

The Catholic Record.

Published Weekly at 481 and 483 Richmond street, London, Ontario.

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

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.

Agents for Newfoundland, Mr. T. J. Wall St. John's.

LETTER OF RECOMMENDATION. UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA. Ottawa, Canada, March 7th, 1900.

LONDON, SATURDAY, NOV. 14, 1903.

PREMIER COMBES AND THE FRENCH NATION.

Our readers will not drop many tears of regret when they hear that M. Combes, the anti-Catholic and anti-Christian Premier of France, has determined to retire from office.

The Paris Figaro asserts positively that he would retire from the Premiership immediately, were it not for the fact that his immediate withdrawal would result in the defeat of the budget which is now before the Chamber and which M. Combes is anxious to pass.

It is true that we are elsewhere told in the Confession that, "they who upon pretence of Christian liberty, shall oppose any lawful power, whether it be civil or ecclesiastical, resist the ordinance of God." (Sec. 4.)

It is a matter of some surprise that these crude contraries were not removed by the General Assembly which met last summer and revised the Confession. As this was not done, it remains the duty of Presbyterians to believe in opposite doctrine which cannot be reconciled with each other!

We do not by any means deny that Christ's Church has legislative powers over its members and clergy to direct their conduct toward eternal life. These powers are absolutely essential to the Church. But when a Church lays it down as a certain principle that it has this power, and elsewhere declares that all exercise of such a power is a tyranny which ought not to be obeyed, we may well doubt that this is the same Church which St. Paul declared to be "The Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of truth," or that Church to which Christ promised that the Holy Ghost should "teach all truth," and with which the same Holy Ghost should "abide forever."

It is easy to see the purpose with which both the contradictory doctrines we have pointed out were invented by the compilers of the Confession. That which restricts the authority of the Church is meant to justify their rebellion against the Catholic Church, whereas the assertion of the authority of the Church to make laws was made to give them authority to rule their followers; the purpose being not in either case to inculcate the strict truth.

Do not lose hope if you do not at once succeed. Remember that patience is a missionary virtue as well as zeal. "So is the kingdom of God, as if a man should cast seed into the earth, and should sleep, and rise, night and day, and the seed should spring, and grow up whilst he knoweth not." (St. Mark iv. 26.)

work of restoring France to the proud position she once occupied as the eldest and most faithful daughter of the Church of God on earth.

The deeds of the Bretons in 1791 and down to 1795 constitute some of the noblest history of the French nation, but it the descendants of the heroes of that period desert their country at a critical moment, we fear we must call them degenerate sons of noble sires. We cannot believe that the despatch is true which would force us to regard them in this light.

ECCLESIASTICAL LEGISLATION.

It is generally supposed that the Presbyterians are the most firm among the Protestant denominations in the repudiation of all ritualism and ceremonialism in religious worship and practice; and this firmness is accentuated in the Westminster Confession, which says in Chapter 20, section 2:

"God alone is Lord of the conscience and hath left it free from the doctrines and commandments of men which are in anything contrary to His word or beside it, in matters of faith or worship. So that, to believe such doctrines, or to obey such commandments out of conscience is to betray true liberty of conscience; and the requiring of an implicit faith, and an absolute and blind obedience, is to destroy liberty of conscience, and reason also."

It thus appears that it is a destruction of liberty of conscience, and therefore, a grievous sin, to command a special dress for the clergy, which is not to be found ordered in scripture, and to obey such a law is a betrayal of conscience!

Notwithstanding this, we are informed by the New York Tribune that a South Presbyterian Presbytery has passed a resolution strongly condemning those ministers of the denomination who presume to depart from the use of the clerical garb which clergymen usually wear, and who adopt "bob-tailed coats."

Such a decree is as tyrannical as it is trivial in the face of the above provisions of the Confession of Faith; and it is difficult to understand how the Presbytery in question, which is said to be one of the most important and intelligent of the Presbyteries of the South, can vindicate itself from the charge of Ritualism, as well as of a "betrayal of conscience" by enacting such a law.

It is true that we are elsewhere told in the Confession that, "they who upon pretence of Christian liberty, shall oppose any lawful power, whether it be civil or ecclesiastical, resist the ordinance of God." (Sec. 4.) We are likewise told in Chap. 31, Sec. 3, that it belongeth to synods and councils ministerially . . . to set down rules and directions for the better ordering of the public worship of God, and government of His Church." From this it might be inferred that the Church has authority to regulate the dress of ministers, so far, at least, as the decorum of their demeanor is concerned. But where two sets of principles are laid down which are irreconcilable with each other we must infer that the religious body which thus lays down contradictory articles of faith—the Confession being the standard of faith of all Presbyterians—must teach error either in one case or the other.

It is a matter of some surprise that these crude contraries were not removed by the General Assembly which met last summer and revised the Confession. As this was not done, it remains the duty of Presbyterians to believe in opposite doctrine which cannot be reconciled with each other!

We do not by any means deny that Christ's Church has legislative powers over its members and clergy to direct their conduct toward eternal life. These powers are absolutely essential to the Church. But when a Church lays it down as a certain principle that it has this power, and elsewhere declares that all exercise of such a power is a tyranny which ought not to be obeyed, we may well doubt that this is the same Church which St. Paul declared to be "The Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of truth," or that Church to which Christ promised that the Holy Ghost should "teach all truth," and with which the same Holy Ghost should "abide forever."

It is easy to see the purpose with which both the contradictory doctrines we have pointed out were invented by the compilers of the Confession. That which restricts the authority of the Church is meant to justify their rebellion against the Catholic Church, whereas the assertion of the authority of the Church to make laws was made to give them authority to rule their followers; the purpose being not in either case to inculcate the strict truth.

Do not lose hope if you do not at once succeed. Remember that patience is a missionary virtue as well as zeal. "So is the kingdom of God, as if a man should cast seed into the earth, and should sleep, and rise, night and day, and the seed should spring, and grow up whilst he knoweth not." (St. Mark iv. 26.)

THE CONCLAVE OF CARDINALS.

There is one persistent statement of the Roman correspondents who gave professedly by telegram a detailed account of all the movements of the Cardinals having reference to the election of a new Pope after the death of Pope Leo XIII, which has been most fully refuted by authentic information which has been furnished since the election of Pope Pius X.

The assertion was made boldly that there were several parties in the college of Cardinals representing several distinct policies, and having their specific candidates for the supreme Pontificate.

The College of Cardinals was represented as an intriguing cabal divided into irreconcilable hostile factions endeavoring by every means in their power to overthrow each other.

We do not at all doubt that there were different views held as to the most eligible candidate, but we have been assured by all who were in any way connected with the Conclave, that the proceedings were, from the beginning to the end, conducted with the utmost gravity, dignity, and charity. So true is this that there could not be found anywhere a deliberative body to excel in decorum the Conclave's proceedings.

The facts that votes were divided from the beginning among different Cardinals shows that opinion was divided, but there was no such thing as canvassing in the sense of the word as it is usually understood. The Cardinals were not only free by the fact that they could at any time give their votes for whom they would, but they were free even from the influences of persistent persuasion; for every member of the Conclave was fully aware that his colleagues were men of piety and having minds of their own which would make them immune from excessive outside influences, and there was no attempt to make use of such influences.

All this has been attested by Cardinal Gibbons who, having been a participant in the entire proceedings, was thoroughly acquainted with all the movements of the Cardinals. Other Cardinals have given similar testimony.

Another matter which concerned Cardinal Gibbons personally was also denied by him on his return from Europe. It had been asserted that he was canvassing in France while on the way to Rome, to induce the French Cardinals to oppose the election of Cardinal Rampolla, and that he had succeeded in obtaining their promise for a united votes against Pope Leo's Secretary of State.

This statement, like many other statements made by Roman correspondents on divers occasions for the press, when upon affairs of the Church were in question, has also been most positively contradicted, as not having in it an iota of truth.

PRESBYTERIAN UNION.

A movement has been begun in the United States looking toward a union of the various Presbyterian Churches. The leaders of the movement are encouraged to take this step, seeing that the unions of Presbyterians which have taken place in Canada and Scotland respectively have operated in adding very much to the strength and influence of the whole Presbyterian body.

Two committees from the Northern and Cumberland Presbyterians have already met and discussed plans of union. No definite action has been taken further, but it is admitted that a decided advance has been made, the more especially as the members of both committees are more positively confident that a union can be effected than was generally expected, and even than they themselves expected before meeting. It is presumed that their confidence will communicate itself to the members of both denominations, and thus hasten the union.

Should this union be brought about between the two denominations now negotiating, it is expected that the Southern Presbyterians will be induced to follow so good an example, and to seek to make one body with their Northern co-religionists.

It is to be remarked that in all these negotiations the colored Presbyterians are not taken into account. None of the white sects have any desire to combine with their dark-skinned brethren, who, it may be presumed, will not have the same heaven with the former in the next life!

The Cumberland Presbyterians have at least one doctrinal difference with the Presbyterians in general, as they hold that it is unlawful to give their allegiance to the United States under the present constitution, or to serve in any political office, inasmuch as the constitution does not recognize the subjection of the nation to Almighty God. We do not anticipate that this will be a very serious obstacle to the union, as doctrines are very readily laid aside by sects when there is some purpose to be gained by so doing.

IS ANARCHY A RELIGION?

An English Anarchist named John Turner recently reached New York, and since that time has been endeavoring to propagate Anarchistic doctrines. The police arrested him, and on the matter being brought before the Government, his deportation was ordered. Habeas Corpus proceedings for his liberation were entered before Judge Lacombe to prevent the enforcement of the order of deportation, and a hearing was given on the 28th ult. to the pleading of Turner's counsel, who maintains that anarchy is not a crime, but a religion, and that the order for Turner's deportation is a violation of the bill of rights, and an act of persecution.

Anarchy is opposed to all religion, and it is a grotesque proceeding to give it the name of a religion for the purpose of shielding an Anarchist against laws deliberately passed by Congress to protect the country against Anarchists. So soon after the murder of President McKinley, it is a piece of unconscionable impudence to give Anarchy the name of a religion of which it is the denial, and to endeavor to gain for it any privileges which may be accorded by law or public conscience to religion in any form.

We are strongly of the belief that public opinion is still so firmly set against the murderer of President McKinley, that no such plea as that set up in favor of Turner will meet with the approval of the people of the United States.

THE DOWIEITE CAMPAIGN IN NEW YORK.

John Alexander Dowie's invasion of New York with an army of evangelizers which has been estimated variously at from six hundred and fifty to three thousand has proved to be a complete fizzle, and probably before the present issue of the CATHOLIC RECORD reaches our readers the whole company will have returned to Zion, the Dowieite city which was built by the pseudo-Elijah, and in which most of the business enterprises are his property. It was unfortunate for Dowie's enterprise that at the very moment when he was starting on it, the final decision of the New York Court of Appeals was given in the case of J. Luther Pierson, holding a Dowieite father responsible for the death of his child who was allowed to die without a medical man being called in for the relief of his infant daughter. This fact caused much indignation in the city against the whole Dowieite movement, and any success in converting the New Yorkers to Dowieism was not to be expected under the circumstances, and no one will be surprised to learn that Dowie shortened his stay in the city by a whole week on finding that he excited no enthusiasm for his cause.

Some remarks on the decision of the court in the Pierson case will be found in another column in this issue. The multitude of the people in New York attended Dowie's lectures in vast numbers, indeed, but the crowd was in no way sympathetic with the Faith-Curist, and was assembled rather to jeer and ridicule the Faith-Curist Chief, who took his revenge by heaping contumelious reproaches against the people of New York and especially the newspaper reporters whom he described as noxious vermin, the scum of mankind, and the vilest of the vile. All this vituperation was indulged in because the reporters with one accord described Dowie's actions in detail without giving a word of encouragement to the people to believe in him, which they could not be expected to do if they were honest even in a moderate degree.

During Dowie's stay in the city, as he was driving through the streets in his carriage which is elegant and costly, the carriage and team were seized by a constable for the payment of the costs of the law-suit against Pierson, for which Dowie was held responsible, not merely because he was the prime cause of the neglect of the father to provide medicine and a physician for the child that died, but also because he had authorized the employment of a skillful lawyer to defend the cause of Faith-Curism.

The carriage and team have been attached for \$1,000, and it would appear that Dowie will be held to the payment of this amount. As he is said to be a multi-millionaire this sum will be a small matter to him.

By a curious coincidence, another case of Dowieite malpractice occurred at Massawippi, near Sherbrooke, Quebec, on the 23rd of October, which was also during the time of Dowie's attempt to convert New York. As this fact was made public through the press, many people of Dowie's audiences were made acquainted with the case, and this contributed greatly to the hostile reception given to the prophet. The case was as follows:

The fifteen year old boy of Mr. Alexander Kezar, Mayor of the township of Hatley, fell sick of diphtheria, and as

the parents were Dowieites, medical aid was not called in. Shortly before the boy's death, and three days after he was attacked by the illness, the parents had him get out of bed to pray and sing.

Such instances of malpractice as those which we have mentioned in this article have been frequent among both Dowieites and Christian Scientists during the last few years, but it must be said that the Dowieites have been more aggressive than Christian Scientists against all forms of the Christian religion. Dowie has been an earnest propagandist of his peculiar views, and his publications have been abusive against all Christians, but especially so against the Catholic Church, for the reason probably, that very few Catholics have been induced to give up their religion to embrace Dowieism; whereas the Christian Scientists, though they do maintain an absurd system of philosophy, do not attack so viciously the foundation of Christian faith as taught by the Churches.

JOAN OF ARC.

It is stated that the Holy Father Pope Pius X. has decided that at the first meeting of the Congregation of Rites at which he will preside in person, and which will take place on Nov. 17th, the question of the beatification of Jeanne d'Arc or Joan of Arc, will be taken up again with a view to her ultimate canonization. So far, the investigation has shown that the life of this heroine was most saintly, and her career inspired of God, and that the evil stories on the strength of which her character has been blackened are calumnies.

Jeanne d'Arc's career is one of the brightest pages of French history, and France will, no doubt, be grateful to the Popes Pius IX., Leo XIII., and Pius X. for having vindicated her good name.

Some of our Catholic contemporaries have supposed that the canonization of the heroic "Maid of Orleans" will contribute towards making the French Government less hostile to the Catholic Church. We do not count upon this result so long as Premier Combes rules the destinies of the country. The present rulers of France are decidedly Atheistic, and the canonization of a hundred French saints would not make them less so. The battle for freedom of worship must be fought at the polls in France by the Catholics themselves shaking off the bondage of an infidel Government.

A BOLD FORGERY.

A bold attempt was made a few days before the issuance of the first Encyclical letter of Pope Pius X. to palm upon the Church a spurious letter which was issued from some obscure and unknown quarter, as the official document of the Holy Father.

The same type and form of document were used which are accustomed to be employed in Vatican publications, and the forged paper was sent by mail to all the Cardinals and nuncios abroad.

This spurious missive was in good Latin, so that many who read it really believed it to be the expected Papal Encyclical. It quoted copiously many texts of Scripture, and imitated the style of Papal documents. It was addressed to all the Church dignitaries of the world, including those schismatical bodies, inasmuch as such passages as would have restricted it to Catholic dignitaries were omitted; and this fact was a clue whereby the Osservatore Romano, the official organ of the Vatican, was enabled to trace the forgery to its source, which was found to be one of the anti-Catholic institutions of the city. The Osservatore Romano warned the public against the fraud, and by careful analysis of the contents of the document showed that it was spurious.

WHAT IS THE INDEX?

NOT THE WHOLE, BUT ONLY A SMALL PART OF THE CHURCH'S LEGISLATION REGARDING THE READING OF BOOKS. Rev. M. I. Smith, S. J., in the New Voice.

What is the Index of Prohibited Books? This question is discussed by theologians and canonists who wish to make clear the scope and purpose of ecclesiastical authorities in sanctioning the publication of a list of forbidden books. It is asked by well-meaning non-Catholics who desire to obtain information for merely speculative ends. It is asked by conscientious Catholics because they seek the guidance of the Church in what is now a matter of the greatest importance—the matter of reading.

It is asked by bigoted and flippant declaimers in order to have a suitable occasion to show the obscurantism, the timidity or the narrow minded intolerance of the Church. The index, they think, is one of the pitiable devices of Pope and Cardinals to hold the allegiance of Catholics by keeping them ignorant of the enlightening teachings of modern times. Or again, these writers, deeming it not worth while to waste their virtuous indignation on the Church, take an apparently different talk. They grow merry over the fallibility and ineptitude of such means and instruments as the Index. They point out the fact that in this list comparatively few books are contained, while hundreds of thousands go unlisted.

And the unlisted are incomparably more dangerous to Rome and Roman pretensions than many of the practically harmless books on the Index. Evidently the Pope and Cardinals are a little too timid or too lazy to pursue, capture and put into their pillory the great faith-destroying criminals who are going about at large. For all these classes of inquirers a very interesting article appeared recently in the Civiltà Cattolica. This magazine is a bi-weekly edited by learned Jesuit fathers in Rome under the immediate supervision of the Holy Father. The gist of the article is as follows:

The Index is not the whole, but only a small part of the legislation of the Church regarding the reading of books dangerous to faith and morals. No upright man would think himself permitted to do every deed in his power, speak every word or think every thought or entertain every wish. Because such a course is clearly forbidden by the law of nature, revealed in the Reason and conscience of man. A vast multitude of books are so openly coarse, obscene, immoral, irreligious, blasphemous that no other law is needed to declare authoritatively that they are not to be read. The Church teaches that this natural law is the will of God, binding on the conscience not merely of Catholics, but of every man and woman whose mental condition is such as to leave them responsible for their actions. The natural law is unchangeable. Books of the above description have always been, are now and always will be prohibited to all. They need no further listing or indexing.

Second. Many books not clearly forbidden by the natural law because not openly heretical or immoral or atheistic or obscene are still full of danger to unsuspecting readers. We know on good authority that the devil has a way of taking the role of an angel of light. In olden days he displayed this angelic disposition through the instrumentality of the serpent. In modern times his favorite instruments are certain classes of authors.

To prevent this cunning deception especially since the time of the Reformation, the Church has issued general decrees prohibiting not individual books, but large classes and divers kinds of writings which either manifestly or insidiously labor to undermine the faith and morals of their readers. The zeal of the reformers in propagating their doctrine was largely frustrated by the loyalty of the Catholic peoples to ecclesiastical authorities. It was then that the wily "angel of light" process began to be extensively used. It was then, too, that the great Catholic invention of printing was made means of spreading heresy and immorality, everywhere endeavoring to lead man away from their allegiance to the Church. Even since this propaganda of Atheistic, and the canonization of a hundred French saints would not make them less so. The battle for freedom of worship must be fought at the polls in France by the Catholics themselves shaking off the bondage of an infidel Government.

The need of special action on the part of the Church to save her people from false teaching and immoral influence became urgent at once and has lasted to our own day. Our critics of the index are guilty of an ignoratio elenchi. They take the index as identical with the complete and general legislation of the Church on this matter of reading. The fact is, the Index is not, strictly speaking, in the nature of legislation at all, but rather in that of a series of court judgments. The natural law and the general decrees of the Church did not make known by name what books were prohibited. Thousands of books—today—we might better say hundreds—were clearly to be placed in the categories of the books forbidden by either the natural law or the general decrees of the Church. Thousands, too, were just as clearly free from any taint that would bring them under either ban. In between these two classes there would naturally be many doubtful and controverted cases. When doubts occurred or controversies arose as to whether a book was prohibited or not, inquiries were made of the proper authorities. The book thus brought up for trial was examined and condemned or acquitted, according to its merits. In order to make the saving legislation of the Church more effective, Bishops, priests, educated laymen and especially officers of Catholic schools and universities were encouraged or required to present doubtful books for examination. Again, it happened that careless and wayward Catholics might read books about which there really was no doubt on the part of conscientious and intelligent men. The latter knew that such books came under the general prohibition, while the former persisted in reading until examination took place and an explicit decision was rendered; in other words, until the book was put on the Index.

Out of cases of this character grew the list of prohibited books now known as the Index. Hence: First, not all prohibited books are contained in this list, but only a comparatively very small number. Second, they are not by any means the worst books that are found in the Index, since real and bona fide doubts existed as to whether they were forbidden or not until a decision was obtained and the books listed. Third, some grossly bad books are indexed either because it was found that disobedient Catholics would otherwise read them or for some other particular reason.

Our exclusion from these facts and explanations should be that the Church is not a tyrannical or intolerant, but laudably vigilant in safeguarding the souls entrusted to her keeping; that the character of the works on the Index and the smallness of their number do not show any carelessness or incompleteness on the part of the Church in selecting the books worthy of condemnation, but rather demonstrate the ignorance and conceit of the critics; that Catholics ought to have a sincere respect and reverence for the natural law, the ecclesiastical decrees and the special decisions as shown in the Index relating to this matter of prohibited reading.

THE CHURCH

Novel The distinctive burial ground is word, with its sleeping apart Christian early with a difference—the faithful departed says, "with the but merely a shadow followed by a glorious The Catholic solicitous to a character should it ever scene of any occurrence, says ceases to be ground without seclusion or ecclesiastical restricted extent entitled to its friendship with and whenever, thirty years a Church are in forced against space is placed shunned by all cemetery is a ment. The people indifferently community is and traditions principle and Church has Catholics and the honors ture, namely, ground and suffrages. Su sistent and se organization the memory rided its claim flouted its p continue the com counter to all and of scandal astical burial not allowable, when civil fu burial are on unworthiness apostasy or su encouragement—has been co sisted in to it will be rare to give a ally in the first consul already him habits and as intrinsic sometimes allows it, but usage and as and atheists neither admiri nor grant Ch before dying regard of b bodies to be

BISHOP COZ TO A NON-

The Rt. D. D., B. addressed the regular mee House of C and her f were also Roy Jones, Bishop Con interesting often misun "The Pap Score." The disti closest inter argument m The Pap arrogance, pation nor authority by Scrip Christian turies. It in unbrok looked on from His d sion to tea is a field f seeking th it cannot presented, understood by the des His Churo know the doer than into the w with the B a more pe will bring the childr until, as S into the u ledge of t man into fullness of one bapt Jesu. Ch sponse wi speed the

A Father tor of the been in patients, in that h only succ and acco correspondary (Dr cruelty in smallpox consolati Church. of Fa the to menti him last "Cross " Pontif refused

It won "voers pr meditati at least