

persecution. Our regret is that the inevitable struggle between Christianity and atheism was not fought to a finish in the days of Gambetta. We recognise, however, that even from a religious standpoint strong arguments might formerly be urged for a policy of compromise, when no vital issues were involved, and we feel further that the Church had no right to jeopardise lightly her revenues, which, as the Pope observes in one of the most pathetic passages in the Encyclical are 'partly the patrimony of the poor, and partly the patrimony, more sacred still, of the dead.' Still the fact remains, that when a further surrender was impossible without a sacrifice of the faith, and the Pope and the French Church opposed to the intolerable demands of the atheistic State the non-cessum of the purest ages of Christianity, almost a miraculous change has been effected. For the first time in the annals of the Gallican Church has the whole body of her clergy, from the Cardinal Archbishop to the student in the seminary, rallied to the Papal side in a controversy between the Curia and the French State; and never since the day on which the Scotch Free Kirkers under Chalmers forsook homes and income for what they deemed the 'crown rights of Christ' has Europe witnessed so impressive a spectacle of the abandonment of all earthly goods for the sake of the faith as she has seen in the acceptance by the French Bishops and priests of expulsion from their palaces and presbyteries.

If we admitted, which we do not for moment, that Pius X. and the French Church should base their policy on considerations of expediency, the remarkable success that has already attended the stand for principle would seem to show that in this case at least the path of honor is also the path of safety. And as to the complaint that the Encyclical contains no detailed scheme of action for the Bishops and clergy to follow, he must be a fool himself who imagines that the Pope, face to face with a malignant enemy, would be such a fool as to go into details in the message 'urbi et orbi.' Is he likely to show his plans to 'The Times' correspondent in Paris, for instance? The bishops will know what to do, but they will not tell their enemies either in France or in England.

In the Encyclical the Pope explains why he was unable to sanction the 'associations cultuelles.' They were, he tells us, organised in such a way as to run counter to the whole basis on which the constitution of the Catholic hierarchy rests. We believe that any ecclesiastical lawyer or theologian, Roman or Anglican, who understands the question would endorse the Pope's view. Unless the Pope was prepared to accept as theologically correct the proposition that the rulers of the Church by divine law are lay taxpayers and householders, that the bishops and priests are their subordinates, and that the State is the supreme judge, of heresy, he could not have recognised a church based on 'associations cultuelles.' This self-evident truth has lately been admitted even by M. Combes. Yet English newspapers continue to assert that the majority of the French episcopate would, but for Papal interference, have willingly enrolled the faithful in the semi-Presbyterian, semi-Voltairean established Church of the Separation Law. The truth is that the Bishops at the meeting on May 31 condemned the insulting and ridiculous suggestion with practical unanimity. We may add that it is accurate to state that the majority of the episcopate favored the modification rather than the rejection of this insulting proposal. What happened was this: Some bishops at the council and some newspaper canonists outside did believe that legal dexterity might devise some kind of associations, of which the constitution should not be repugnant to Catholic principles, and whose form could be one which was technically legal under the Separation Law. By a majority the council decided not that such Associations should be formed, but that the question whether their formation was possible should be submitted to the Pope. It may be added that many of the Bishops who voted for this proposal had no hope or belief that such a solution of the difficulty was possible. They merely desired to have the Pope's view. And every Englishman who recalls the recent fate of a Scotch Nonconformist body in the House of Lords must admit that the Pope only acted as any prudent lawyer would have done in dissuading the French episcopate from any such attempt to juggle away the plain meaning of the Republic's law. M. Briand's circular of September 1 showed conclusively that the attempt would have failed. At the best the device of a smart attorney would have been a poor defence for the Christian faith. We have dwelt at some length on the dead issue, because it is necessary to show that between the Pope and the Episcopate there has never been any real difference on matters of principle. The attitude of the Bishops

at their meeting this week is a further proof that the French prelate who desires to accept this Republic's law is the brother of the Jesuit of fiction.

'A Silly Accusation.'

The Encyclical repudiates the charge that the Pope has wilfully courted war and persecution, or that he desires to combat the French Government on its civil side. No one who knows the modern history of the Papacy could credit an accusation so silly. Though our newspapers talk with weary reiteration of the hostility of the Papacy to the Republic, the charge so far as the history of the last century goes is absolutely void of foundation. Tories and Churchmen indeed may hold that in times past the principle of authority throughout Europe has been seriously weakened by the disinclination of the Papacy to interfere in the internal affairs of France, a disinclination by the way which England has not always shown. At every critical stage of French history, from the date of the Concordat to the present time, the Holy See has invariably struggled to keep the French clergy in obedience to their 'de facto' rulers. True it may not have always succeeded, and English Churchmen who cherish the tradition of the Nonjurors can hardly blame in some French priests a lingering attachment to the 'impossible loyalties' of the past. That the bulk of the French clergy to-day are if anything too naive in their trustful submission in all things lawful to their rulers is proved by the remarkable speech of the Abbe Lemire this week in the Chamber. It is well for the French Republic that it has not had to face a Swift or an Atterbury.

Are English Christians going to persist in callous indifference to the persecution of Christianity in France at the hands of politicians who talk of 'their noble father Satan,' or brag of their desire to make an end of the idea of Christianity? If on this matter they condemn Pius X. they pass judgment also on Baxter and Chalmers. To genuine Churchmen however a stronger appeal may be made. The Gallican Church has been the one portion of the Papal communion where from the days of Bull to the days of Lightfoot Anglican theology has been respected. There are therefore sentimental grounds for sympathy. Apart however from sentiment the one principle which has obliged Anglicans to resist the Erastian tyranny of the Privy Council demands that they should protest against the infinitely more shameless Erastianism of the French Separation Law. Here is a field upon which the reunion of Christendom may be practically advanced. The old Tractarians would have rejoiced for such an opportunity to prove their Catholicism. Can it be that their successors out of anti-Papal prejudice are ready to pass by without a word of sympathy the Church of St. Louis and Bossuet, when she is suffering for the faith?

WHAT ARCHBISHOP IRELAND DID SAY

A couple of months ago Archbishop Ireland, of St. Paul's, Minnesota, preached a sermon in his Cathedral, in the course of which he referred to the persecution in France. The cable report of the Archbishop's sermon grossly misrepresented his references to the French clergy. When the faked report of the discourse was first printed in the Paris 'Matin,' a virulent anti-Catholic organ, the Archbishop cabled a contradiction, but the contradiction was not published by the paper, although it appeared in another Parisian newspaper. The English cable agencies also ignored the contradiction, although they had previously spread broadcast the false report. Here are the remarks of Archbishop Ireland on the occasion referred to as reported in the New York 'Freeman's Journal':—

The conflict raging at the present time between the Church and State in France awakens universal and profound interest. It could not be otherwise, were it only for the personalities of the contestants: on the one side the Catholic Church, on the other, the "Grande Nation." Now, by Act of Parliament, the Concordat is abolished; a regime of separation is instituted. Let not Americans be misled by words which have a totally different signification in their land from what is allowed to it in France. Separation of the Church from the State in America means liberty and justice; there it means servitude and oppression.

Under advice from the Head of the Church, the bishops of France refused the associations offered by the Law of Separation. They acted from principle; in the interest of religion they could not approve such associations; they could not by tolerating them appear to approve them.

"MERIT is behind success." That's why "Hondai-Lanka" is so much used. It's tea with quality and flavor.

"DEED AYE! 'Twa spoonfuls o' 'Cook o' the North' gang as faur as three o' maistither teas!"