

The Catholic Record.

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

REV. GEORGE R. NORTHGRAVES. Author of 'Mistakes of Modern Italy.'

THOMAS COFFEY. Publisher and Proprietor, Thomas Coffey.

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

LETTER OF RECOMMENDATION. UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA. OTTAWA, Canada, March 7th, 1904.

LONDON, SATURDAY, SEPT. 17, 1904

THE FRENCH BUDGET OF PUBLIC WORSHIP.

Owing to the manner in which the Protestant Press represents the disputes which have arisen between Premier Combes and the Pope, there is a very general impression that the threatened abolition of the Concordat, and of the connection between Church and State in France, will affect only the Catholic Church; and for this cause we find that these papers generally applaud the policy of the French Government in persecuting religion, and hope to see the threatened abolition of the Public Worship Budget.

It is not at all certain that this threat will be put into execution, but should this actually be the case, it will affect Protestants and Jews even more than Catholics in proportion to their numbers; for the Protestant and Jewish clergy receive subsidies from the Department of Public Worship which are larger than those given to the priests.

Owing to the comparatively small numbers of Protestants and Jews it has long been deemed proper to give their clergy larger salaries than to the priests. Also, as the non-Catholic clergy are married, this was deemed another reason for the adoption of this course, as it was necessary to provide for the sustenance of their families.

The Protestants receive from the State about 1,600,000 francs, and the Jews, about 162,500 francs. The non-Catholics would therefore suffer more in proportion from the suppression of the Budget than would Catholics.

The total amount given in subsidies to the Catholic clergy is only about 1 per cent. on the value of Church property confiscated at the great Revolution in France; so that so far from being a free gift from the government to the Church, it is only about one-fourth or one-fifth of what is actually due from the States to the Church, the value of money being assumed to be 4 or 5 per cent.

CHURCH CONTINUITY.

Under the title "Some Famous Archbishops," Saturday's Mail and Empire has an editorial article giving a short history of several Archbishops of Canterbury. This article was written in view of the expected visit of the present (Anglican) Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Davidson, who arrived in Toronto last Saturday, and preached in St. James' and St. Alban's Anglican Churches.

On the whole, as coming from a Protestant source, the article was one of the fairest we have seen for a long time in regard to the real history of the Christian Church in England, though there were in it some historical inaccuracies.

The Mail and Empire remarks that Dr. Davidson would, probably, not admit that "The Church of which he is the temporal head is an offshoot of the Church of Rome. All Anglicans hold that their religion existed before Pope Gregory sent his first missionary to the island of Britain, and that it was founded by him."

"The Church of which he is the temporal head is an offshoot of the Church of Rome. All Anglicans hold that their religion existed before Pope Gregory sent his first missionary to the island of Britain, and that it was founded by him."

to England by Pope Gregory, and was the first Archbishop of Canterbury."

The writer goes on to admit that the three successors of Augustine were missionaries from Rome. This implies the jurisdiction of the Popes in England at least from the time of St. Augustine, who began his work of the conversion of the Saxons in 597. After that date, it is true that there were from time to time disputes with the kings of England, but even throughout these disputes the authority of the Pope was always seen to be paramount in matters of religion, and was over and over again acknowledged by the chief pastors of the Church in England, as well as by the kings. Thus Ethelbert in giving directions to erect churches throughout his kingdom, calls himself "the Catholic King of the Angles," and declares that:

"By the counsel of the most holy Pope Gregory, and his spiritual father Augustine, he has built a great number of Churches, of which none is more dear to him than that of Canterbury (Duroverum) dedicated to Sts. Peter and Paul; and the Abbot presiding over the same was sent by the Apostolic See, and as from Gregory the Pope of the Apostolic See he had received as a mark of affection a tunic embroidered in gold and silk, he gave the name to that Church with other valuable gifts."

That the Pope's authority was recognized in its plenitude is evident from the formula used by Pope Boniface IV, in confirming the king's decrees relative to Westminster Abbey, which he had erected:

"If any of the Kings, your successors, or any Bishop, cleric, or layman, shall presume to disobey, he shall fall under the anathema of Peter, Prince of the Apostles, and of his successors."

This was in the year 616; and in 610 Archbishop Laurence went to Rome with Mellitus, Bishop of London, and Justus, Bishop of Rochester, to attend a council held there.

We might quote many evidences that the Church in England remained under the authority of the Pope. The history of the ages following the reign of Ethelbert proves this amply; but we shall satisfy ourselves here with a single reference from the career of one of the most illustrious of Canterbury's Archbishops, St. Anselm. When he was Abbot of Bec, Pope Urban II, wrote to St. Anselm asking him to counsel the Bishop of Beauvais so that the latter might be able to bear the burden of his office. The Pope says "Notwithstanding his resistance, we have enjoined on him to retain his episcopal charge, in the confidence that you will aid him to bear its weight."

St. Anselm answers that the Bishop of Beauvais himself will bring his answer to the Pope and will explain personally the trials and persecutions he has endured for justice's sake. He continues:

"I, therefore, beseech you as a humble suppliant speaking to a kind master to sustain by your Apostolic authority his noble efforts. Our community, your children and servants, pray with me daily for your patronage, and desire me to recommend them to your prayers and your benediction. (This was written in the year 1089.)"

Anselm's whole life was one of obedience and submission to the Pope, and the above answer must be regarded in this light, and it will be observed that the Pope regarded himself as supreme ruler of the whole Church, and as such he was recognized by Anselm both on this and later occasions.

It will be seen from all this that the Pope was the supreme head of the Church, not merely for a few hundred years, as the Mail and Empire implies, but for the whole period extending from the conversion of the Saxons to the Reformation.

But England was converted before the time of Augustine. That is true. This conversion was much earlier than the date when we find Irish missionaries in the country. The Irish missionaries went to labor in a country which was already Christianized, and therefore, the faith they preached was identical with that which already prevailed in the country. The Irish missionaries preached the faith of St. Patrick, which was Roman and Catholic; therefore the faith of Britain was Roman and Catholic. St. Patrick planted in Ireland the faith in which he was instructed in a Roman Seminary under the very eye of the Pope, and it was a Pope, Celestine, who sent him to Ireland in 432, and it was the faith which the Irish missionaries assisted in maintaining in England, then Britain. Britain was converted in the reign of King Lucius, as he was styled in Latin, or Lever-Maur in Celtic.

William of Malmesbury found in the archives of the Abbey of Glastonbury the record:

"Fagan and Dwywan, (who are the two holy missionaries Fugatus and Damianus) were sent to the British chieftain Lever-Maur by Pope Eleutherius. These missionaries died at Glastonbury and were buried at Glastonbury."

There is an ancient manuscript history of England in the Vatican library to the same effect:

"Lucius wrote a letter to Pope Eleutherius asking him to give him knowledge of the Christian religion, and he obtained what he asked for."

In a catalogue of the Popes, written in the reign of the Emperor Justinian, the same facts are mentioned, and the British historian Gildas and the Saxon Bode, give the history of these missionaries very fully, and state that they and their successors rendered obedience to the Popes, and that the succeeding Bishops all acknowledged the authority of the Holy Apostolic See. These testimonies are confirmed by that of Tertullian, who in his book written about A. D. 200 against the Jews, says: "The parts of Britain which have not been penetrated by the Romans, are nevertheless subject to Christ."

In the year 314, there were three British Bishops at the great Council of Arles, which though not a general Council, was a Council of the whole Western Church, even Africa being included. That Council testified to the supreme authority of the Pope. We say, therefore, that it is fully proved that the Church of the Britons, as well as that of the Saxons, was instituted by a Pope, and governed by Popes during the whole period of its existence, with some temporary dissensions which arose out of the obstinacy of individuals.

There was, indeed, as disinclination on the part of the British Bishops to help St. Augustine to evangelize the Saxons, but this arose from the fact that the heathen Saxons were hated as the enemies of the Britons who had been driven to the Western coast of the island, and who regarded the Saxons as their despoilers. Hence they would not help in their conversion. But not a long period elapsed before both sections of the Church were united and worked harmoniously together.

The Britons also being cut off by harassing wars from communication with the continent had lost the method of computing Easter, which, indeed, was not quite uniformly kept even on the continent. This embittered the dispute between them and St. Augustine's company. But this was a minor difference which did not affect the faith of the Church, though it was the cause of temporary dissensions and even of a rebellious disposition towards Rome at this particular period. All this did not affect the belief of all Christians that the Pope was the successor of St. Peter, the Prince of the Apostles.

The Church of Henry VIII, and more so that of Edward VI, and Elizabeth differed entirely from the Catholic Church. The modern Church of England is distasteful to by two States what it is to believe; the Catholic Church adheres unchangeably to the traditions of nineteen centuries. The Church of England has a humanly appointed Head, whereas the Head of the Catholic Church is the successor of Christ's Apostle who was divinely appointed. The modern Anglican Faith differs essentially from the Faith of Catholics. It has a local, changeable and modern liturgy, whereas the Catholic liturgy has been approved by the Universal Church, and preserves its antiquity throughout the ages without substantial change. The Anglican faith has already undergone periodical changes, whereas the Catholic faith is unchangeable. The creeds received by the Catholic Church will continue to be read and believed, whereas the Archbishop of Canterbury has virtually told us within the past few days that there might easily be a change made in these venerable confessions of faith, only that the Church of England must obey the will of the nation and submit to the faith which Parliament imposes on it.

In fine, the Catholic Church teaches the people what Christ taught, whereas the Church of England teaches whatever the people wish to be taught at any particular time. There is no similarity between the two Churches, and the claim that the Church of England is identical with the pre-Reformation Church is absolutely preposterous. The Archbishop of Canterbury is not by any means the successor of Fugatus, Augustine, or Anselm, but he does succeed Matthew Parker, the Archbishop of Canterbury of Elizabeth's creation, and the first of his line.

Neither is the Church of England an offshoot of the Catholic Church as the Mail and Empire would have it. It is a branch cut off from the living tree.

There are other errors in the Mail and Empire's history, but we have already dwelt upon the matter at so much length that we must defer their consideration.

The Supreme Court has just decided that Masonic secrets are not privileged and must be divulged when the interest of justice demand. The tribunal of penance—the confessional—in the Catholic Church is the only institution recognized by courts of all nations as privileged, and the priest is not required to divulge anything that transpires within it.

M. COMBES AND THE HOLY FATHER.

M. Combes, the French Premier in a recent speech stated with a great flourish of braggadocio that he will continue to carry out his policy for national sovereignty and the laicization of society.

And what does he mean by this? Who is disputing the national sovereignty? Certainly not the French clergy nor the Pope, for there are none more solicitous for the honor of France than the clergy, and both Pope Pius X. and Leo XIII. have over and over again declared their intense love for France. Pope Leo even went so far as to recommend all Catholics to support cordially the Republic, and to cease all efforts to restore the worn-out dynasties of former days, which have been set aside once for all, by the French people, and which we cannot expect ever to be restored as sovereigns to rule the people of France.

When it is considered that since the establishment of the Republic, the Government has year after year been more and more aggressive in persecuting the Catholic Church it is not to be wondered at that there should have been among true Catholics considerable hesitation in joining themselves under the banners of Republicanism; but, following the advice of Pope Leo, they have done so in the expectation that the Republic would be a fair form of Government, giving liberty of conscience to all. But this has not been the case hitherto.

We are told in the acts of the apostles that "Herod the King stretched forth his hands to afflict some of the Church. And he killed James, the brother of John, with the sword. And seeing that it pleased the Jews, he proceeded further to take Peter also." But the Government of M. Combes has out-Heroded Herod himself in malignity. He has laid his hand upon St. Peter's successor, endeavoring in every way possible to thwart the Holy Father in his administration of the affairs of the Church, but he has not confined himself to afflicting "some of the Church," but has attacked the whole Church, by the suppression of religious education. And this is what he is maintaining national sovereignty and the laicization of society.

The Catholics of France have, indeed, shown a surprising apathy in maintaining their liberties—an apathy which amounts to criminal torpidity. But the time must come when they will assert themselves, and will establish a true Republic under which the religion of the vast majority of the people will not be made to endure persecution. M. Combes and his Masonic Government certainly do not act upon the principles of government of the people by the people and for the people, which it is the purpose of a Republic to do, and the sweeping away of his tyranny will purify the Republican form of Government which has been deliberately adopted by the French people, and the Premier, in pretending that the expulsion of the religious orders was a necessary step towards the maintenance of the Republic was guilty of deliberate falsehood. There is indeed, a murmur of dissatisfaction among the people of France, but in the schools and in the monasteries, there is no discussion of politics, and these might have been left untouched without any danger to the Republic.

M. Combes adds in effect in his speech that it is so important that his policy should be continued that it must be carried out, even though the French protectorate in the East should be lost on account of his quarrel with the Pope who has violated the Concordat in many ways.

He certainly knows while making this assertion that it is a barefaced falsehood. Every one knows that it is he who has violated the Concordat. His reference here is undoubtedly to the summons issued by the Pope to the Bishops of Laval and Dijon to come to Rome to answer charges which had been brought against them.

M. Combes pretends that the Concordat contains clauses which forbid Bishops to leave France. The Concordat contains nothing of the kind, and no government can have the right to interfere with the internal government of the Church as established by God, in such a way as to set Bishops or the clergy beyond the Pope's jurisdiction. The Pope could not and will not consent to such a thing on any consideration.

The breaches of the Concordat have all been on the part of M. Combes, who has tried to bully the Holy Father, but failed, whereas throughout the whole discussion on this subject, the Holy Father has spoken with dignity and firmness, but at the same time in a conciliatory manner as it was proper the representative of Christ should do.

The French people are very sensitive to ridicule, and appreciate the situation very quickly when any one puts himself into a ridiculous situation. We have no doubt that the absurd position

into which M. Combes has placed himself will be properly appreciated by them. He is evidently looking for some excuse for threatening to abolish the Concordat. It would be far better that the Concordat should be abolished than that the Church should be deprived of its right to "reprove, entreat; and rebuke with all patience and doctrine" those who do not conduct themselves according to the standard of the gospel. It is on the right to do this that the present dispute between M. Combes and the Holy Father has arisen. The Premier should not forget that Christ said to His Apostles, to the Prince of whom Pope Pius X. succeeds: "He that despiseth Me, despiseth Him who sent Me."

A REMARKABLE RESULT OF CATHOLIC SCHOOL EDUCATION.

A recent issue of the Salem (Mass.) News gives a remarkable account of the proficiency of Henry Sullivan one of the pupils of St. Mary's parochial (Catholic) school of that town. Henry is thirteen years of age, and was examined along with the advanced pupils of all the parochial schools of the diocese of Boston. He was second in the competition, and we must infer that his answers, surprising as they are for a lad of his age, were excelled by another competitor.

There were many others of the same class who passed with the requisite percentage for promotion, but this boy's answers were so brilliant that it may be seen that he must have been instructed most carefully in all the branches which are on the programme of studies of the public schools.

We have no space for the reproduction of all the answers given by the Salem News, but we give some of them which will show the excellence of his answering and will prove to carping critics of Catholic Education that their notion that the Catholic schools are of inferior grade, has no foundation in fact. It will be noticed that the language itself in which the young boy's answers are given, is remarkably elegant, and would do honor to a college man, while the accuracy of the answers is equally correct and complete on a very great number of subjects, historical and otherwise. Some of the replies are the following:

(a) History is the summary of the principal events in the life of a nation.

(b) Patriotism is love of country. Patriotism is developed at home and in school by parents and teachers, by example of great men and by oppression, as was the case of the colonies in 1776.

To the question, "Why is patriotism shown?" Because true love of country cannot help showing itself when needed.

To the question, "How is it shown?" In times of peace, by praising one's country in speeches and writings, in time of war by fighting for it.

The code of laws of the United States: The legislative department is vested in congress, and it makes the laws. The executive power is vested in the President, who enforces the laws.

The judicial department is vested in the courts, which expound the laws. In 1803 Thomas Jefferson purchased the Louisiana territory, mainly to get control of the Mississippi river. By this purchase the country gained control of the great tract of land now comprising thirteen states.

The labor question concerns the contest going on between the laborer and his employer, the former seeking shorter hours and more pay and the latter opposing his claims.

The immigration question concerns the limiting of foreign immigration to people who will make good citizens. The civil service question aims to regulate by means of examinations the system of civil service appointments and promotions.

in competitive examinations, they have more than held their own. This is a fact of which all Catholics should be proud, considering the many serious disadvantages under which parochial schools are built, equipped and maintained. The tremendous sacrifices Catholics are making for the education of their children according to the teachings of the Church and the results obtained are swamping fair-minded non-Catholics to the dangers of an irregular education and winning from them a more just view of the Catholic claim for an equitable share of Public school moneys. That Catholic schools fulfill all the requirements demanded by the state in the way of purely intellectual development is a claim that has been substantiated by numerous tests, but as a most convincing individual case in point, we do not have to go beyond the answers of Master Henry Sullivan of Boston.

These remarks are equally applicable to the Catholic schools of Ontario, as we have frequently shown in our columns.

THE POPE AND ITALY.

Our readers will remember that some months ago Cardinal Svampa was permitted by the Holy Father to visit King Victor Emmanuel on the occasion of the visit of the latter to his diocese, and it was further said that the Italian Government entertains personally for the present Pope a most friendly regard. On these facts as a basis, it has been recently asserted that there is some likelihood of a not distant agreement between the Pope and the Italian Government which will effect a reconciliation between them, the result of which will greatly benefit both Church and State.

We cannot presume to say at the present moment whether or not these prognostications are correct. It is certainly not an article of faith that the temporal rule of the Pope is essential to the existence of the Church or to the spiritual authority of the Pope, yet it is certain that an independent territorial possession is necessary in order to secure to the Holy Father that freedom which he ought to possess that he may efficiently perform his duty as supreme head of the Church of all nations. The recent events which have occurred in France in regard to the interference of the infidel Government with the free exercise of the Pope's authority is sufficient to prove this.

We did not believe the sensational telegram which announced that three Archbishops and a larger number of Bishops of France had risen in rebellion to the Pope's authority, and had preferred to obey the authority of the French Premier, M. Combes, and we so stated in our columns. Our doubts were fully confirmed by the more full news which came by mail, and whereby it was shown that the whole difficulty was limited to two out of the eighty Bishops of France. These two were Mgr. Geay of Laval, and Mgr. Nardex of Dijon, who were summoned to Rome by the Pope to meet serious charges which had been brought against them.

The Government forbade the Bishops to act upon the Pope's order, but the Bishop of Dijon obeyed it notwithstanding the threats of the Government to cut off his stipend if he obeyed. The Bishop of Laval obeyed M. Combes rather than the Pope, but it is now stated that he has repented of his rebellious spirit, and that both Bishops have shown that the charges against them were malicious and false, and have so fully satisfied the Holy Father of their innocence of the grave charges made against them that the Pope has acquitted them, and withdrawn all repressive action, though it is not to be denied that in a moment of weakness Mgr. Geay was disobedient.

If the French Government could thus interfere with Bishops in their intercourse with Rome, it would be equally an easy matter for any Government under which the Pope might live to interfere with the Holy Father in his administration of the affairs of the Church.

This is only one of many reasons on account of which it is necessary the Pope should be an independent sovereign, and that his capital should be Rome, where he has ruled since the donation of Constantine the Great.

But it is pointed out by the Vaterland, published in Vienna, that

"The sovereignty of the Holy Father is one thing, and his claim upon this or that piece of territory another. For instance, while France formally renounced any claim upon Alsace-Lorraine, this act did not involve the renunciation of other territory. Thus the Holy Father might, by treaty, renounce a portion of the territory, which rightly belongs to him, in favor of another power. He could thus invest an unlawful occupant of such territory with the rights of lawful ownership. In other words, he could condone any illegality, and under certain conditions and guarantees, he might expressly recognize a situation created by that illegality. It is, at the same time, averred with the utmost earnestness that the Pope can never voluntarily relinquish his claim to the real, actual and complete sovereignty which he needs for the maintenance of his dignity and freedom and independence in the administration of the Church. Any Pope would rather take