

The Catholic Record.

Published Weekly at 454 and 456 Richmond Street, London, Ontario.

Price of Subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

REV. GEORGE R. NOETHIGRAVES, Author of "Mistakes of Modern Infidels."

THOMAS COFFEY, Publisher and Proprietor, Thomas Coffey.

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

Approved and recommended by 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.

LETTER OF RECOMMENDATION. UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA, Ottawa, Canada, March 7th, 1899.

Dear Sir: For some time past I have read your estimable paper, THE CATHOLIC RECORD, and congratulate you upon the manner in which it is published.

Its matter and form are both good; and a truly Catholic spirit pervades the whole.

Therefore, with pleasure, I can recommend it to the faithful.

Blessing you and wishing you success. Believe me to remain, Yours faithfully in Jesus Christ, D. FALCONE, Arch. of Ottawa, Oshawa, Ont.

LONDON, SATURDAY, SEPT. 24, 1904

THAT PARKHILL INCIDENT AGAIN.

A correspondent censures us for what he terms a flippant paragraph on Parkhill which appeared in our columns a short time ago. We are sorry that our plea for Parkhill as a resort for the nerve-racked should be dubbed flippant. It was not a prose picture, but it was well-meant, and bore to our eyes the hall-mark of earnestness.

TRUSTEES AND TEACHERS.

The report of the Mosely Educational Commission on American schools has occasioned comment in various quarters. In a previous issue we endeavored to show why it might be read with profit by Canadians. One quotation to which we referred at the time, to the effect that "Woman teachers must be for most purposes relatively inefficient; and as teaching is an occupation in which more than other imaginative power, individuality, insight and originality are wanted, it is important that men rather than women should exercise the predominant influence," seems to linger in the memory of some of our readers.

A CAUSE OF MENTAL DYSPEPSIA.

Professor Armstrong, a member of the Mosely Commission, says:

"Over-teaching is the bane of American schools of every grade, and there is danger that the work of education may be over-organized. In consequence education is a fetter rather than a help."

That opinion has been held for years. Or as a business man told us recently: that the "coming man" from school or college works well enough, but he seems to lack the power of thinking for himself. This individual, of course, is talking of his employees. There is a twist, he went on, in his mental machinery. He is all right when there is a question of dates and things that are dead, but he is useless when it comes to solving a life business problem.

With facts of every hue—appliance to facilitate the progress of youth—literary chit-chat, eclectic English Literature, a multiplicity of text books which foster mental anaemia, the teacher and his charge—the grammar and the crammed—are to be pitied. If more attention, says Professor Armstrong, were paid to teaching principles and their applications, less to mere facts, many of the difficulties with which the student's path is now strewn would disappear, and he would do effective work: if the meaning of one tenth of the facts we now lay before the student were properly taught, the remaining nine-tenths might safely be jettisoned.

Similar advice was given by the Angelical Doctor to the students and masters of his time.

TO OUR YOUNG MEN.

Why are so many of our young men unmarried? They answer the query in different ways, but some of them will not dissent from the opinion as expressed by Lord Burleigh, as follows:

"Thou shalt find there is nothing in life so irksome as the female fool; pretty in face it may be, but silly, empty-headed, lazy, idle, and as incapable of serious thought and sustained exertion as mercury is of the temper of steel."

There are some women who answer to this description. But the strong woman is still on the planet. She is in every parish, and it would be a blessed thing were some of our men to acquire a modicum of her piety and common sense. She is as intelligent at least as they are, better educated as a rule, and she may be pardoned for not seeing anything attractive in the young man whose mental pabulum is supplied by the "sporting" column in the daily prints. Again, the suit of some of the individuals who set store on the quotation given above would not be tolerated by a self-respecting girl. To begin with, many of them are in poverty, which is due to indolent and shiftless habits. But why do the successful persist in remaining single? Well—let the successful make answer. It is sure to prove interesting reading. The chattering ancient female extravagance, etc., to account for non-marriage, is merely a ruse to divert one from the real reasons. And it may be that the young man who examines these reasons may not have much heart for loquacity on this question.

WORN-OUT ARGUMENTS STILL IN VOGUE.

An assault on religion is very easy to the man who knows where to go for his weapons. Voltaires are always available, though out of date, and one may seek assistance for the blatant blasphemers who have striven to rival him. The author of a book recently put on the market did not forget the fact, and has with the assistance of a publisher of note, contrived to let the public know what he thinks of religion.

Religion, of course, is not harmed by rhetoric or sentimental twaddle. Its force is unimpaired by verbal artillery. But what astonishes one is the insistence of the author in inviting us to follow after shadows and phantoms and to accept him as a teacher. But the infidel of the type that re-echoes hackneyed phrases is not deficient in conceit. And he beats the scientific drum in the same old way.

Science, of course, has its uses, and the men who work therein have no time for quarrelling with their God. In fact since the significant admission of Tyndal and Spencer acent inability of science to pierce the mystery beyond the phenomenal order of things, the scientists who know their business confine themselves to physics.

Rev. Father J. C. Sinnett, V. G., has been commissioned by His Lordship Bishop Paschal of Saskatchewan to collect funds in Canada to aid in missionary work in the North-West. There is pressing need of this work amongst the settlers who are constantly coming into the country. They are, as a rule, very poor people, and the Bishop finds it for two or three years their circum-

stances are very poor, but after that they are generally able to supply funds themselves in support of the Missions. Father Sinnett has lately given Jubilee Missions in Renfrew and Arnprior, and we are pleased to be able to state that he meets with warm encouragement wherever he goes, the good work he has on hand commending itself to priests and people alike.

FREE vs. UNITED.

The case of the Free Church vs. the United Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland continues to be discussed throughout both Great Britain and Canada with undiminished vigor, notwithstanding that six or seven weeks have elapsed since the decision of the Judicial Committee of the House of Lords, the highest Court of the British Empire, has pronounced in favor of the small body of Free Kirkmen who refused to enter into the union with the United Presbyterian Church to form what is now called the United Free Church. It is remarkable that most of the Protestant religious and semi-religious journals take sides against the decision of the Court as unjust and unprogressive.

The Law Lords who sat in judgment on the case were five, of whom three were in favor of the decision given, and two against.

Lord McNaughten, one of the dissenting Lords reasoned thus: "Is the Free Church, as the very condition of her existence, forced to cling to her subordinate standards with so desperate a grip that she has lost hold and touch of the supreme standard of her faith? Was she from birth incapable of all growth and development? Was she (in a word) a dead branch, and not a living Church? This I think is the real and only question."

This is the view of the case which the majority of those who believe the decision arrived at to be unjust take. It is admitted that the Free Church before going over to the Union held it to be the duty of the State to support the Church. By the union, this doctrine was practically set aside, as it is not the teaching of the body to which the Free Churchmen attached themselves, and it was the agreement that all members of the new Church should be free to accept or reject this doctrine. Of course, after a few years, this doctrine, as well as that of election (of which we shall also say a few words) will be eliminated together.

In the matter of election also the Free Church majority set aside its former adhesion to the Westminster Confession. Thus the Rev. Dr. Lyle of Hamilton in a recent sermon explained that

"Four or five years ago the majority of the greatest minds in the Free Church had come to the conclusion that the old doctrine of the sovereignty of the Lord had not been rightly represented in the Westminster Confession of Faith. Too much stress had been laid upon the divine decree, and too little on the infinite love of God and its saving power. By what is known as the Act of Declaration, the change was made which enjoins that salvation is for every man, and that no man will be lost because of the decree of God, but because he will not accept Jesus as his Saviour. The House of Lords by its decision declares that the Free Church has been unfaithful to her trust by declaring that every man can be saved, and because she has shaken off the narrow bonds of Calvinism."

"If the Free Church had acted in any other way, I think she certainly would have been unfaithful to her trust. It is no use to cavil or quibble on this question at all. Let us admit frankly that we have changed, and for the better. We are not a dead Church."

This rev. doctor asserts also that "there is nothing in the Scriptures to say that the Church should not adapt herself to present conditions and surroundings, and there is nothing in the light of history to say that the Church must be the same now as in the beginning. The Church has been ever changing from the better to the best."

In another place this rev. gentleman said:

"Has the Church no right to reform her doctrine? Must the Church go to the State and get permission and legislation to sustain a new doctrine? Has the Church no right to modify her form of life or any of the doctrines she holds? Must she in her polity and doctrine be the same yesterday, to day and forever, unless the state gives her permission to alter them? I think that every right-thinking person will agree with me in declaring that the Church has every right to modify her doctrine on Church matters, and that the state is not supreme in this."

It is conceded, therefore, that the Free Church in forming a union with the other party to the agreement positively changed its doctrine; and the Rev. Dr. Lyle assures us that the Canadian Presbyterians have changed their creed to the same extent, and that they have all very properly "shaken off the narrow bonds of Calvinism."

But is it true that the Church of Christ has the right, according to Holy Scripture, to change or reform her doctrine?

We fully admit with Rev. Dr. Lyle that the State has no right to impose

any doctrine or discipline on the Church; for the state has never received from God any such authority. But we would remind him and other creed-makers that a question of doctrine is one which regards what Christ has taught mankind, and commanded His Apostles to teach to all nations; and that there is no authority in Pope or Church to change His teaching.

A doctrine of the Church is a truth revealed by God, and as no power on earth can change the truth of God, none can suppress a doctrine thus revealed; so, according to St. Paul, there are teachers of various degrees in the Church as instituted by Christ, for the express purpose of perfecting the Church that we may not be "children tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, in the wickedness of men, in craftiness by which they lie in wait to deceive." (Eph. iv. 14.) The same Apostle assures us twice in Gal. i. 8, 9, that "though we, or an angel from heaven preach a gospel beside that which we have preached to you," he is to be anathematized.

Here we must remark that in matters of discipline, which are subject to the laws enacted by the Church itself, the case is different. A legislator may change or modify his own decrees.

A Church is instituted for the purpose of leading men to God through the truths she teaches in the name and by the authority of God. It follows that if a so-called Church changes these truths, she violates the purpose of her institution, and we do not see any good reason why the Law Lords should not take this view of the case, as they have done by awarding the property of the Free Church of Scotland to those who remained firm to the old Free Kirk doctrines, who are the only persons left to maintain the principles which that Kirk was instituted to propagate and maintain.

It must be noted that the Law Lords did not, on behalf of the State, claim to dictate what doctrines the majority should believe, nor did they arrogate to themselves any right to control their faith; but their decision amounts to this that money subscribed for the teaching of a certain creed must not be used for the maintenance and propagation of a creed opposed thereto.

The Rev. Dr. Lyle's pronouncement gives us light on another matter. We know that the Presbyterians of the United States recently changed their creed by practically abolishing the old Calvinistic teaching on election. We were aware that this teaching had become unpopular also in Canada, but we were not prepared for the statement made by the rev. doctor that the Canadian Presbyterians, who have not revised their creed, have actually practically rejected this repulsive belief. The rev. doctor wishes this fact, however, to be openly proclaimed. Yes; it should be openly proclaimed if it be true. It is a very great anomaly that this doctrine should be still taught from the Catechism to children, and proclaimed in the Confession of Faith, if it has been actually abandoned.

But what are we to think now of the proclamation of the Edinburgh Assembly of August 27th, 1847, which is regarded as inseparable from the Confession itself, and is always published therewith, that the Confession is "most agreeable to the Word of God," if it is now to be modified by the elimination of its most distinctive teaching?

While treating this subject, we should mention that the Small Free Church, which has come into possession of the temporalities, has made an offer to hand over to the seceders for a time a portion of the property which they cannot use, including churches and manse where there is not at present a Free Church congregation which refused to enter the union. This offer is to terminate with June 30th, 1905, but the provision is annexed that churches shall not be used in the meantime to teach dogmas contrary to those of the Free Church. Nevertheless it is distinctly stated that the Free Church reserves the full right to follow up formally the whole judgment of the House of Lords.

The United Free Church may not accept these terms, and it is said that it may seek legislation which will put it into possession of a large part of the assets.

A UNITED HIERARCHY.

Premier Combes has now definitely announced that it is his intention to bring forward soon in the Chamber of Deputies a Bill providing for the disestablishment of the Church in France. He has been moved to this by the clamor of the Socialistic party, on whom he depends for his present majority in the Chamber, though the more moderate Republicans do not wish to push matters to this extreme. Recent occurrences, however, have convinced him that he must go to this extreme in order to satisfy the Atheistic party. He is besides all the more angry at the Pope because he has been beaten in the dispute regarding the two Bishops who were supposed

by him to be rebellious against the Holy Father, on whom he relied as the nucleus of an anti-papal French Church, if they would rise in schism, and sustain the Government in its opposition to the Pope's authority.

It was at first given out that three Archbishops and a considerable number of Bishops were ready to uphold the Government in opposition to the Pope. We declared from the beginning that we did not credit this story, as it was sent by cable, and the result has justified our prediction that further news would prove its fallacy. The large number of Bishops said to have been implicated in an act of disobedience to the Pope dwindled to two, and indeed these two really showed themselves at first as being somewhat weak, inasmuch as when called to Rome to give an account of their administration, they took refuge under an order from M. Combes not to obey. These two were Mgr. Geay, Bishop of Laval, and Mgr. Le Nordez of Dijon. But when the Pope, in spite of M. Combes' prohibition, insisted on their coming to Rome, the Bishop of Dijon made his submission at once, and left France for Rome; and not only has he done this, but at the desire of the Holy Father, on September 5th, he resigned his Bishopric into the Pope's hands. Mgr. Geay has also resigned his episcopal charge, the resignation having been sent in to the Pope and the Ministry of Public Worship on September 2nd. Thus it has been demonstrated that the whole episcopate of France have sided with the Government; and there will be no schism. The French clergy, we are sure, will be found to be equally faithful should the occasion arise for them to manifest which master they will serve.

M. Combes in announcing his intention to continue his warfare against religion, said: "The religious power has openly torn up the Concordat, and it is not my intention to try to mend it. The risk of France losing her position as the protector of Eastern Catholics is quite an insufficient motive for giving up our intention to separate the Church and State which circumstances have obliged me to make part of my programme."

He then endeavors to belittle the benefits which the protectorate over Catholics throughout the world has brought to France while she was the oldest daughter of the Church. "It was," he says, "quite natural that the oldest daughter should feel herself to be the protectress of her younger sisters, and consider herself to be bound to aid, support and sustain these children wherever they were threatened with danger. But now France has long ceased to regard herself as the oldest daughter of the Church. Besides, the younger sisters have now grown up fully, and have become of age, and are not pleased when France undertakes to regulate their affairs. I repeat that France gains nothing by holding the protectorate."

That M. Combes did not believe what he was saying when he spoke thus is evident from the hurry he was in to demand reparation and compensation from China as soon as it was known that a Belgian Bishop and two of his priests had been murdered recently in a new Boxer rising. In fact the highest authorities have testified that France has gained prestige in the eyes of Moslem and Heathen nations through the protectorate, and to such an extent that rival nations were jealous of her position in this respect. Should France resign this office, Germany would be glad to take it up, for she would then become the great civilizing force of the East instead of France, which has hitherto been regarded in this light.

From the apathy with which French Catholics have looked upon the brutalities of M. Combes' regime, we have almost lost confidence in their rousing themselves to action to maintain religion in spite of the machinations of the Atheistic party; yet we do believe that they will still take the action of brave men to undo what the Premier has done towards infidelizing the country. The hierarchy and the clergy have shown themselves united, and we believe they will still stir themselves and their people to action in the maintenance of religion; but this may not be till the next elections, when we believe the good sense of the people will show them to put an end to infidel government.

Nevertheless we are satisfied that the abolition of the Concordat will not be nearly so disastrous to religion as M. Combes thinks. It will leave the Church untrammelled by the State's interference, and she will no longer need to seek the approbation of the Government for Episcopal appointments. There may be, and no doubt will be for a time considerable trouble and perhaps a good deal of suffering before the Church can fall in with the new conditions which disestablishment will entail; but the Church, with which Christ has promised to remain to the end of time, will survive the trials to which

she may be subjected, and will come forth from them in the end; stronger and more vigorous than ever for being freed from the trammels which bind her at present to an irreligious government.

M. Combes in stating that "the religious power (the Pope) has torn up the Concordat states what he knows to be a falsehood. The provision that the commands of the Pope are to be subject to the approval of the Government before being enforced, is not a part of the Concordat at all. The Concordat is an agreement between the Pope and the Government—but there is no agreement where there is only one party thereto, and this is the case with the so-called Organic Articles which have this provision. These Articles were never agreed to by the Pope, having been issued solely on the authority of Napoleon I. The Pope has always rejected them. It is a poor cause which thus rests upon a deliberate falsehood. The Pope could not give up the rights which come to him from God and which belong essentially to his sacred office of Head of God's Church.

Throughout this dispute the Holy Father has comforted himself with great forbearance, seeking always not to add fuel to the flame by rendering railing for railing, while M. Combes has attempted to browbeat him into submission to his will. It was proper that Christ's representative and vicar should imitate the meekness of his divine Master. But he could not be bullied into bargaining away the prerogatives of the Headship over the Church of God which Christ committed to St. Peter and his successors. The triumph is with the Holy Father in the severe ordeal through which he has passed.

Here it is right to remark that we are not to conclude hastily that M. Combes' triumph is assured, dark as the prospect appears when viewed solely with our material eyes. It does appear as if the days of persecution are already bearing fruit in increasing earnest piety among the people of France. It was a common saying among the ancient Christians that the blood of martyrs is the seed of Christians, and the same may be said of persecution, even when it does not go so far as the making of martyrs by the actual shedding of their blood. Persecution purifies those who endure it patiently, and the general faith is thereby nourished and strengthened. This is even now the case, as is evident from the vast numbers who have this year performed pilgrimages to the sacred shrines throughout France, and especially to Our Lady of Lourdes. It is our belief that the best results will follow from these facts, and that the effects will be visible in the determination of the people to have a thoroughly Catholic Government to take the place of the present men who entertain a most diabolical hatred of God and His Church. Thus Almighty God will bring forth good out of evil.

KENSITITES AGAIN AT WORK.

Despatches from London indicate that the anti-Ritualistic agitation by the interrupting of public worship, initiated by John Kensit, the vendor of obscene literature, who was killed while addressing a large crowd against Ritualistic practices, is being revived by the followers of the dead agitator. This agitation has been for some time quiescent, but on Sunday, Sept. 11th, in the middle of the service in Westminster Abbey, there was a loud expression from the transept, whereby the kneeling congregation were startled and a dangerous rush was made for the doors. It was then discovered that the interruption came from a number of large fire-crackers which had been exploded by a Kensitite present, who had probably several accomplices. The culprit however, escaped, though detectives are endeavoring to locate him.

A panic was prevented through the presence of mind of the Rev. Canon Duckworth, who assured the people that there was no danger. It is expected that the fanatic who thus disturbed public worship to the imminent danger of the lives of the congregation will be discovered and punished. It is believed that a label which was found on the exploded fire-crackers will lead to his identification, and perhaps to the discovery of his accomplices.

A PRIEST'S UNKNOWN INFLUENCE.

The pastor of a parish is often tempted to despond. "What is the use of my life?" he will ask himself. "Here I sacrifice myself, and my people go on in their way in spite of my example, my preaching and my exhortations in the confessional. There is no stability in them. There is no improvement. Surely, something's wrong. It may be in me. Truly I am an unprofitable servant." But this thought is a vile of the evil one. For every good priest is a light on a hillside. He will never know how often he is seen, how frequently he is thought of, how many times his influence keeps members of his flock from sin. If he could know this he would be comforted and, instead of thinking