

The Catholic Record

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.
United States and Europe—\$2.50.
Publisher & Proprietor, Thomas Coffey, Ltd., D.
Editor, Rev. James T. Foley, D. D.
Associate Editor, P. J. Mackintosh.
Manager—Robert M. Burns.
Address business letters to the Manager.
Classified Advertising 15 cents per line.
Remittance must accompany the order.
Where CATHOLIC RECORD Box address is required send 10 cents to prepay expense of postage upon replies.

Obituary and marriage notices cannot be inserted except in the usual condensed form. Each insertion 50 cents.
The Editor cannot be held responsible for unsolicited manuscripts. Every endeavor will be made to return rejected contributions when stamped addressed envelopes are enclosed.

The CATHOLIC RECORD has been approved and recommended by Archbishops Falcioni and Blumenthal, late Apostolic Delegates to Canada, the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa, and St. Boniface, the Bishops of London, Hamilton, Peterborough and Oshawa, N. Y., and the clergy throughout the Dominion.

The following agents are authorized to receive subscriptions and canvass for the CATHOLIC RECORD:

General Agents—Stephen V. James, George J. Quigley, Miss Bertha Saunders, Resident Agents—H. Chamberlain, Hilson Ave., Ottawa West; Phone Sherwood 383 W.; Mrs. Geo. E. Smith, 2283 Manor St., Montreal; Miss Anna Hogan, Hutton St., St. John's, N. B.; J. P. Farrell, 50 Fraser St., Quebec City; Thos. Lavell, 331 College St., Montreal; L. F. Galvin, 383 Oxford West, Moose Jaw, Sask. General Agents—P. A. Arseneault, Howland, P. E. I.

LONDON, SATURDAY, APRIL 11, 1925

HOLY WEEK

The whole Lenten season of self-denial and penance culminates in the Great Week as it is called in the liturgy; in the language of the faithful, Holy Week. Sin is the one great and only real evil that afflicts mankind. Christ came to convince the world of sin and of judgment. Christ's Church sets apart the holy Lenten season that we may dispose our hearts and souls to realize the great lesson that Jesus desires to teach. God alone is the searcher of hearts; but there is not one of God's priests who has not reason to believe that countless thousands of souls are now nearer to God, and that, convinced of sin and of judgment, they realize more fully and feel more deeply the stupendous mysteries commemorated in Holy Week.

Palm Sunday recalls the triumphant entry of our Divine Lord into Jerusalem. "Filled with heavenly enlightenment" the populace went out to meet the Redeemer and strewed under His feet branches of olive and palm, crying: "Hosanna to the Son of David! Blessed is He that cometh in the name of the Lord! O King of Israel! Hosanna in the highest!"

The sacred liturgy for the whole Great Week does more than commemorate the great events of the Passion, Death and Resurrection of the Saviour; with much of the directness, force and wisdom, with something of the same deep knowledge of the human mind and heart that characterized the teaching of the Divine Master, the Church teaches afresh the old and ever-new lessons of Holy Week.

The shadow of the Cross is felt even amid the Palm Sunday acclamations of joyous faith and love. It deepens. The machinations of His enemies, their apparent triumph, the awful mockery of the crown of thorns and the purple robe, the agony in Gethsemane, the weariness unto death, the faintness and falling under the burden of the Cross, the darkness over the earth as the God-man dies on the hill of Calvary.

It is overwhelming in its awfulness even to us who have the key to this dread mystery: "Greater love than this no man hath that he lay down his life for his friends." And shining through the darkness of Holy Week is the transcendent mystery of Love, the miracle of Holy Thursday, the institution of the Blessed Eucharist.

The darkness of the mystery of Christ's suffering and death is like the darkness of night that reveals the glory of the star-lit heavens; and we look forward to the certain dawn of another day when the darkness flees before the rising sun.

So without the heart-breaking fears and doubts of the Apostles and disciples, with untroubled faith we see that the darkness of Holy Week, of Christ's suffering and death and seeming defeat, ends in the glory of His Resurrection and complete triumph over death and sin.

The Great Week, Holy Week, should be for us Catholics—and thank God is for millions—a time when we learn anew the sublime lesson of the Redemption.

And as through the grace of the Sacrament of Penance we rise again from the death of sin we cannot do better than take to heart the admonition of St. Paul: "If ye be risen with Christ, seek the things that are above where Christ sitteth at the right hand of God."

THE PARLIAMENTARY POPE

Whether the Anglo-Catholic movement within the Church of England paves the way for the full acceptance of the Catholic faith or rather hinders it is a matter on which opinions differ. One thing seems beyond question: a large proportion of Church-going Anglicans are being familiarized with Catholic beliefs and Catholic practices from which they or their forbears were long estranged. It would seem to the outsider that this must do much to soften traditional Protestant prejudice even though it leads some to accept the shadow for the substance.

However this may be the World's Evangelical Alliance which met last week in London (England) seems to have no doubt as to whether the movement is tending, nor of its magnitude and significance. The object of this meeting, indeed the object of the World's Evangelical Alliance, the cable informs us, is to uphold the doctrines of the Reformation and to protest against an attempt by Anglo-Catholics to undo its work.

Sir William Joynson-Hicks, Home Secretary, who presided, appealed openly, directly—and no doubt honestly—to anti-Catholic prejudice:

"We want no priestly interference, we ask for no purgatory, and we will submit to no compulsory confession."

"Priestly interference" with what? With politics? On this side of the ocean politics is bedevilled not by the priestly interference Sir William repudiates, but by the interference of evangelical Protestant ministers. It will hardly be denied that the blame—or credit—for Prohibition is largely due to them. Is it priestly interference with the liberty of the individual? We should like anyone to point out wherein the Catholic, either in England or America, is less free from "priestly interference" than his Protestant fellow-countryman.

Sir Joynson-Hicks may "ask for no Purgatory;" but there is abundant evidence that many of his fellow-countrymen, especially during the War, found the Catholic doctrine of Purgatory both consolatory and reasonable: that the souls of our dear ones departed, while undergoing the purifying and cleansing influences of Purgatory, still share in the Communion of Saints and can be helped by our prayers and good works. But why all the fuss about Purgatory while Evangelicals still "want" hell? The Home Secretary wants "no compulsory confession." It would be interesting to know just what befuddled notion he has of Confession. Catholics must confess their sins at least once a year or cease to be Catholics in good standing. That is the only "compulsion" there is about the confessional.

"The desire for reunion with Rome is still in existence," the Home Secretary added. "Men who do not represent the Church of England, and who have no right to speak for the Church of England or for England itself, are once more seeking a reunion, while Rome smiles and sits still, knowing that the only way is by submission to itself. We stand for the Scriptures as the highest and final authority, and there is a danger that the spiritual freedom of the laity will be taken away."

Now that is clear and understandable. As to who has the right to speak for the Church of England is a matter on which, at first sight, Sir William seems a little mixed, for the despatch goes on:

"Sir William appealed to the Non-conformists to come forward and join in the protest, and declared that people who attempted to tamper with the power of the Prayer Book would have to reckon, not only with the nation, but with the Parliament of this country."

It does seem a bit funny to deny the right of the Anglo-Catholic wing of the Church of England not only to speak for their Church but to work for what they deem its highest and best interests, and in the same breath to invite Nonconformists to join in the protest against Anglo-Catholic activity and thus help preserve "the spiritual freedom of the laity!"

Then it seems that there is a limit to private judgment. If it lead Romeward it is a dangerous thing; if toward modernism, rationalism or infidelity it is a

privat affair of no consequence to the nation or interest to Parliament.

But when he sternly warns those who would tamper with the Prayer Book that they will have to reckon with the Parliament of the country this member of Parliament and of Government speaks as one having authority. For Parliament is Pope of the Church of England as by law established. And Nonconformists, Jews, Catholics, agnostics, indifferents, and anti-religionists all have a voice in the choosing of Members of Parliament. So, after all, the Home Secretary is not so inconsistent in calling on Nonconformists to join in his protest.

The despatch concludes by indicating the inevitable "resolutions": "The meeting adopted resolutions declaring that alteration in the character of the National Church would be a disaster to the religious life of the nation and the Empire, and appealing to the Bishops and Parliament to maintain its Protestant character."

The protesters appeal to the Bishops—the appointees of Parliament—and to Parliament itself to save religion, the nation and the Empire by subjecting the National Church to proper control. The "spiritual freedom" of the Church of England is to be strictly regulated and limited so that the danger to the "spiritual freedom" of the laity may be averted.

All this is a bit bewildering; but Sir William Joynson-Hicks, the World's Evangelical Alliance and the conjoint Nonconformist protesters are all on solid ground.

The Church of England was created by civil law and is still subject to the civil power.

The Act of Supremacy (1534) declared the King to be Supreme Head of the English Church, and an oath was prescribed affirming the Pope to have no jurisdiction in the realm of England. It decreed that, as Supreme Head of the Church, the King "shall have full power and authority from time to time to visit, repress, redress, reform, order, correct, restrain, and amend all such errors, heresies, abuses, offences, contempt, enormities, whatsoever they be which by any manner, spiritual authority or jurisdiction ought or may be lawfully reformed." (26 Henry VIII., i.)

Another statute secured to the Crown absolute control in the appointment of bishops.

The changes under Edward, Mary and Elizabeth need not detain us, as the law today is substantially the same as under Henry VIII. When in 1640 Archbishop Land had a series of canons drawn up in Convocation the indignation of Parliament was so great that he begged leave to withdraw them. And the House of Commons unanimously passed a resolution declaring that "the Clergy in Convocation assembled has no power to make any canons or constitutions whatsoever in matters of doctrine, discipline or otherwise to bind the Clergy and laity of the land without the common consent in Parliament." (Resolution 16 December, 1640.)

The effect of the legislation under Henry VIII., revived under Elizabeth, and confirmed in subsequent reigns, has been, as Lord Campbell pointed out in his famous Gorum judgment, in 1850, to locate in the Crown all that decisive jurisdiction which before the Reformation had been exercised by the Pope. Thus, whatever views or aspirations have been held theoretically by Anglican divines on the spiritual authority of the Anglican Church, the Royal Supremacy remains an effective reality; and both as to the doctrines to be taught and the persons to be put in office to teach them, the Crown has practical and substantial control.

Of course now it is only on the advice of his responsible ministers that the King exercises ecclesiastical or any other jurisdiction, which means that the supreme authority in the English Church is Parliament, Parliament is Pope.

The supremacy of the Spirituality in the domain of doctrine, the sole guarantee of true religious liberty, is as much lacking today as in the days when the Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity created the Anglican Church.

Politics we all know, and politicians. The quarrels of Anglo-Catholics and Evangelicals will be avoided as long as possible. But Joynson-Hicks and the Evangelical Alliance are on solid ground when they appeal to Parliament to restrain the activities and curtail the liberties of the Anglo-Catholics

in the Church of England. How far they will succeed in their appeal will depend on their political influence. It may well be sufficient to secure the appointment of bishops only from the Protestant wing of that very "comprehensive" church. A queer sort of spiritual freedom this that the Home Secretary champions!

BY WHOM SCANDAL COMETH

By THE OBSERVER

The first duty of Catholic parents is to keep scandal away from their children. Nothing else that they can do for them will make up for that if it is not done. Parents may flatter themselves that they have done much for their children; but if they do not take care to keep them from being scandalized all the other things they may have done for them will do neither to them nor to their children the smallest good imaginable.

There was a time, in a simpler state of society, when it was not so very hard to perform this duty of protection. But times have changed. The spread of written matter of all kinds, the extension of the wonders of photography all over the world, the sharpening of the childish mind in schools provoking it to all-embracing curiosity, have made the conditions under which parents have to perform their duty, much more difficult than they formerly were.

The conditions of life have become much more complicated than they used to be. When the Pope recommended to the world the practice of Frequent Communion even for children, he unquestionably had in mind the increased dangers of modern times. These dangers are greater where large numbers of all sorts of people live in a small area called a town or city. In the old days when the bulk of the population of the country lived in rural districts, the problem of preserving the innocence of the young was not so great or so acute as it now is.

Under modern conditions, the responsibility of parents is increased enormously. From the very day when they can understand the meaning of spoken or written words to any extent the devil is after the souls of the young. In the modern city or town the devil is assisted immensely by a hundred agencies, some of which deny vehemently that they are doing the devil's work, while others more or less openly admit that they are in his service. The printing press and the camera have largely been devoted to the work of the devil. The great modern invention of motion picture photography is to a great extent used for the purpose of filling young minds—and not only young minds but old minds as well—with the scenes of lust and with thoughts of lust.

It has been the fashion always for men and women to excuse themselves on one or another pretext when they did not wholly deny responsibility for scandalizing their neighbor. The earliest instance, if we remember correctly, was when one member of the first family asked whether he was his brother's keeper. Men who do not wish to accept responsibility have been asking the same question, with a view to shaking off responsibility for the moral injury they were doing or had done to their neighbor. It is Catholic doctrine that to a great extent we are our brother's keepers. We owe to all persons the charity of a good example. It may seem to us that in our own particular case our example is not likely to be very influential, but we can never be sure about that. It may be, in any given case, that the sight of us doing the forbidden thing is the deciding factor in the fall of our neighbor. Not that that excuses him; but we are nevertheless responsible; for, at the least we ought to count for one more on the side of right and instead of that we count for one more on the side of wrong. In other words, we are doing all we can to scandalize our neighbor, and it is not for us to say that we really did him no harm.

These considerations arise in the case of every human relation even though it be between strangers. For, even in the case of strangers, there is a tendency and inclination to copy the actions of others. But what of the case where the duty of good example is extended and magnified by the special relation of parents and children with all that that implies and involves? How in that case are those who scandalize

the little ones going to answer to the God who gave them the special responsibility and the special duty of preserving those little souls from scandal?

No question that a parent can think about is more important than this: Are you doing your duty to the children God entrusted you with, or are you, on some pretext or other, passing the responsibility to some one else; to a teacher, or to the priest, or to some one else? Are you taking due notice of all the dangers of the day in which your children are being brought up, and of the place in which they are living their lives at the most critical time of their lives? Are you considering what sort of things your children are seeing or reading?

Woe to him by whom scandal cometh—that is the dread warning of God Himself. By whom does that scandal come? That is the question for parents who allow the scandal to reach their children, as well as those who directly give the scandal for money or for power. Woe to the man by whom scandal cometh; but what unspeakable woe will certainly be theirs who, being placed directly by Almighty God in a position of special responsibility, fail to discharge their duty to the very best of their power.

NOTES AND COMMENTS

ACCORDING to a "Commissioner" of the Baptist denomination in Canada, who has recently returned from Europe that entire continent is about to precipitate itself into the Baptist fold. In Russia alone the increase has been tenfold since 1918. Were this so it might be taken as one key to the anarchical conditions now prevailing in that country. Certain it is that the Soviet war against religion has much in common with the Anabaptist war on the Catholic Church in Holland under the "Baker-Bishop" of Haarlem.

FOR EXAMPLE the seventh anniversary of the Bolshevik revolution was celebrated by the burning, in the public square of Moscow, of 2,000 crosses taken from the churches of the country. Just substitute the term Baptist (or Anabaptist, as the sect was then known) for Bolshevik and you have an accurate picture of doings in Holland in the sixteenth century. The thing is precisely the same, in nature at least, if not in degree.

RUSSIA, it may be added, is the only country in the world where conditions have allowed full scope for organized war of this kind. She has a terrible record of ghastly crimes not only against the Orthodox Church and its priesthood, but against intelligible religion in any form. Catholics, though protected to some extent by the influence of the Holy See, have felt the full force of this evil spirit. And the war in that respect is still at its height.

It is but last December that a central authority was established in Moscow under the atrocious name "Permanent Society of Anti-God Workers," and one of its leaders, M. Zinovief, has issued an appeal full of sentiments so blasphemous that no reputable journal outside of Russia could be found to reproduce it. That it should be tolerated even in Russia but accentuates the state of chaos under which the re-bound from the tyranny of Tsardom has plunged a mighty nation.

THE WORDY war in the matter of "Church Union" has brought temporarily into the limelight the Westminster Confession of Faith, and the Calvinistic doctrines of Election and Predestination which that famous document embodies. Many, not excluding Presbyterians, who have never before known just what subscription to the Confession implied have now had some sort of an awakening in regard thereto. And it is interesting to note that many Presbyterian clergy who subscribed at their ordination now declare they did so with mental reservation. We had thought that Catholic casuists, and Jesuits alone countenanced such a practice (at least Protestant controversialists have assured us that they do) but the boot is on the other foot, as, indeed, it has been all along.

IN VIEW of the publicity given to the doctrines in question it may not be amiss to set down the Catholic view, which we do in a few excerpts

from Scripture and the Fathers as drawn up by a qualified teacher of theology.

"Calvinists alleged original sin as a sufficient reason for God to single out those He wished to save and those He wished to exclude from salvation, but Scripture and Tradition show plainly enough that such a reason does not hold good.

"Wisdom 11, 24: But Thou hast mercy upon all, because Thou canst do all things, and overlookest the sins of men for the sake of repentance. For Thou lovest all things that are, and hatest none of the things which Thou hast made. Thou sparest all because they are Thine, O Lord, who lovest souls."

"1 Tim. 2: I desire, therefore, first of all, that supplications, prayers, intercessions, and thanksgivings be made for all men. . . . For this is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour, who will have all men to be saved, and to come to the knowledge of the truth. For there is one God, and one mediator of God and men, the man Christ Jesus, who gave himself a redemption for all."

"St. Ambrose: He willed all to be His own whom He established and created. . . . He wants even those who flee, and does not will that those in hiding should perish."

"St. Prosper: 'God wills all to be saved and to come to the knowledge of truth, . . . so that those who are saved, are saved because He wills them to be saved, while those who perish, perish because they deserve to perish.'"

"St. Gregory: The law, the prophets, and the sufferings of Christ by which we were redeemed, are common property and admit of no exception; but as all men are participants in the same Adam, deceived by the serpent and subject to death in consequence of sin, so by the heavenly Adam all are restored to salvation and by the wood of ignominy recalled to the wood of life, from which we had fallen."

EARTHQUAKE 300 YEARS AGO

CANADIAN QUAKE 262 YEARS AGO

By Rev. Francis A. Tondorf, S. J., Director, Georgetown University Observatory

Washington.—The severe earthquake felt, on the evening of February 28 last, at about 9.30 o'clock, in the evening, along the entire eastern coast of the United States and towards the interior of the States as far as Michigan and the Carolinas, had its center, as has now been fully established from seismological investigations, in Canada, along the St. Lawrence River.

Of timely interest, therefore, may be found the accounts of a much more severe quake in this same neighborhood on February 5, 1663, and which, according to Morton, Josselyn, and other historians, was noted sensibly not only in New England but also New Netherlands (New York).

One account is by the French missionary, Father Hierosme Lalemont and is chronicled in the Jesuit Relations, 1663, 2. The story reads:

"At half past five in the evening of the fifth (February, 1663) a great roaring sound was heard at the same time throughout the whole extent of Canada. This sound, which produced an effect as if the houses were on fire, brought everybody out of doors, but instead of seeing smoke and flame, they were amazed to behold the walls shaking, and all the stones moving as if they would drop from their places. The houses seemed to be bent first to one side and then to the other. Bells sounded of themselves; beams, joists, planks cracked; the ground heaved, making the pickets of the palisades dance in a way that would have seemed incredible had we not seen it in divers places.

"Everybody was in the streets; animals ran wildly about; children cried; men and women, seized with fright, knew not where to take refuge, expecting every moment to be buried under the ruins of the houses, or swallowed up in some abyss, opening under their feet. Some, on their knees in the snow, cried for mercy and others passed the night in prayer; for the earthquake continued without ceasing, with a motion much like that of a ship at sea, inasmuch that sundry persons felt the same qualms of stomach which they would feel on the water.

"In the forests the commotion was far greater. The trees struck one against the other as if there were a battle between them; and you would have said that not only their branches, but even their trunks, started out of their places and leaped on one another with such noise and confusion that the Indians said that the whole forest was drunk."

Father Lalemont concludes his narrative adding that it was midsummer before the shocks wholly ceased and the earth resumed her wonted calm.

ANOTHER ACCOUNT

This same earthquake was reported by Father Charles Simon, a Jesuit missionary, whose account Father Francis Ragueneau enclosed in a letter which he sent to the Rev. Gian Oliva, General of the Society of Jesus on December 12, 1663.

The narrative reads in part: "February the fifth, 1663, the day of the quake, broke tranquilly and serene. At five o'clock in the evening a sound was heard seemingly centered at a distance. A frightful crash followed, appearing to come from the lowest depths and the extreme confines of the earth, resembling in sound the battle of waves and the roar of the sea.

"The earth rolled to and fro under foot as a boat is restlessly buffeted about by the waves. The violence of the first shock subsided after about an hour. Towards nine o'clock in the evening the earth again began to shake and that alternation of shocks lasted until the ninth of September. During this period there was a great variety of dissimilar shocks.

"The River St. Lawrence changed its color, not for a brief space of time but for eight entire days. . . . From various circumstances we are forced to the belief that all America was shaken by the earthquake. . . . Barbarians came to us and reported that eighteen miles from here (Quebec) the earthquake raged much more violently. . . . Enmities extinguished, disputes laid aside, restorations of offended Charity, kneeling supplications, mutual petitions for pardon, and other things of the same kind, sufficiently declare that the earthquake was rather a scheme of the Divine Mercy than a scourge of Justice, especially since, in so great a confusion of affairs and perturbation of the elements, no one lost life or fortune. Fear came to all, penalty to none."

It is to be noted that both stories agree as to the time of the occurrence of the quake, Parkman, in his "The Old Regime in Canada" Volume I, places the time at five-thirty in the morning. We find no authority for this. Strangely enough the quake of February last also took place in the same month, within twenty-three days of the date and four hours of the time of day. In this connection it might be mentioned that Pere Simon states that most of the after shocks took place in the night time. That both the quake of 1663 and of 1925 were of the same character is evident from the fact that in spite of the severity of the earth movement in either instance, there was not a single fatality and the damage done was slight.

A close analysis of the grams obtained at this observatory on our five seismographs warrants the conclusion that the energy liberated in the quake of this year was tremendous. Two factors are held responsible for this energy, the velocity of the movement and the mass of crustal displacement. That the velocity of the initial movement was moderate is unquestionable. The instruments show this. It remains then to equate this energy to the mass of shifting rock, necessarily of gigantic dimension, gradually but fully adjusting itself. And here we feel justified in assuming that as Mother Earth saw fit to rearrange her footing so adequately, a recurrence of a like tremor is not to be anticipated within the lifetime of the bulk of the readers of this article.

TEN COMMANDMENTS READING IN SCHOOLS

New York.—The proposal of an interdenominational committee of laymen who seek to have the Ten Commandments read once a week in all the Public schools here will be fought, in the courts if necessary, by the Freethinkers Society of New York. Furthermore, the Society will attempt to bar any type of Bible-reading from the schools, should the issue continue to be pressed.

This announcement was made by Joseph Lewis, president of the Freethinkers, after the laymen's committee had petitioned the Board of Education to adopt a by-law compelling the reading of the Ten Commandments in the schools. The committee, headed by Miss Helen P. McCormick, of the Catholic Big Sisters of Brooklyn, is made up of representatives of the Catholic Protestant and Hebrew faiths.

The Society will contend that the reading of any part of the Bible in the schools would violate both the Federal and State constitutions, said Mr. Lewis. The move is an "entering wedge for the churchification of our schools and State," he declared, adding that it would "abrogate the time-honored tradition of keeping Church and State separate in the United States."

Many prominent men and women will support the position of the Society, Mr. Lewis said. He mentioned particularly Thomas A. Edison and Luther Burbank, in connection with his statement he made public a letter which he said he had received from Mr. Edison and which read:

"I do not believe that any type of religion should ever be allowed to be introduced in the Public schools of the United States."

He also pointed out that in some States Bible-reading in the Public schools is expressly forbidden by law.