

The Catholic Record.

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

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

EDITORS: REV. GEORGE H. NORTHGRAVE, Author of "Miracles of Modern Infidels," 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. Rates of Advertising—Ten cents per line each insertion, scale measurement.

LETTER OF RECOMMENDATION. Ottawa, Canada, March 7th, 1903. To the Editor of THE CATHOLIC RECORD, London, Ont.

LONDON, SATURDAY, NOV. 7, 1903.

THE GLORIES OF THE CHURCH.

In celebrating at the beginning of this month the feast of All Saints the Church wishes us to forget all things earthly and to show our veneration not only for the Saints with whose names we are familiar, but for those also unknown to us who kept the faith and merited thereby the reward of the vision of God.

THE CHURCH SUFFERING.

This thought will strengthen us in the service of God and it will move us to heed the cry wrung from the anguished lips of the sufferers in Purgatory. Yes, the hand of the Lord has touched them sorely. They have died free from deadly sin, but because of some imperfection, or of temporal punishment due to sin, that has been repented of, they are suffering so keen a torture that some theologians declare that it differs from that of hell only in this, that it is not eternal.

therefore, be some middle state, where sin is expiated and punishment undergone for the debt which may remain after sin has been forgiven.

This truth appears so convincingly to human reason that it is passing strange that many reject it as a mere myth and superstitious fable. If it is true, as St. John says, that nothing unclean shall enter into the presence of God, who may dare to expect to appear before Him robed in the vesture of a perfect innocence?

A REASONABLE DOCTRINE.

And yet shall we say that the soul whose beauty is tarnished by a venial transgression only, or which has gone forth with the debt to sin unpaid, must be awarded the same fate as the soul which appears laden with every species of crime before its God?

ARE WE FAITHFUL?

There they await the moment when the Eternal Gates should be lifted up for them. The night in which no man can work has come upon them. We can by our prayers and good works and the Adorable Sacrifice bring them nearer the day. They, members of the Church, throw themselves upon the charity of their brethren. We can speak to them while Purgatory retouches the image of Christ that has been disfigured by sin.

THE CHURCH CATHOLIC.

The Pan-American Conference of Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States and the Anglican Church of Canada and the West Indies met last week in Washington, D. C., and we are informed by telegraphic despatches that the attitude which the Anglican Churches should hold in regard to the Catholic Church was discussed at some length.

without whom there can be no Church of Christ, but schismatical bodies which do not derive life from the true vine Who is Jesus Christ Himself.

It is no justification of that Bishop's words that a few discontented Poles have formed a schism by raising a National cry for a Polish Church subject to a Polish Bishop. This is merely the cry of discontent with true authority for which there is no place in the true Church of Christ.

The description of the Catholic Church as an "Italianized communion" is a poor excuse for the absence of authority in the Anglican Church. The head of the Church must reside somewhere, and we have no proof that Christ located him in either London, Canterbury, Washington, Berlin, or St. Petersburg.

There can be but one head of the Universal Church, and that head can be no other than Pius X., who is undeniably St. Peter's successor. The Catholic or Universal Church of Christ can be subject to no other. It is absurd to raise a hue and cry against his primacy on any plea of nationality.

To all this we may add some lucid reflections given by the Protestant Episcopal Churchman on this very subject. We quote from a September issue of that journal some passages in reference to the Primacy of the See of Rome, and the causes which led to the fixing of the See of Rome as the primal See of the Church of Christ.

"The world itself was Roman." This refers, of course, to the time when Christ instituted the Church, and for many centuries after during which the Roman power extended to the far East and West over almost the whole known world, or at least over that part of it where there was any pretence of civilization.

"Rome had as much to give the Church in the way of organization and practical efficiency as Greece had to give of philosophic self-interpretation and expression. A first step toward a scientific impartiality is to divest ourselves of all which has become attached to the name Roman that is pure ignorance and prejudice."

The unnamed Bishop who speaks of the Italianizing of the Church may well ponder on these words, and consider whether his language is not founded upon these sources of misunderstanding, "pure ignorance and prejudice."

"That at least so long as the world was Roman, the Church also was Roman, is to be set down as one of the most fortunate circumstances in the history of Christianity. That the Church of England soon enough in her history ceased to be Irish, or Scotch, or British, and became more Catholic by communion with Rome, was a fortunate event in her history. Among the great achievements and triumphs of the Church of Christ were those due to the fact of her being Roman.

This is something more honest than we have been accustomed to from Anglican journals in general. It is an admission that the Church of England was really Roman for centuries—though it is coupled with the mistaken notion which Anglican divines frequently set forth, that the pre-reformation Church in England was formerly non-Roman, or was independent of the Pope.

In reply to this we may point out that both Ireland and England were converted by missionaries sent from Rome. St. Patrick was sent to Ireland by Pope Celestine and Fulgentius and Damien, were sent by Pope Eleutherius in 183; and afterwards, when the Britons were driven into the western part of

the island, the Saxons were also brought to Christ by St. Augustine, who was sent by a Pope—Gregory the Great.

At the Councils of Arles and Sardica, held in the beginning of the fourth century, British Bishops took part in acknowledging the primacy of the Holy See, so that the non-Roman character of the early Church of England is a mere myth. There was, indeed, a difference between St. Augustine and the British Bishops, arising from the fact that the Britons would not co-operate in bringing the faith to the Saxons, who were their enemies. But this difference was political and not having regard to faith, the only question on which the dispute between them had any religious aspect being concerning the date when Easter should be kept.

It is clear from all this that the universal Church from the beginning acknowledged the Pope's authority, and there is no foundation for any opinion that the universal Church ever made any pretence to withdraw from the Pope that universal authority which was originally admitted to be vested in him. In fact Catholics deny that individual Churches, or even the whole Church, would have authority to make any such change in the Church's constitution.

From the beginning Christ intended that His Church should be one, and He always refers to it as the one, and one judicial body, and the Apostles do the same. It never could have remained one Church without the Primacy of the See of Peter, and this consideration alone is sufficient to vindicate the necessity of the supreme authority of St. Peter's successor.

DIVORCE AND THE PROTESTANT SYNODS AND COUNCILS.

At the meeting of the General Council of the Lutheran Church held recently at Norristown, Pa., the question of divorce was carefully considered, with the result that resolutions were passed declaring the dissolution of the marriage contract which is so prevalent throughout the country with the sanction of the decrees of the law courts, is "a crime against God which cannot be mitigated or apologized for by any defects, or any lowering of the standards prescribed in God's word on the part of the community around them, or those who may be regarded as leaders of public opinion."

The resolutions add that "Licenses issued by the State cannot be a guide to the conscience of either pastor or applicants. Every movement to promote a general uniformity in legislation by State governments is worthy of hearty encouragement in the interests of sound morality, so that ultimately divorce may be the same in all the States and territories of the United States."

There have been similar pronouncements by ministers individually and collectively, including the Presbyterian General Assembly, which has declared that divorces should not be allowed in any case outside that which is laid down in Scripture as the sole case in which the marriage tie may be dissolved.

The question has also been debated in the Pan-American Council of Anglicans which met recently at Washington, and the general opinion which prevailed among the Bishops there assembled was that divorces should not be allowed. This Council, however, has, admittedly, no legislative authority, composed as it was of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States, and the Anglican Churches of Canada and the West Indies, which are all independent organizations having no control over each other, even when thus assembled in a kind of general Council.

We cannot but approve of any movement which may tend to lessen the gigantic evil of divorce, which in the United States is spreading like an infectious disease over the whole Protestant community, but as clergymen of all these denominations are always to be found who are ready to marry persons who have been divorced by the courts, it does not appear very probable that any decrees sent forth by the synods, conferences, or councils of these Churches will have any practical effect in stopping the evil which they deprecate so strongly.

Anything else than what is happening at present in regard to divorced couples can scarcely be expected when

we reflect that both Lutheranism and Anglicanism have been committed from their beginnings to the practices of polygamy and divorce respectively. Luther, Melancthon, Beza, and the other leaders of Protestantism in Germany sanctioned over their signatures the second marriage of Philip Langrave of Hesse while his first wife was living, and actually permitted him to have two wives at once, with the proviso that the fact should be kept secret. The object in view in granting such a permission was to obtain Philip's adhesion to their cause in the German diet, and this purpose was attained. Anglicanism also was founded on the fact that Henry VIII. desired a divorce from his wife Catherine of Arragon that he might marry Ann Boleyn. This he could not do while he remained a Catholic, and so he founded the Church of England, which was always thereafter ready to accommodate him in anything he wished for. It is not much to be wondered at, therefore, that in practice the clergy of these Churches should be ready for a fee to ignore what the gospel may say in regard to the indissolubility of marriage, in order to follow the way their own fancies and personal interests dictate to them. In fact these clergymen in one parish will stand on the gospel principle, while in another they will have no objection to marry divorced persons. And in other Churches every one will follow the dictates of his own fancy, or, as he will call it, his conscience, because it is the characteristic of Protestantism to do this. In the Catholic Church there is uniformity of action. No priest anywhere will marry divorced persons under any pretext, for the Catholic Church has the same teaching and practice everywhere and at all times where the law of God is concerned.

A LEGAL DECISION ON FAITH-CURE.

A recent decision of the New York Court of Appeals will be a severe blow to the practice of Eddyism, Dowieism and similar fads of the so-called Faith-Curists in that State. By the decision of the Court, the guilt of J. Luther Pierson, who was fined three years ago for criminal neglect in not furnishing medical attendance for his infant daughter of sixteen months old when she was seriously ill of pneumonia, has been established.

Pierson is the Dowieite, and in accordance with the Dowieite practice, would not employ physicians or medicines for his child.

It is regarded as a remarkable coincidence that this decision was pronounced on the day before Dowie and his followers began their New York crusade for the conversion of that city. The District Attorney of Westchester County, Mr. J. Addison Brown, states that it is the first time in the history of the United States that the law defining the duty of parents to furnish medical attendance to their children has been made certain by a decision of the higher courts.

The conviction is based upon provisions of the State penal code which enact that "a person who willfully omits without lawful excuse to perform a duty by law imposed upon him to furnish food, clothing, shelter, or medical attendance to a minor under his charge . . . or neglects, refuses, or omits to comply with any provisions of this section . . . is guilty of a misdemeanor."

Pierson was convicted by a jury in the local court in 1901, and fined \$500, or condemned in default to five hundred days in jail; but the Appellate Division of the Supreme Court reversed the decision. The original verdict is now confirmed by the State Court of Appeals.

The defence was that the law does not order the use of medicine, that medicine is not an exact science, that doctors have lost the confidence of many people, that they disagree among themselves in regard to the manner in which diseases should be treated, and that the prosecution should prove that, in this particular instance, medical attendance would have saved the child's life. It was also contended that the parents of the child are guaranteed religious liberty by the Constitution, whereas they believed conscientiously that the services of a physician would be useless, or even harmful.

The Court in rendering its decision said: "The peace and safety of the State involves the protection of the lives and health of its children, as well as obedience to its laws. Full and free enjoyment of religious profession is guaranteed, but acts which are not worship are not. A person cannot, under the guise of religious belief, practice polygamy, and still be protected from our statutes constituting the crime of bigamy. He cannot, under the belief or profession of belief that he should be relieved from the care of children, be excused from punishment for slaying those who have been born to him. Children, when born into the world, are utterly helpless, hav-

ing neither the power to care for, protect, nor maintain themselves. They are exposed to all the ills to which flesh is heir, and require careful nursing, and at times, when danger is present, the help of an experienced physician."

The various religious opinions held by people are stated in regard to the best manner in which diseases are to be treated so far as the Providence of God is concerned, and the decision continues:

"But sitting as a court of law, for the purpose of construing and determining the meaning of statutes, we have nothing to do with these variances in religious beliefs, and have no power to determine which is correct. We merely declare the law as given us by the Legislature. We have considered the legal proposition raised by the record, and have found no error on the part of the trial court that calls for a reversal."

There is a remarkable unanimity of opinion of the press in approval of the finding of the Court, and the following from the New York Commercial Advertiser may be taken as a fair sample of what is said of the matter:

"Judge Haight, who wrote the opinion handed down by the Court of Appeals, goes directly to the heart of the whole matter, which is the exact interpretation of a specific statute. He does not allow himself to be lured into any discussion of the value of faith cure or absent treatment, or the clash between different schools of formal medicine."

Another paper, the Philadelphia Ledger, says:

"The statute is a wise, provident, and humane enactment, and it should be incorporated into the criminal codes of all the States." There is nothing in all this to condemn the prayer of faith for the sick; but the neglect to make use of the ordinary care of the infirm is condemned, and justly so. We have even the declaration of Christ that they who are ill have need of a physician. We are also told that God Himself hath declared that He hath given "fruits for food, and the leaves thereof for medicine."

It is a mockery of religion when Eddyites (Christian Scientists) and Dowieites proclaim that they are the sole teachers of Christian truth while they deny these plain words of Holy Scripture. If the law as defined by Judge Haight errs at all, it is on the side of too much leniency toward fanaticism, whereas it does not authorize the agents of the law to enter homes of faith-curers to save the lives of the little ones by obliging fanatical parents to furnish adequate medical attendance for their children; but it is well that it will insure the punishment at least that Mr. J. Luther Pierson has brought upon himself. It is like the punishment inflicted upon the ordinary murderer. No law can entirely prevent murders from being committed, but when they are perpetrated, it is well there should be a punishment inflicted as a terror to other evil-doers, to deter them from the commission of the same crime.

HONORE DE BALZAC.

W. G., of Ridgeway, Ont., enquires: "Was the French writer Honore de Balzac, who died in 1858, a Catholic?" He was nominally a Catholic, and from his infancy was educated as a Catholic; but, like many other French novelists, he practically laid aside his religious convictions in his writings to gain favor as an author with those who delight in prurient reading. Most of his works are not fit to be read in decent society, or by decent people, owing to his pandering to the morbid passions of his readers. Many of his books were written in his poverty merely to be sold, and to this end he labored strenuously, though with poor success, for he did not acquire wealth until in 1848 he married a rich Polish lady. His extravagance was one of the causes which stood in the way of his financial success. All Balzac's works are on the Index or list of prohibited books issued by the authority of the Pope.

The Priestly Stole.

The stole is the consecrated emblem of sacerdotal power. As he places it around his neck the priest repeats this prayer: "Return unto me, O Lord, the stole of immortality which I lost through the prevarication of our first parents and although I approach unworthily the holy mystery, may I nevertheless deserve to attain to everlasting joy and felicity." As the stole is the outward token of priestly power, it is worn by him whenever he exercises solemn jurisdiction. Only those who are admitted to major orders are allowed to wear the stole. The manner in which they wear it indicates the order to which they belong. The deacon, who has as yet no power to consecrate or absolve, places it over his left shoulder and crosses the extremities under the right arm. The priest whose power is limited and dependent crosses the stole on his breast. The Bishop who has received the fullness of the priesthood lets the two sides hang down. The Pope alone has the right to wear the stole always and everywhere, because he alone is the viceregent of Jesus Christ, our high priest who said of Himself: "All power is given to Me in heaven and on earth,—Catholic Columbian.

SOME PRACTICAL ACUOUS

BY RIGHT REV. BISHOP In his sermon at the Cathedral some statements of interest in Catholicism were referred to "vision" at Oswego. The Bishop's follows: "Unless you will not be perfect. He had and wonders healing the sick blind, cleansing even the dead to that Christ possessed storing to health at the point of the stricken and the strong spoken of Matthew. He was a social presence power was necessary exclamation worthy that the root; say but shall be healed. "Christ here broke while the son was at that. "Unless you will not believe. EVIDENCE. "The seeking and wonders of faith and of Jews sought wisdom. Not St. Paul preached Christ crucified. Cross, to the Jews a scandal, and but to them a wisdom of God. "When added Hill of Mars Hill with superstitious things you were all employed and in to new doctrine. His own, and known God. V. deomas, and I philosophers, V. dom, but ignorant in the simple faith and of morals almost Catholic child of faith in the they were won the Christian known God is earth and of visible ever p and redemption w spring. He preached the remission truths, death and life ever! "If modern tans and reform banks, who I but their own pagan fancies catechized them they would of ignorance a shame. AGE OF Ficklene characteristic nature. We or satisfied e spiritual. I be entirely When we are be better off to be richer become poorer are miserable everything! "In their age of Egypt Israelites heaven, yet called it man mured again and longed pots of Egypt. "Our age And the Ap sins that ex God, heretic driving into wisdom an knowledge o religious fancies and "We hav and priest faith, crucer signs and v osities. "After t the reformer the Bible i dora's box gods, conta legend, the curses if no evil and o opened her miseries th "Every and religio Paine and Dowie, the of a new r the Bible a fancies. "The poetic The high p and mind Sacred Bo systems, a various sen in it thew Hence the ded by t "Unles false prop establishesh such relig resp against sn and upon Church a prevail ag Father a comforter