The Catholic Record.

Published Weekly at 484 and 486 Richmond street, London, Ontario.

Price of subscription—$2.00 per annum.

EDITORS:

REV. GEORGE R. NORTHGRAVES, Author of "Mistakes of Modern Infidels."

THOMAS COFFEY.

Publisher and Proprietor, Thomas Coffey.

Messrs. Luke King, John Nigh and P. J. Neven are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transact all other business for THE CATHOLIC RECORD.

Agent for Newfoundland, Mr. T. J. Wall, St. Johns.

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

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

Correspondence intended for publication, as well as that having reference to business, should be directed to the proprietor, and must reach London not later than Tuesday morning.

When subscribers change their residence it is important that the old as well as the new address be sent us.

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 Tuesday morning. Please do not send us poetry.

LETTER OF RECOMMENDATION.

UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA.

Ottawa, Canada, March 7th, 1900.

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. FALCONIO, Arch. of Larissa, Apost. Deleg.

LONDON, SATURDAY, NOV. 28, 1903.

THE ENCYCLICAL OF POPE PIUS X.

The first Encyclical of our Holy Father Pope Pius X. which has already appeared in print, and has, no doubt, been read with intense interest by our readers, was looked for anxiously by the Catholic world as it was fully expected that it would outline the policy to be followed by the Pope during the period of his Pontificate.

There was much speculation as to whether Pope Pius X. would adopt towards the nations in general, and France and Italy in particular, the same resolute policy which was followed by Leo XIII. and Pope Pius IX., of maintaining the rights of religion and of the Holy See in the midst of the persistent and determined attacks which have been made upon those rights by the governments of the two nations above named.

The Holy Father does not name either of these nations or their governments in his Encyclical, but he lays down clearly the never-changing principles of right and justice on which he will govern the Church, and these are the same as those upon which his illustrious predecessors acted. From these principles he draws the same inferences which were drawn by these Popes in regard to the necessity of "the liberty and independence of the Church of Christ from all foreign dominion," and he demands that same liberty, stating that in so doing "he is defending, not only the sacred rights of religion, but is also consulting the common weal and the safety of nations; for it continues to be true that piety is useful for all things. When this is strong and flourishing, the people will truly sit in the fulness of peace." (1 Tim. iv. 8: Is. xxxii. 18.)

Pope Pius opens the Encyclical by stating the unwillingness with which he accepted the burden of the Supreme Pontificate, as he deemed himself unworthy to succeed the great Pontiff "who ruled the Church with supreme wisdom for nearly twenty-six years, and showed himself adorned with such sublimity of mind, such lustre of every virtue, as to attract to himself the admiration even of adversaries, and to leave his memory stamped in glorious achievements."

He declares that human society today, more than in any past age, is suffering from a terrible and deep-rooted malady which is developing every day, and eating its inmost being, dragging it to destruction. This malady is apostasy from God.

This is unfortunately too true, and we cannot but regard with the deepest sorrow the fact that the nation of Europe whose traditions have been most closely tied up for centuries with those of the Church is now waging a relentless war upon religion. However, even with this cause for sorrow, there is some consolation in the fact that in other countries in both the old and the new worlds, the Catholic faith has gained in vigor to an unexpected degree which may compensate for the losses she has endured for the time being, but which, as we firmly believe, will be fully repaired in due time.

The Holy Father declares in unmistakable terms that the aim of his Pontificate will be this, and no other: "To renew all things in Christ:" thus:

"The nations have raged, and the peoples have imagined vain things" against their Creator, and "among the majority of men we find extinguished all respect for the Eternal God."

The Holy Father regrets this state of affairs, but he does not for a moment doubt that "in the contest between man and the Most High, the victory will ever be with God." All must learn that "God is the King of all the earth."

By what means is society to be saved under these circumstances? The Holy Father tells that the only means to bring men back to submission to the majesty and empire of God is through Christ, and the only way to reach Christ is through His Church. For this end Christ founded the Church at the price of His Blood, made it the guardian and depository of His doctrine and laws, and bestowed upon it an inexhaustible treasury of graces for the sanctification of mankind.

Christ instituted the priesthood that through their ministry the human race may be brought to follow His teachings and imitate His example. It is for this reason the duty of Bishops to take measures toward forming the clergy to holiness above all things.

The Pope declared that the study of every branch of learning is useful to priests, that they may be able to defend the truth, and to refute the calumnies of the enemies of the Faith; but the most important duty of the priesthood is to save souls through the exercise of those ministries which are proper to a priest zealous for the glory of God. Hence the most important studies of the priests are those which cultivate ecclesiastical and literary erudition. Diocesan seminaries should keep these objects in view.

Further, the Holy Father tells us that not priests alone, but all the faithful should concern themselves with the interest of God and of souls, not according to their own views, but under direction and orders of the Bishops whom the Holy Ghost has appointed "to rule the Church of God."

Good Catholic Societies which observe faithfully and zealously the precepts of the Church, frankly and openly make their profession of religion, and exercise all kinds of charitable works independently of self-interest or worldly advantage, are strongly commended and blessed by Pope Pius X. as they have been in the past approved and blessed by his predecessors in the chair of St. Peter. But all such associations should aim firstly and chiefly at the constant maintenance of Christian life among those who belong to them.

The Holy Father exhorts that in their zeal to attract souls to God, Bishops and the clergy should temper zeal with patience and charity, imitating the example of our Lord Who invited all who are tried and burdened under the slavery of sin and error: "Come to Me all ye that labor and are heavily burdened and I will refresh you."

Jesus has shown tenderness and compassion toward all kinds of misery, and the pastors of the Church should deal similiarly with those who are in this sad condition.

This beautiful Encyclical, while it shows the firmness and zeal for the glory of God which our blessed Saviour manifested when God's honor was in question, bears out the character which Pope Pius X. gained for benevolence and charity while he was Patriarch of Venice—a character in which he is also a close imitator of the example of our Blessed Saviour.

THE PAN-AMERICAN ANGLICAN CONVENTION.

The meeting of the Protestant Episcopal and Anglican Bishops of the United States, Canada, the West Indies, and Mexico which was held recently in Pittsburg, Pa., dealt with a number of subjects of general interest, among which were the questions of the remarriage of divorced persons and the attitude to be observed by these churches toward the Catholic Church.

It is admitted that the meeting had no authority to make any decrees binding on the churches whose representatives took part therein, so that we must regard the proceedings rather as a social gathering for the purpose of cultivating mutual friendships, and interchanging opinions with a view toward securing some kind of phantom of united action than as the decisions of a seriously deliberative body.

Bishop Doane of Albany introduced the divorce question, and delivered thereon the principal address in the course of which he laid down the following principles and statements:

1. "The marriage relation is a fundamental principle of all civilized and national life.

2. "The alarming increase of divorce has become a serious threat to morality, decency, and social stability.

3. "The canon law of this (American Anglican) Church of to-day sets a higher standard than is set by the civil law of the states, or by the canon of any religious body, except the Church of England.

4. "Judged either by its effect or by the authority on which it rests, it is not stringent enough.

5. "There is absolute agreement in this Church upon the one fact—namely that divorce, with remarriage can be possibly tolerated only in the one instance of what is called the innocent party in a divorce suit for adultery."

We willingly admit that the Bishop here takes a higher ground than most of the sects in the maintenance of the indissolubility of the marriage tie, and the Council, or Convention, in approving of his stand has shown some desire to restore the sacredness of marriage to the status to which it was raised by Christ Himself, Who said: "Wherefore they are no more two, but one flesh. What, therefore, God hath joined together, let not man put asunder."

Further, the Bishops declare that this is the law of God "based upon the princal revelation of the character (of marriage) as re-enacted by our Lord's own words." They add "that in the alarming prevalence of divorce and of the remarriage of divorced persons, the Bishops assembled here declare their conviction that while the sacraments of the Church should not be denied to the innocent party in a divorce for adultery remarried, the sanction of the Church should not be given to any remarriage after divorce for any cause arising after marriage."

We submit that in this expression of opinion there is a glaring inconsistency. For no cause can the sanction of the Church be given to the remarriage of divorced persons, nevertheless the "innocent party" who has obtained a divorce for adultery and has married again is to be admitted to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper! What is this but a sanction of remarriage in the case in point? Admission to this sacrament is an acknowledgment that the party so admitted is leading a blameless life, inasmuch as the great Apostle of the Gentiles declares that "Whosoever shall eat this bread, or drink the chalice of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord. But let a man prove himself; and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of the chalice." (1 Cor. xi, 27 28.)

In fact, the Bishops thus declare that the Catholic position is the correct one, which prohibits any real divorce between parties who have been duly married, and yet they take upon themselves to admit to the sacrament of the Communion those who disobey this law of God: they assume the authority to set aside a law which they admit to be God's own decree!

We have heard much in days gone by from Protestant polemists of ecclesiastical usurpations in the Catholic Church; but we can assert confidently that no instance can be adduced in which either Pope or Council has assumed the right of setting aside the laws of God, as the Pan-American Council has done here. Nor is it any excuse that this council states only its conscientious conviction, without any assumption that it has authority to enforce the same as a law, for it has gone as far as it could go, conscious as it was that it had no legislative authority. We may safely presume that if it had authority, the conviction thus expressed would have been put into the form of a law; and as it is, it may be regarded as an advice to the independent Churches represented to enact canons to put that conviction into effect.

It must strike the most cursory reader how different from the proceedings of the first general Council held at Jerusalem, by the Apostles of Christ, are these resolutions of the Pan-American Anglican Convention. The Apostles made decrees for the whole Church of Christ, and issued them under the clause: "It hath seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us," and the decrees were obeyed as God's law, even though they were but disciplinary and temporary, and intended to meet the peculiar conditions of the time. But the Pan-American Anglican Convention cannot even command that the laws of God should be observed strictly, and make a kind of apology for speaking of them at all, by informing those to whom their advices are directed that they are doing no more than making a recommendation, or stating their honest convictions.

We would fall short of our duty to the public should we not also point out the absurdity of the statement of the third principles laid down in Bishop Doane's address:

"The canon law of this (Anglican) Church of to-day sets a higher standard than is set by the civil law of the States, or by the canon of any religious body, except the Church of England."

Does the Bishop mean to say that the milk-and water resolution of the Council to the effect that the "innocent" party to a divorce ought not to remarry, but may yet do so without incurring any censure from the Church, is a higher standard of morals than that set by the Catholic Church which regards the remarriage in such a case as absolutely wrong?

In our estimation, and we believe the common sense of our readers will bear us out in our view, the resolutions of the Pan American Anglican Council are a mournful admission of incapacity to deal with what is admitted to be a fundamental question of Christian Society. The Catholic Church alone can deal satisfactory with this question, because she alone possessed an authority which is derived from Christ, whereas Anglicanism has only the authority which a national parliament can give, having been founded upon laws enacted merely by the parliament of England.

We can safely say that not even the Anglican clergy will follow the course implicitly recommended by the Council. They know that their Church is the creature of the civil power, and they will continue to act as they have been doing in the past, re-marrying without scruple all the divorced couples that present themselves if they have obtained their divorces according to the civil law, whether in Canada or the United States. Besides, there is frequently a good fee to be got for not being overscrupulous so far as the strict observance of God's law is concerned.

The following extract from the Canadian Churchman will show what is thought of the Pan-American Anglican Convention, by Canadian Anglicans. The Churchman says:

"We are jealous of anything that will increase American influence here, or that will in any way tend to the Americanization of our Church or country. The Church in Canada can only act through its synods, and we would like to know more of what is aimed at by this Conference before committing ourselves to the wisdom or necessity of its assembling. We have every confidence in our Bishops, but so far the public have not been much enlightened as to what the Conference proposes to accomplish, or what good is anticipated from it. It may promote international amity, but hitherto American amity has only been purchased by the surrender of British interests and the sacrifice of Canadian territory. It occurs to some that friendliness can only be maintained by yielding to unreasonable demands that costs too much, and is not worth having.

As Anglicans themselves are thus outspoken in the expression of their disregard for the conclusions arrived at by this Conference, what we have said regarding the non-obligation of its decisions cannot be considered as being intended to minimize the value of the conclusions arrived at by a body of gentlemen whom we respect personally and individually, but whose ecclesiastical status we cannot conscientiously recognize.

IRRELIGION GONE MAD.

There seems to be no limit within the bounds of reason to the absurdities to which the Government of France under Premier Combes intends to push its manifestations of hatred of God and the Catholic Church.

The determination to close all schools taught by religious orders was one of these absurdities, for it manifested the intention of the government to push its hatred to religion to an extreme which must drive all Christians into the ranks of irreconcible opponents to the Government. But it has done more than this, for even M. Waldeck-Rousseau was driven thereby to oppose the Government on the education question; and as he has a strong following in the Chamber of Deputies and in the country there will be a break-up among the Republican party itself should M. Waldeck-Rousseau's stand on this question make him a permanent Oppositionist.

The order of the Government whereby French officers who practice their religion by going to Mass, are shut out from promotion, has already caused great dissatisiaction, not only among practical Catholics, but even among the more moderate and honorable Republicans who while not being practical religionists, nevertheless do not wish a code of penal laws to be enacted and enforced "for conscience sake" against those who are true Catholics. Such laws must cause a deterioration in the efficiency of the military power of France, which is something which patriotic Frenchmen ought not to endure, especially at the present critical moment when all the nations of Europe felt the necessity of keeping up strong armaments ready for any emergency which the near future may precipitate.

M. Pelletan, the Minister of Marine, shows an infatuation quite equal to that which crazes M. Combes. Surely the ostentatious erection of a statue to Ernest Renan by the Government in the midst of the most intensely Catholic population of France, should have been a sufficient trial of the people's patience, without heaping on new insults to the Bretons. But M. Pelletan appears not to be of this way of thinking.

The Bretons showed their indignation on the occasion of the unveiling of Renan's statue. Renan was indeed a brilliant writer, but the brilliancy of his writings is marred by the fact that he was an Athiest and a defender of Atheism. His chief, and we may say his only claim to distinction was that he wrote a blasphemous Life of Christ, whose aim is to destroy the Christian religion. The Bretons were restrained from destroying the statue and driving away M. Combes himself and his assistants in performing the cermony of unveiling, only by the squadrons of soldiers who guarded the party which so wantonly insulted them.

M. Pelletan is not to be outdone by his master; and he has recently flaunted a new insult before the faces of the Bretons, who are a very large percentage of the sailors of France. He has named one of the new ironclads recently added to the navy "the Ernest Renan," and a second one "Jules Michelet," after another writer who is also an enemy to religion, and an unscrupulous and frequently an indecent writer of history.

It is surely out of place to name battleships after literary men, but it is worse to do this with an implied insult to a large percentage of the men who are expected to win the battles of France. There is an unwisdom in this which can be compared only to the useless burning of a candle at both ends.

Surely these excesses of M. Combes and his ministry must soon bring on a reaction against their rule! "The God's first dement those whom they would destroy."

THE EPISCOPALIAN ATTITUDE TOWARD THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

Under another title, we treat of the action of the recent Pan-American Anglican Convention in regard to the divorce question. Another matter dealt with as stated by the Convention is "the attitude of the Episcopal Church toward the Roman Catholic communion."

The resolution passed on this subject is as follows;

"That while no witness can be borne for truth without antagonizing error, whether of excess or defect, this earnest contention for the faith once delivered to the saints should be with unlimited charity to the Roman Catholic clergy and people, rather in the spirit of maintenance, defence, and proof, than of controversy and attack. That the right of this Church to enter countries, where there are churches subject to the Roman obedience, such as the Philiipines, Porto Rico, Hawaii, Cuba, Mexico, and Brazil, rests partly on the necessity of ministering to its own people in these countries, and partly on the duty to give the privileges of the Church to Christian people deprived of them unless they submit to unlawful terms of communion. That we shall be more ready and outspoken than we have been in teaching our young people in our congregations as to the important matters on which there is difference between the Roman Church and ourselves, and in guarding them against being misled. That we most earnestly urge that in the case of marriages between members of our own Church and those of the Roman Church, our own members should be warned by no means to promise, as they will be asked to do, that their children shall be brought up in the faith and worship of the Roman Church."

Because of the strides which High Churchism has made both in England and the United States, when it was first announced that the attitude of Episcopalianism toward the Catholic Church would be a subject of consideration at the recent Conference, many supposed that terms of peace on which reunion with the Catholic Church might be effected would be considered by the Convention, and that some proposition of this nature might be offered. We did not expect anything of this kind, for we were fully aware that the Bishops and clergy of the Anglican churches know that they are separated from the Catholic Church by doctrinal differences which can be bridged over only by the admission on the part of those who have separated themselves from the one fold, that they have hitherto wrongfully rejected revealed truths, and added erroneous teachings to the faith once delivered to the Saints. We did not believe that Anglicans were prepared to make such an admission, and we, therefore, could not anticipate that they would make any peace offering toward re establishing unity. This view of the matter has turned out to be correct; for the tendency of the resolution above quoted is rather to increase than to diminish the prospect of reunion. It is a declaration of war, rather than an Irenicon; and any one can see that the chief reason which stood in the way of at least one strong section in the Council offering the olive branch was that innate pride which makes the human heart rebel against the admission that it has been in the wrong. Such a pride is condemned by God in Holy Scripture.

The Bishops say their Church has a right to enter countries "subject to the Roman obedience." They should have said, "their "Churches" with all their varieties of faith; for the Protestant Episcopal Church and the various Anglican organizations are not one Church in any sense of the word. They are governed differently, and are so distinct from each other that, notwithstanding their community of origin they have already begun to disagree in regard to important doctrines.

But is the excuse offered by the Council for the intrusion of Anglicanism into Catholic countries a valid one? Does it justify the starting of new Churches in opposition to the one already existing there?

The excuse is based on two grounds. The first is "the necessity of ministering to our own people;" the second is that the Catholic Church refuses "the privileges of the Church to Christian people . . . unless they submit to unlawful terms of Communion."

Of what value are these pleas? "The necessity of ministering to our own people" implies that instead of one Church for the world, Christ intended that every nation should have its own Church. Nothing is more foreign to the nature of the Church as described in Holy Scripture, in which Jews and Gentiles, Greeks and Romans, bondsmen and free are described as being brethren in Christ taught by the same Apostles.

"For there is no distinction of the Jew and the Greek; for the same is Lord over all, rich to all that call upon Him. (Rom. x. 12.)

"I beseech you, brethren, that there be no schisms (Prot. Bible: divisions) among you; but that you be perfect in the same mind, and in the same judgment." (1 Cor. i, 10.)

The Church is therefore one, and schism is the work of Satan—the enemy who plants tares among the wheat.

The Church is the one continuous body which will continue to the end of time teaching Christ's doctrine, and having an unbroken ministry derived from that Apostolic ministry which Christ Himself instituted. This effectually excludes the right of all modern sects to intrude upon the work of the true successors of the Apostles, who cannot be found elsewhere than in the Catholic Church.

These considerations show the fallacy of the second excuse also which is founded upon the supposition that the Church of Christ has fallen away. This cannot be, as the original Church is described as "the Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of truth." It is plain, therefore, that the Church alone can regulate her own proceedings, and that no outside or modern organization has the right to sit in judgment upon her, or to pronounce that the terms of communion on which she insists are unlawful.

The New York Independent highly praises the Convention for having asserted the right of the Anglican and Episcopal Churches to send missionaries to Catholic countries. We are not surprised that this should be the case, for that journal regards Churches as human institutions which every one is free to start on his own responsibility. It is not surprising that so erroneous a principle should lead to an erroneous conclusion.

It is peculiarly out of place for the Episcopal Church to claim the right of intruding itself into Catholic countries, inasmuch as they are as strict on the observance of territorial diocesan limits as is the Catholic Church itself; and besides, they claim (wrongly) that their ecclesiastical jurisdiction is derived from the Apostles through their ordination or consecration by Catholic Bishops. They should, therefore, respect the orders and jurisdiction of the Catholic episcopacy on which their own claim is based.

The Convention advises members of the Episcopal Churches, in case of marriage with Catholics, not to promise that their children shall be brought up as Catholics. We can assure the Bishops that the Catholic Church has no desire to see mixed marriages take place, and if the advice given by the Convention should be a new obstacle to such marriages, that assemblage may produce more good results than might have been expected.

ALWAYS INTOLERANT.

When the Reformation triumphed in Scotland, one of it first fruits was a law prohibiting any priest from celebrating, or any worshipper from hearing Mass, under pain of the confiscation of his goods for the first offense, of exile for the second, and of death for the third. That the Queen of Scotland should be permitted to hear Mass in her own private chapel was publicly denounced as an intolerable evil. "One Mass," exclaimed Knox, "is more fearful to me than if ten-thousand armed enemies were landed in part of the realm."

In France when the government of certain towns was conceded to the Protestants, they immediately employed their power to suppress absolutely any Protestant from attending a marriage or a funeral that was celebrated by a priest, and to put down all mixed marriages, and to prosecute to the full extent of their power those who have abandoned their creed.

In Sweden, all who dissented from any article of the Confession of Augsburg were at once banished. As late as 1690 a synod was held at Amsterdam, consisting partly of Dutch and partly of French and English ministers who were driven to Holland by persecution, and in that synod the doctrine that the magistrate has no right to crush heresy and idolatry by civil power was unanimously pronounced to be "false, scandalous and pernicious."—Leeky's Rationalism in Europe, Vol. 2, pages 49, 50.