

The Catholic Record

Price of Subscription—\$1.50 per annum. United States & Europe—\$2.00. THOS. COFFEY, L. D., Editor and Publisher

Advertisements for teachers, situations wanted, etc. go to the office of the publisher. Remittance to accompany the order. Approved and recommended by the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa and St. Boniface, the Bishops of London, Hamilton, Peterborough, and Ogdensburg, N. Y., and the clergy throughout the Dominion.

When subscribers ask for their mail at the post office it would be well to tell the clerk to give them their Catholic Record. We have information of carelessness in a few places on the part of delivery clerks who will sometimes look for letters only.

Subscribers changing residence will please give old as well as new address.

LETTERS OF RECOMMENDATION

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 distinguished by its ability, and, above all, that it is imbued with a strong Catholic spirit.

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 matter and form are both good, and a truly Catholic spirit pervades the whole.

Yours faithfully in Jesus Christ, D. FALCONE, Arch. of L. Apos. Deleg.

LONDON, SATURDAY, MAR 2, 1912

MODERN SEARCH FOR TRUTH AND THE "TIMID IGNORANCE" OF THE DARK AGES

Theodore Roosevelt, in the Outlook, under the title "The Search for Truth in a Reverent Spirit," reviews about a dozen recent books, among which is "Thoughts of a Catholic Anatomist," by the late Professor Thomas Dwight, M. D.

"Dr. Dwight's book is very largely a protest against the materialistic philosophy which has produced such conceptions of life, and against these conceptions of life themselves."

"There is much that is true in the assault he makes; but in his zeal to show where the leaders of the modern advance have been guilty of shortcomings, he tends to assume positions which would put an instant stop to any honest effort to advance at all, and would plunge us back into the originating and blind ignorance of the Dark Ages."

"The reviewer thinks Dr. Dwight is 'less than just to Darwin' and holds that it is due to the triumph of such seekers after truth that makes possible for such books as Dr. Dwight's to be published with the approval of the orthodox thought of the Church to which the writer belongs."

"A half-century ago no recognized authorities of any Church would have treated an evolutionist as an orthodox man. A century ago Dr. Dwight would not have been permitted to print his book as orthodox even if it contained the statement that the earth goes round the sun."

"This pretty fairly represents the average man's view of modern search for truth as compared with the 'clerical absolutism' and 'theological tyranny and superstition' (to quote again Mr. Roosevelt) of the ages of faith."

Darwin's one scientific principle, "natural selection," is unanimously discarded by scientists. Prof. Loeb, of the University of California, certainly not blinded in our favor, said in an article published in Science, Dec. 1904:

"It seems to me that the work of Mendel and De Vries and their successors marks the beginning of the real theory of heredity and evolution."

superficial work distracted attention for many years from the solidly scientific work of Father Mendel, but Mendel has now come to his own, and Darwin is a scientific authority only amongst the unscientific.

"A century ago," the ex-president tells us, "one could not print as orthodox a book containing the statement that the earth goes round the sun."

Nearly four hundred years ago Nicholas Cusa maintained that heliocentric system at the Council of Basel, side by side with his friend Cardinal Cesarini. He was summoned to Rome and Nicholas V. gave him the Cardinal's hat, and made him a bishop!

With regard to the fable of ecclesiastical prohibition of dissection of dead bodies, Catholics should read Prof. Walsh's "Popes and Science," a work called forth by a controversy between the author and President Andrew D. White, who made similar statements in his book "The Warfare of Science and Theology in Christendom."

This work of Prof. Walsh, through the influence of the Knights of Columbus, has been brought out in a very cheap edition; yet Catholic should have a copy and read it. Much of the loose scholarly talk of modern freedom in pursuit of truth as contrasted with the theological absolutism of Catholic ages, is here met by Dr. Walsh with facts of history and documentary evidence.

Mr. Roosevelt concedes that Dr. Dwight is right when he quotes Roger Bacon to the dogmatists of modern science: "The first essential for advancement in knowledge is for men to be willing to say, 'We do not know.'"

"The most significant feature of the book is the advance it marks in the distance which orthodoxy has travelled. Fifty years ago no recognized authorities of any church would have treated an evolutionist as an orthodox man."

Of course "evolutionist" is one of those elastic terms which may mean anything; but here is something written not fifty years ago, but six hundred years ago, and quoting St. Augustine, who wrote one thousand five hundred years ago:

St. Thomas Aquinas, the greatest theological doctor, thus speaks of evolution: Q. 69, art. 2—"Augustine says that this is said to have brought forth herbs and trees, inasmuch as it received the power of bringing them forth. Hence on the third day they were not actually brought forth but only causally."

Q. 70, art. 1—"But Augustine says that on the fifth day the nature of the waters brought forth fishes and birds potentially."

Q. 72, art. 1—"According to Augustine the terrestrial animals were brought forth potentially."

Q. 73, art. 1.3m—"Nothing entirely new has been subsequently made by God, which has not had some sort of beginning in the works of the Hexameron. For some things existed materially and some causally. Thus the individuals now generated had a beginning in the first individuals of their species. And if new species arise, they had a beginning in certain active principles."

For fifteen hundred years this forecast of the origin of species has held its ground and never once has it been condemned as unorthodox by "theological tyranny" or "clerical absolutism."

marriage unless contracted before the parish priest of the parties (or one of them), the ordinary of the place or before a priest delegated by either of these and two witnesses. A marriage before a duly authorized priest and two witnesses is not a clandestine marriage, even though the fact of the marriage be kept secret from all the friends and acquaintances of the contracting parties. This is the plain and clearly defined meaning of the term clandestine when used by the Church in her marriage laws.

The Anglican memorandum on the Ne Temere decree says: "(The Benedictine) decree declared mixed or clandestine marriages to be valid even when the witness thereto is a Protestant minister."

It would be interesting to know just what meaning these learned specialists, who have undertaken the task of enlightening the country, attach to "clandestine" in the foregoing sentence. But when they come to the elucidation of the Benedictine Decree and its bearing on the present situation those blind guides flounder hopelessly in the ditch. That their unscholarly treatment of the question is due to gross ignorance is evident from a quotation on another page from Father Gouthier's commentary on the Benedictine Declaration.

To understand this question it is only necessary to remember that the decree of the Council of Trent enacted that a marriage to be valid must be contracted before the parish priest or some other priest delegated by him and in the presence of two or three witnesses. All other marriages were clandestine marriages and therefore invalid. But the Tametis decree, unlike the Ne Temere, had to be published in each parish and had no force except in those places in which it had been promulgated. In many parts of the world it was never in force. Benedict XIV. issued his famous decree or declaration with regard to the marriages of Protestants in Holland and Belgium, declaring that such marriages in these countries were not governed by the Tametis decree of the Council of Trent, and hence, though clandestine, were valid. He declared further that clandestine mixed marriages were also valid in those places where clandestine marriages of Protestants among themselves were valid. Though this decree or declaration referred only to Holland and Belgium it gradually extended to many parts of the world under the name of the Benedictine dispensation or the Benedictine privilege. So that generally speaking clandestine mixed marriages were valid even where the Tametis decree had been promulgated. That is to say, that the marriage of a Protestant and a Catholic was valid even if contracted before a Protestant minister.

Justice of the Peace, or in any other way provided by the civil laws. Now hear the grave and reverend authors of the memorandum: "In 1741, Pope Benedict XIV. issued the Benedictine Decree, which, according to its terms, affected only Roman Catholics."

"This decree was not intended to and did not affect the marriages of Protestants."

Could gross ignorance go further? The Benedictine Decree related exclusively to Protestant marriages, and as a consequence to mixed marriages; but did not affect the marriages of Catholics amongst themselves in the remotest manner.

The Benedictine dispensation extended to Canada after the English occupation and hence all clandestine mixed marriages contracted before April 18th, 1906, are valid in Canon Law as well as in Civil Law.

The Ne Temere Decree abrogates this privilege, and clandestine mixed marriages, though valid civilly are no longer recognized by the Church as valid sacramental marriages.

It would be necessary to understand what hazy misconception of the Benedictine dispensation the Anglican committee had to follow their tortuous reasoning thereon.

Another ludicrous mistake of these gentlemen is the interpretation of the following clause of the Ne Temere Decree: "The same laws are binding also on the same Catholics as above, if they contract betrothal or marriage with non-Catholics, baptized or unbaptized, even after a dispensation has been obtained from the impediment mixtae religionis or disparitatis cultus; unless the Holy See decree otherwise for some particular place or region."

The meaning is very plain; mixed marriages henceforth must be entered into before the parish priest of the Catholic party except in those places or regions which the Holy See may exempt from this clause of the decree. By a later decree, Provida, the Holy See exempted Germany from the new legislation in so far as mixed marriages were concerned. A like dispensation has been granted to Hungarians marrying within the boundaries of Hungary, and some minor places; also all Catholics of the Eastern rites in union with the Holy See are exempt from the law.

misty conception of canon law, and their still mistier understanding of the Benedictine decree, and triumphantly conclude, "therefore the Ne Temere Decree does not affect Canada, and the old marriage law continues."

Again we read: "It was equally a 'sacrament' where the marriage took place before a civil Magistrate."

Yes, those clandestine marriages that were valid were sacramental marriages. If our Anglican canonists took the trouble to learn the Catholic teaching with regard to marriage they would have avoided the cheap sarcasm of putting "sacrament" in inverted commas. The Church holds that the ministers of the sacrament of matrimony are the contracting parties themselves. And the very decree they are so learnedly discussing provides that in case a duly accredited priest cannot be reached inside of a month, "marriage may be validly and licitly entered upon by the formal declaration of consent made by the spouses in the presence of two witnesses."

What do intelligent Anglicans think of this memorandum issued in their name, bearing in its every page evidence of ignorant misconception of almost every phase of the question that it pretends to treat in a scholarly and exhaustive manner?

THE OLD STORY

Of all the preachers of the sects we think the Baptist is the least entitled to the claim of profound learning. One of them in Detroit, by name Rev. T. W. Young, condemns the use of the crucifix by the Roman Catholic Church. "By its practices," he adds, "the Roman Church has constantly ignored the commandment which says, 'Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image nor bow down and worship it.'" We hasten to assure the reverend gentleman that Catholics do not do this. If he desires to become informed as to the use the Catholics make of the crucifix he should step into a Public Library and consult the Catholic Encyclopedia, after which he would be in a different frame of mind. We pity the congregation that takes its instruction and inspiration from such ill-educated spiritual guides as the Rev. T. W. Young. We should like to enter into an explanation of this matter for his benefit were it not that life is too short and more important matters claim a space in our columns.

Meantime let us remind him that he takes rank with the inconsistent class. While he is opposed to Catholics making use of the cross as a symbol, and calls it idolatry, he forgets that the Baptist sect uses a symbol too. On many of its churches may be found a weather vane, denoting that the members of that Church are cast about by every wind of doctrine, for we have the Armenian, or General Baptists, the Calvinistic, or Particular Baptists, the Baptist Church of Christ, the Campbellites, the Dunkards, the Free-Will Baptists, the Old Two-Seed-in-the-Spirit Predestinarian Baptists, the Hard Shell Baptists, the Seventh Day Baptists, the Six-Principle Baptists, etc., etc.

ANOTHER NEW CHURCH

On last Sunday was dedicated to the service of Almighty God Holy Angels' Church, St. Thomas, in this diocese. It was a remarkable event as betokening the spread of the faith, and the whole-hearted material interest in its substantial upbuilding on the part of the people of that parish whose pastor is Rev. T. West, a priest of most remarkable apostolic zeal. For St. Thomas the church which he and his people have erected seemed at first sight to be a work of such magnitude that a few were inclined to think it was too great an undertaking for the present. But the Right Rev. Dr. Fallon, Bishop of London, and Rev. T. West, are not building only for the present. The great work was undertaken by the pastor with a firm faith that the Eternal Founder of the Church would be with him. He has not been disappointed, for the financial outlook is exceedingly hopeful. Such is always the outcome when priest and people are of one mind and one heart. We congratulate Father West and the Catholic people of St. Thomas. No finer church edifice may be found in any parish of the same size in the province of Ontario.

The past few years has shown remarkable growth in church property in the diocese of London. Right Rev. Bishop Fallon's watchword seems to be "Build up; spread the faith." Not only have the larger parishes been well supplied with splendid church edifices, schools, rectories and religious institutions, but the smaller ones, where the Catholics are few and poor and far between, are not forgotten, and ere long wherever even a dozen Catholic families may be found they will have a place of worship and a priest, if not in their midst, at a convenient distance. This is a blessed work for which future generations will be grateful to our Bishop. In the old days, because of adverse conditions, some of the sheepfold strayed into the by-paths of heresy, and the sorrowful

spectacle presents itself of men and women of Catholic blood and Catholic names associated in religious communion with those whose ancestors cast themselves loose from the centre of Christian unity. All honor be to those who are thus endeavoring to keep the sheepfold intact and who are striving to bring back the lost ones. We congratulate our Right Rev. Bishop. With priests possessing such abounding zeal and perseverance and constancy of purpose as the pastor of St. Thomas he will be strengthened to reach that high ideal which he has set for himself in spreading the faith.

THE SOUR AND THE SWEET

Here is an account of two receptions, one given by Sir James Whitney, the Premier of Ontario, and the other by Mr. Rowell, the leader of the Opposition, to Mr. Joseph Gibson, President of the Ontario Alliance:

"When I went into Sir James' room and took hold of his hand I did most of the shaking. He hardly deigned to look at me. The discourtesy he showed was not becoming a gentleman. He gave no answer. I say he ought to have given an answer. And, God helping me, Tory though I am, I'll make him answer yet."

"I gave Mr. Rowell my hand. It was as if I were giving my hand to my best girl. Mr. Rowell is a good Christian gentleman any party might be proud of. I say that, though I am a Tory and he is a Grit."

AS TO INTOLERANCE

An agent of the Canadian Press Service has sent the startling news from Quebec that two Protestants, by majorities of one hundred and eighteen and two hundred and thirty eight, have been defeated in the civic elections in that city. Two Catholics by very large majorities were defeated in Toronto at the last election when running for the Board of Control and nothing was said about it. Toronto never yet had a Catholic Mayor. It would be too much to expect Canada's Belfast to elect one, and Toronto, at rare intervals, has had a Catholic alderman. In the matter of religious tolerance the Catholic Province of Quebec has given many examples which should be a lesson for the Protestant Province of Ontario. We firmly believe that the two Protestants in Quebec were not defeated because they were Protestants, but for other reasons. It is a miserable business this voting for a man because he is a member of this or that Church or this or that lodge. Fitness for the office should be the test. Many a first class bootler takes refuge in a church or a lodge to promote his selfish purposes.

FROM ONE OF THEIR OWN

Reynold's newspaper, of London, England, published by Protestants, is severe on the Orangemen. In its issue of Feb. 4th, the editor tells us that "the conduct of the Ulster Orangemen has an aspect which deserves attention. They stand forth as representatives of Protestantism in its purest form. Now in its last analysis Protestantism stands for freedom of belief and speech. The Reformers protested against the attempt made in their day to prevent free discussion. Freedom of thought and utterance they contended to be a natural right of man. Such a theory, of course, is incompatible with intolerance and persecution. And yet we have in Ireland a band of men calling themselves Protestants who would trample under their political boots the very principles for which their ancestors contended. The Orangemen are not patriots, but renegades, political apostates who mistake splenic ferocity for patriotic fervour, and sectarian bombast for holy zeal. Orangemen is not Protestantism; it is a kind of religious and political fungus, a parasitical excretion. Home Rule will be the death of it, as Orangemen well know — hence their uproarious rowdiness, their flutulent violence."

ANOTHER HOOKING

We have always held William Briggs, publisher, Toronto, in high esteem, and we should be sorry indeed if we were forced not to consider him a good Christian gentleman. We are more than surprised that he has permitted his publishing house to give to the world a novel in which, the advertisement tells us, the life of a pure minded Protestant woman is sacrificed and the career of her boy blighted by ecclesiastical tyranny. We are furthermore told that the work shows in clear, heart-reaching language how easily the Ne Temere decree can twist a good husband into a home wrecker. The average non-Catholic, reading this book, will take it for granted that fiction is fact. In times of excitement there will always be found a literary soldier of fortune who will throw upon the market a book that sells. He cares not what he puts into it so long as it brings him money. The author of this work ought to be ashamed of himself, that is, if he has any shame left. Matters of controversy between Catholics and Protestants may surely be carried on in a judicial manner becoming high-minded citizens. It is a pity that so much countenance is given to these gypsy writers who are ever ready to turn the dishonest penny, reeking not what turbulence may be created in the community by their abom-

nable work. William Briggs, we are surprised! Surely, you did not see the manuscript of this novel before it was handed to your compositor. We should not like to put you in the same class as the editor of what we may call the Weekly Maria Monk—the Orange organ of Toronto.

A LITTLE SERMON

George Joy, of Acton, when charged with contracting a bigamous marriage with Mrs. Blanche Racoon, an Italian woman, pleaded through his counsel, Mrs. T. C. Robbette, K.C., in the Police Court yesterday morning, that he understood the young woman had obtained a divorce from her first husband, Thomas Racoon. Racoon and his wife are Roman Catholics, and were married in Toronto by Father LeMarche. The second marriage took place last Nov. in Acton, the ceremony being performed by Rev. J. C. Wilson, Presbyterian. Blanche Racoon has been convicted of bigamy, and is serving a six months' term on that charge.

ANOTHER ONE

The examination of Everett McLellan, of Tennoy, charged with seduction of Miss Frances Longard, also of Tennoy, took place before Stipendiary James Farquhar on Thursday of last week. The evidence adduced was that the girl was under age, she being only fourteen years old last March. The evidence of the girl was that McLellan induced her to go with him against the wishes of her parents. He took her to St. John, N. B., and was there married by the Rev. Gordon Dickie, on the 2nd day of December. After the evidence was all taken, McLellan was sent up for trial in the Supreme Court.

AS TO INTOLERANCE

An agent of the Canadian Press Service has sent the startling news from Quebec that two Protestants, by majorities of one hundred and eighteen and two hundred and thirty eight, have been defeated in the civic elections in that city. Two Catholics by very large majorities were defeated in Toronto at the last election when running for the Board of Control and nothing was said about it. Toronto never yet had a Catholic Mayor. It would be too much to expect Canada's Belfast to elect one, and Toronto, at rare intervals, has had a Catholic alderman. In the matter of religious tolerance the Catholic Province of Quebec has given many examples which should be a lesson for the Protestant Province of Ontario. We firmly believe that the two Protestants in Quebec were not defeated because they were Protestants, but for other reasons. It is a miserable business this voting for a man because he is a member of this or that Church or this or that lodge. Fitness for the office should be the test. Many a first class bootler takes refuge in a church or a lodge to promote his selfish purposes.

HOME RULE NOT A RELIGIOUS QUESTION

III

Most of the trouble and noise in the world is caused by people meddling in matters of which they know nothing. The present agitation over the Ne Temere decree is an example. The frothy Orange utterances against Home Rule is another case in point. The brethren in Toronto, Winnipeg, and other centres have been making exhibitions of themselves, passing long-winded resolutions in defence of their "Protestant liberties," and planking down good Canadian dollars for the fight against "Roman aggression" under the guise of Home Rule. They would have it appear that Home Rule is a religious question. Nothing could be farther from the truth. Irishmen take their religion from Rome, but in the words of O'Connell, they would as soon take their politics from Constantinople as from the Vatican. Irish nationalism is neither Protestant nor Catholic. A man's worth to the cause is not measured by his religious beliefs, but by the genuineness of his service to Ireland. On the long roll of Irish patriots there are no more glorious names than those of Protestants. The canonized saint of Irish nationality, Robert Emmett, was a Protestant. Lord Edward Fitzgerald, another idol of the popular imagination, was a Protestant. Grattan was a Protestant. Isaac Butt, the first Home Rule leader, was a Protestant. Parnell, his successor, the man who broke the power of landlordism in Ireland, and who was almost worshipped by the people, was a Protestant. At the present moment the chief whip of the Nationalist party, Captain Donegan, is a Protestant, and there are six or eight Protestants sitting for purely Catholic constituencies. The Ancient Order of Hibernians has been denounced as sectarian, and as practicing a rigorous boycott of Protestants, yet in places such as Donegal and Dublin, where the Order is all powerful, we find its members electing Protestant representatives, thus demonstrating that Irish nationalism knows no religious tests. Every responsible popular leader in Irish politics has raised his voice in defence of religious equality. Mr. Redmond has time and again assured British public opinion that Irishmen do not seek the ascendancy of any class or of any creed, and he has invited the Imperial Parliament to em-

body in the coming Home Rule bill such safeguards as it may deem necessary to ensure minority rights. That such legislative safeguards are unnecessary the whole course of Irish history goes to prove. Three times since the "Reformation" Irish Catholics have been in possession of political power—in fact, of the government of the country—yet they never passed one penal law nor persecuted one single Protestant. Speaking at Glasgow recently Wm. Redmond publicly challenged the Unionists to prove that any Protestant, any single man, woman, or child, is being persecuted in Ireland because of their religion. "I ask," said Mr. Redmond, "that their names and the districts should be given to me, privately if need be, and I pledge myself, if such information be given me, to go down myself to that district and to denounce the outrage and to stop it. But, my challenge will remain unanswered. There is no such case in the whole of Ireland."

Protestants have been boycotted in Ireland, but only for political offences. In the old Land League days no landlord was more detested by the people than Lord De Freyne, and he was a Catholic. Surely a handful of North-east Ulster Orangemen, and their next-of-kin in Toronto, do not think that their Protestantism could whitewash such inhuman monsters as Lord Clanricarde and the rest of the brood of exterminating landlords who sent hundreds of thousands to the poorhouse, the grave, or the emigrant ship to make way for the bullocks? They were boycotted by the people for their crimes against the people, not because they were of a different faith. The fact that they were of the same faith did not save the Catholic landlords from the peoples' wrath. Religion had nothing to do with it, and nobody knows this better than the men of the lodges. There has been persecution for faith's sake in Ireland, but the Catholics were the persecuted, not the persecutors. Now that it looks as if Catholic Emancipation were at long last to become something more than a legislative enactment, and that it would be no longer possible for an insolent minority to lord it over the majority, we are regaled with the old cry of religious intolerance. There was no mention of intolerance when, year after year, the incorporation of Belfast refused to employ a Catholic; when Derry with a majority of Catholic inhabitants would not have a Catholic mayor; when no Catholic Unionist was ever sent to Parliament by an Ulster Unionist constituency; when the railways, banks, government departments, etc., were all manned by Protestants? Catholic Emancipation has been eighty years on the statute book, but it might as well have never been passed. To-day the Catholic is the slave of the Ascendancy. And it is simply because Home Rule will change this by ensuring fair play for the majority that the self-styled "English garrison in Ireland" is opposed to it. Orangemen sees its privileges in danger of being swept away. It is beginning to realize that it must in the near future take its chance with the rest of the community. It knows that in a self-governing Ireland it will have to stand on its merits. It has cursed the Pope so long and so vehemently that it hates to think it will have to recognize its Papist fellow-countryman as an equal in fact as well as in theory. Ulster talks glibly of fighting Home Rule. Carson and my Lord Londonderry will die in the last ditch before they bow their necks to Rome. The timid can rest easy. Carson and my Lord will die in their beds. There is no question of their being forced to bow to Rome. The religious question is not a factor in the Home Rule fight. Home Rule will not lead to a Catholic persecution of Protestants, but it will render impossible the systematic exclusion of Catholics by the Protestant minority. And that is why they are opposed to it. Irishmen seek to govern Ireland according to Irish ideas, not in the interest of any party or religious body, but for the welfare of the country as a whole. "Ireland," said Parnell, "cannot afford to do without one of her sons." In the work of re-building the nation that must follow Home Rule there will be room and to spare for all, and no man will be excluded because of his religious belief. The Irish Nationalist creed is well summed up in the lines of the Protestant poet, Davis:

"If you're to Ireland true, We heed not creed, nor race, nor clan, We've hearts and hands for you."

Sectarian bitterness has been fostered in north-east Ulster for a purpose. The passage of Home Rule will, as Mr. Churchill said at Belfast, destroy forever this accursed machinery for the manufacture of hate, and then we may confidently look forward to an era of peace and prosperity in Ireland, when Belfast and Cork will both vie with each other in making for the newer and the greater Ireland. Old feuds will be forgotten, old differences disregarded, old wounds healed, when Orange and Green will blend together in the dawn of Ireland's re-birth.