an office which he has disgraced.

A CORRESPONDENT writes us that a very warm discussion is going on in the eastern section of the country on the question of marriage. "Why there are not more marriages" is the subject of controversy. We may remark that there are two sides to this question and that both sexes are blame-worthy. If we were asked to distinguish we would feel inclined to place the greater amount of blame on the young men. Many a time we have heard some of them declare they could not afford to get married on account of the extravagance of the fair sex. We have in mind at present one in particular who made a statement of that kind. He was in receipt of a very liberal salary, but his savings were nil because he was a sport. In his leisure hours he was faultlessly dressed. The gents' furnishings storekeepers knew him well. He owned an expensive dog. He carried a gold-headed cane. He smoked the most expensive brand of cigars, drank the most costly liquors, and in the heated term he was very fond of showing a Panama hat for which he paid forty-five dollars. And this is the young man who could not get married because the girls are too extravagant. The probability is he is looking for a girl with great expectations. Such a young man is a poor asset in any country, and fortunate is the girl who does not give him her heart and hand.

WE SEND OUR congratulations to the Most Rev. Archbishop of St. Boniface on the opening of his grand new cathedral, one of the most splendid sacred edifices in the Dominion. The missionary zeal which has prompted the erection of such a magnificent place of worship gives us proof abundant of the warm faith and untiring zeal of the clergy and laity under the jurisdiction of Archbishop Langevin. Indeed, throughout the length and breadth of the greater Canada in the West the active and whole-hearted work of all the missionaries is an object lesson most condescending to those that have at heart the spread of God's kingdom upon earth. God's blessing must surely be the portion of His Grace of St. Boniface and his ever faithful clergy and loyal laity for the sacrifices they have made in the cause of religion.

ARCHBISHOP O'CONNELL, of Boston, has made official announcement of the purchase of the Boston Pilot. In a signed article His Grace says:

"Unless we be willing to sit by inactive and indifferent spectators while the faith is threatened with weakness from a thousand influences about us, we must bestir ourselves and do something more than praising the past, which, however good and excellent it was, is past; and which after all was the achievement not of ourselves, but of our fathers and mothers. . . . The Pilot makes its advent modestly and without boast. Under diocesan control, however, it will be no uncertain voice, and no unsteady force for Catholic life and action."

In its career of well over half a century The Pilot has always been the staunch defender of the Church and has also done yeoman service in the cause of Ireland. Under the new arrangement we doubt not its influence for good will be increased.

AN AMERICAN EXCHANGE asks what is becoming of our Catholic young men. He assigns various causes, all of which are more or less worthy of consideration. We may add to this list the reading of bad books and the over indulgence in sports, some of a character having nothing to recommend them. We have seen young men become fairly frantic over certain sporting events, who are in many cases mere non-entities in the activities of life. Legitimate sport has its place in spare time, but the young man with the shining metal in his composition will give the bulk of his time to character-building and the reading of good books. A place at the top will be his in the community.

SOMETIMES we hear the Catholic Church commended by our separated brethren for its condemnation of the divorce evil. A few weeks ago Governor Swanson of Virginia, speaking at the diamond Jubilee conference of St. Vincent de Paul society, at Richmond, Va., said: "In this age of luxury and wealth, when men are seeking to return to the policy of the pagan world, which permitted divorces from whims and caprices, I wish to commend the Church which still places around the marriage vows the sanctity of religion, and stands as a barrier in the path of those who would destroy marriage, and with it the home, the main source of modern progress and civilization. May the Catholic Church ever uphold the sacredness of the nuptial bond, upon which are dependent individual and national happiness and prosperity."