

The Catholic Record.
 Published Weekly at 484 and 485 Richmond street, London, Ontario.
 Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.
 EDITORS:
 REV. GEORGE R. NORTHGRAVES,
 Author of "Mistakes of Modern Infidels."
 THOMAS COFFEY,
 Publisher and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY,
 MESSRS. LUKE KING, JOHN NICH, P. J. NEVIN and Wm. A. NEVIN, are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transact all other business for the CATHOLIC RECORD.
 Rates of Advertising—Ten cents per line each insertion, agate measurement.
 Approved and recommended by the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa, and St. Boniface, and the Bishops of Hamilton and Peterboro, and the clergy throughout the Dominion.
 Correspondence intended for publication, as well as that having reference to business, should be directed to the proprietor, and must reach London not later than Tuesday morning.
 Advertisers must be paid in full before the paper can be stopped.
 London, Saturday, Oct. 27, 1864.

A REMARKABLE MARRIAGE CONTRACT.

After all the difficulties which have arisen in the way of the projected marriage of the Czarovitch and the Princess Alix of Hesse, it has been settled that the marriage shall take place on November 20. The Greek Holy Synod has made an important and curious concession in the form of the reception of the princess into the Greek Church. It is commonly required that converts to Greek orthodoxy shall condemn as accursed the heresies they abandon, and declare them to be false, but this the Princess refused to do; and the Holy Synod has agreed to accept her simple declaration that she joins the Greek Church that she may be of one faith with her future husband.

The anomaly of the proceeding lies on both sides; first on the part of the Holy Synod in virtually declaring that the obligations of Princes toward God are different from those of common people, and in practically acknowledging that the Greek faith is not so absolutely true as it has hitherto been held to be. On the other hand, the Princess virtually declares that the profession of one religion rather than another is not a matter of conscience or conviction, but altogether of expediency. This anomaly exists also in regard to the Emperor of Germany, who as head of the German Church and of the Hohenzollern family, has given his consent to the proceedings taken, thus admitting that Luther-Calvinism is not the one true faith in which all Christians should believe. This admission is the more remarkable as all the doctrines of Greek orthodoxy are very nearly identical with those of the Catholic Church. With the exception of the single article of Catholic belief in the authority of the Pope, they are absolutely identical; so that the transaction is equivalent to an admission that those Catholic doctrines and practices which Protestantism has hitherto held to be superstitious and unscriptural, may be conscientiously believed in and practiced by those who have hitherto been strict Protestants. If this be the case, it may well be asked, why, during the last three centuries and a half, have the Protestants of Germany insisted that the Catholic religion is idolatrous and superstitious?

Another feature of this remarkable transaction is that the Protestant press of America and Great Britain regards the affair with equanimity and as a matter of course. Can we believe, under such circumstances, that they are serious in proclaiming their conviction that the dogmas of Catholicity are subversive of Christian truth and morality. There is yet another side from which the matter may be regarded. It is not a mere possibility, but recent events point to it as a probability more or less likely to become a reality, that there will be at some future time not far distant a reunion of the Greek with the Catholic Church, in which case the only remaining doctrine which separates the two now will become a dogma of the Greek Church equally with the Catholic; that is to say, the universal supreme authority of the Pope over the Christian Church. Should this union take place, there is every good reason to believe that the Princess Alix and her sister the Princess Sergius will become Catholics in full standing, and all this will be done by virtue of the consent and sanction already given by the head of the Lutheran Calvinistic Church!

We suppose it is true that wonders will never cease; but the event which gives occasion to our present remarks is not the least among the curiosities which this age of wonders has brought into existence. The readiness also with which the Holy Synod of Russia accommodates its faith and practices to political exigencies is an evidence that the Russian Church is badly in need of reformation in its constitution, if it

would preserve a character of consistency. It will never be truly consistent with itself until it takes the step of acknowledging the Pope's authority. It is at present nothing more than a puppet in the hands of His Majesty the Czar.

REPUDIATED BY ALL.

A Mr. Oliver Magnuson, a justice of the peace, until recently editor of a Menominee (Michigan) A. P. A. paper called the *New Era*, and a leader in the A. P. A., has publicly renounced all connection with that organization. He expresses the deepest regret for having lent himself to the A. P. A. cause, the pledges of which he declares to be incompatible with the duties of a good citizen.

In a letter which appeared in an Escanaba paper on the 12th inst. Mr. Magnuson says: "I hereby give notice that I am no longer a member of the A. P. A. organization. I consider it an injustice to discriminate against a man on account of his religion, and I positively refuse to be bound by any A. P. A. pledges. I, with hundreds of others, joined the organization without being apprised of the real nature of the pledges before being admitted to the hall, and I for one rebel against such tactics in this free country. I have fully kept my pledges to this hour, not because I thought they were right and just, but because I thought it was dishonorable to take a pledge and break it. My experience has taught me that great injustice has been done to our Catholic citizens by men bound by oath to discriminate against them, and I think any fair-minded man will say that an individual thus bound by oath cannot be a good citizen. I desire to be a good citizen, and cannot therefore be an A. P. A. I am once more a free man. OLIVER MAGNUSON.

Mr. Magnuson's defection, or, rather, his return to common sense, has created a great sensation in the A. P. A. ranks throughout Michigan, and it is believed that it will be a serious blow to Apaisim in that State, especially as at the present critical moment, just before the State elections, the society is occupying a very ridiculous position, the politicians of both parties being engaged in endeavoring to convince the public that they have no connection and no compact with it in any shape or form.

Even the rats desert a sinking ship, and Apaisim appears to be in a sinking condition in Michigan, which State, until now, has been looked upon as a stronghold of the proscription order.

NO HOPE OF UNION.

The Reunion Conference, held this year at Grindelwald, Switzerland, brought out prominently the fact that there is no prospect at present of any union among the Protestant sects, which were understood to be to some extent represented there. The annual reunion at this romantic spot was presided over by Dr. Lunn, of London, Eng., who takes great interest in the Union movement, and the hope was entertained that by means of it much might be done toward preparing a way for a corporate union of the sects.

By a corporate union, as we understand it, the various denominations would continue to hold their peculiar doctrines, while preserving also to some extent their own forms of Church government, and acknowledging some central authority on which would devolve the duty of deciding to what extent differences of belief on the most salient doctrines of Christianity would be tolerated by the new Christian Church thus constituted. The clergy of the various denominations would be recognized by the different branches or Churches composing the Confederated Church; and there would be frequent interchanges of pulpits among them, just as freely as there are such interchanges at present among ministers of the same denomination.

It is easy to see that such a union as this would ignore the fact that any positive doctrinal teaching was given by Christ to His Apostles when He commissioned them to preach His gospel to every creature, teaching all nations "all things whatsoever I have commanded you." How a Church, constituted as the Grindelwald gathering propose to constitute the new-fashioned organization, would be the true Christian Church which Christ established to teach the one faith He "delivered to the saints," is a problem which remains to be solved. Nevertheless, it is the fashion nowadays to imagine that such a Church as the Confederationists propose would be quite in accordance with the Christian idea of a Church having its branches spread throughout the whole world. This, indeed, even Mr. Gladstone's idea, set forth in his recent theological

essay on heresy and schism, which maintains that the greatest latitude should be allowed to Christians in the matter of doctrine.

The conference at Grindelwald, however, appears to have realized the difficulty of carrying out these ideas to a practical result. The London *Review of the Churches* gives a full report of the addresses there given, and it appears therefrom that the clergy of the Church of England present insisted strongly on the necessity of retaining "the historic Episcopate in the United Church it is proposed to establish." They could not readily do otherwise, for it has been laid down by the Bishops of England and America alike as an essential principle that the Episcopate is necessary to the Church. One minister, the Rev. Hugh Price, expressed himself to the effect that the term "historic Episcopate" is a happy and conciliatory one.

It was far, however, from having a conciliatory effect. The Non-conformist ministers did not hesitate to inform the Anglican divines that the "historic Episcopate" is a mere fiction as the Episcopate exists in Anglicanism. Its history only extends back to the days of Queen Elizabeth, and any attempt to connect it with the Episcopate of the Catholic Church in England, which extends back for more than eighteen centuries, is ludicrous and futile. A Christian hierarchy must date back to the days of Christ Himself, if it claims to be historical in the sense that it is the primitive form of Church government; and, if it falls short of this, it is a mere sham.

The Non-conformists do not claim any historic ministry in this sense, but they assert that such a ministry is not needed, and that their clergy are as truly authorized ministers of the gospel as if they had been Episcopally ordained. They say that the Anglican idea of terms of union, if accepted by them, would be an acknowledgment that they have hitherto had an irregular and unauthorized ministry—an admission they are unwilling to make. They say, also, that the mode proposed by the Anglicans to effect a union would be an absorption into Anglicanism, and not a corporate union such as they desire to effect; so that they refuse positively and unanimously to come to such terms.

The Grindelwald Conference is in no sense a representative gathering of the denominations; but it represents fairly enough that section of each denomination which really has some hope that a union can be effected on the confederation plan. It would appear, however, that, as a huge picnic party, visiting the grand Alpine scenery, it was a success, if not so as an ecclesiastical gathering with a great purpose in view.

CATHOLICS AND POLITICS.

General T. G. Morgan, who was Indian Commissioner during the administration of President Harrison, has been once more exhibiting his spleen against Catholics. This time it was in an address delivered at Minneapolis before the Minnesota State Baptist Convention. The subject of his address was "Rome in Politics" and in the treatment of it he maintained the oft-repeated and as oft-refuted calumny that "Pomanism is a political organization."

We would not consider it necessary to offer any refutation of Mr. Morgan's absurdities here if such statements as he makes were confined within the limits of the United States; but as they are identical with charges which are constantly being made in Canada, we deem it useful to say a few words in regard to them. He continues: "The Pope will soon try to have the Ablegate recognized at Washington as an ambassador from a political sovereign. The Catholics secured the defeat of Harrison on account of his administration of Indian affairs. Ninety-nine out of every one hundred Catholics are Democrats, only enough remaining Republican to keep up appearances. Archbishop Ireland is a man who carries a United States Senator in his vest pocket; for convenient use, and the Archbishops of America are at this moment behind closed doors plotting against free schools and the free institutions of America."

It does not make such charges one whit the more true that they are frequently repeated both in Canada and the United States, without a shadow of foundation. We have been accustomed to see charges precisely like these in the columns of the *Toronto Mail*, and in the manifestoes of such associations as Orangeism and the A. P. A., but not a particle of evidence has been produced in any case to sustain them. As a matter of fact, there have

been more interferences on the part of the various Protestant denominations with politics than have ever emanated from the Catholic clergy, or from the Catholic body in any shape.

We do not mean to deny that Catholics feel a deep interest in the school question, and that they will use their influence to maintain Catholic schools, whether it be to preserve them in Ontario against the attacks made upon them by enemies of every kind, or to assist our fellow-Catholics of Manitoba to recover the rights of which they were unjustly deprived by the Legislature of that Province; but in so doing we do no more than maintain our rights as citizens to employ the powers granted by the constitution under which we live to have our views on these subjects carried out, just as our enemies exert themselves to restrict our liberties to the utmost. This they do without the least scruple of conscience, or the least thought on their part that they are doing anything more than they have a right to do. They thus interfere with the natural right of Catholics to educate their children according to their own conscientious convictions; and, when we show this to be the case, we are told we must yield to the wishes of the majority. Our opponents think, or pretend to think, that they have a perfect right to impose their will upon us if they can secure a majority to adopt their views. We deny that, even if they could secure such a majority, their tyranny would be justifiable; but they are impudent as well as tyrannical when they virtually assert that we have no right to prevent them if we can from obtaining a majority in the Legislature to enforce their views upon us on the education question.

We promise that we shall not relax our efforts in these respects, even though our adversaries raise the absurd cry that we interfere in politics as a religious body. We interfere in politics, and shall continue to do so, not as a religious body, but as individual citizens who hold the right of the franchise equally with our Protestant neighbors.

It was not in consequence of any special action by the Catholic clerical authorities, whether of the hierarchy or the priesthood, that Catholics have at any time chosen their side in Provincial or Dominion politics, but because they have formed their political views in the same way as Protestants have done, from their judgment of the political principles of parties. We may presume that it may be said of many Catholics, just as it may of many Protestants, that they have chosen their party from motives of self-interest rather than from the higher consideration of the welfare of the country; but in this respect it cannot be asserted that Catholics are any worse than their neighbors. On the contrary, if it be true, as our enemies have frequently dinned into our ears, that Catholics cast a "solid vote" such as Protestants cannot be induced to give, it must come from the fact that Catholics are more influenced by the consideration of good principles in the candidates who ask for the suffrages of the people. If this be the case, it redounds to the credit of the Catholic body, instead of being a cause for reproach against them.

In asserting that there was not any action taken by the Catholic clergy to induce the Catholics of both Canada and the United States to unite their forces in favor of any political party, we state what we know to be the truth; but we are not to be understood as meaning that there would be any impropriety committed if the hierarchy or the clergy recommended the Catholic body to sustain Catholic rights when those rights are attacked. It is certain that Anglicans, Presbyterians, Methodists and other denominations would resent an attack made upon their religion by any party; and why should not Catholics do the same?

It is a matter of notoriety that the Anglican synods have frequently made pronouncements in favor of religious education in the schools. Presbyterian assemblies have done the same, at least to the length of advocating the introduction of the use of the Bible into the schools; and it is not many years since all the synods, conferences and general assemblies of Canada passed violent resolutions attacking a highly-respected order of Catholic priests for no other cause than that the Legislature of Quebec, attending to its own business, recognized that a debt was due to them and settled their obligation by paying the Jesuits about twenty cents on every dollar of their claim.

If the Protestant clergy assume the right of such interference, on what

principle of equality can it be denied to Catholics?

The truth is that there are persons; there is, indeed, a party, whose whole occupation is to endeavor to ostracise Catholics, but Catholics will not submit to such ostracism, whether it be in Canada or the neighboring Republic, however much ex-preachers like ex-Commissioner General Morgan may desire it.

As regards General Morgan's charge that ninety-nine out of every hundred American Catholics are Democrats, we are satisfied that it is false, though it is certainly true that the large majority of Catholics do belong to that party; but we may well presume that there is a reason for this quite independent of any desire on the part of the Pope to rule the politics of the United States, or to have his Ablegate received as the ambassador of a political sovereign; yet even if the Pope's Ablegate were received in such a capacity, it is difficult to see how it would bring the Pope any nearer to becoming the sovereign of the country. It is evident that General Morgan's hatred of Catholicism has run away with his common sense, as the same hatred has done with quite a number of persons in our own Canada.

The fact that General Morgan has been making such an exhibition of bigotry ever since his resignation of the Indian Commissionership is proof sufficient, if there were no other, that he was unfit to do justice in the position he occupied under President Harrison's administration, and it fully justifies the Catholics for desiring the ex-Commissioner's recall. It might be also a sufficient reason for President Harrison's defeat in 1892; but we know that other causes beside this contributed to bring about that defeat, not the least among which was that the Republican party in many States coquetted with the A. P. A., and in other ways showed that they were more inclined to exhibit bigotry than were the Democrats.

As to Mr. Morgan's statement that the Archbishops are plotting against the Public school system, we need only say that it is another malicious falsehood. The Catholics sustain Parochial schools for their own children; but they have no wish to prevent non-Catholics from having such schools as they prefer. The plotting is altogether on the side of those who are, like Gen. Morgan, endeavoring to destroy Catholic parochial schools; but they will find themselves unable to effect their design.

SUICIDE AND FREETHOUGHT.

Our readers cannot have failed to notice that during the past couple of months the number of suicides which have been reported in the papers has been alarmingly great. During the month of August there were thirty reported in New York city alone, and the same number during the first three weeks of September, while from all parts of the United States and Canada similar cases have occurred to an extent hitherto unheard of.

To what is this sudden mania to end one's own life attributable?

Possibly the general depression of business which has thrown so many out of employment is responsible for a certain number of cases; but this is certainly not a sufficient explanation of the unprecedented increase of this terrible crime against God, our fellow-men and oneself. In only a very few cases have the persons who have committed the irrevocable act been in want or in a state bordering upon want. Besides, even in the extremity of want, there are very few who desire to set themselves directly against the divine will or the innate love for life which Almighty God has implanted in the human heart.

Imperfect as are the provisions made in many localities for those who are in extreme distress, such provision is really made in most places, and this fact is sufficient to remove one temptation to commit the terrible deed; but there can be no doubt that the general religious sentiment and conviction that suicide is a sin forbidden by Almighty God, and which will be surely punished for all eternity, is the greatest of all restraints upon its commission.

Statistics prove abundantly that this is the case, for in countries where the belief in God and His law prevails, suicide is much less frequent than in those where free-thought and atheism are widely spread. It is not likely that persons who believe that the life which God has given us is a sacred trust placed by Him in our hands, to be employed in His service, will sacrilegiously destroy their own lives with the

certainty of an eternal punishment awaiting them. A Christian must feel that it is his duty to bear patiently the trials and afflictions of this life, in order to lay up for himself a heavenly reward. Besides, the examples which are placed before the Christian of those many saints and martyrs who have borne with tribulation and have attained the reward of their patience and their fidelity to God must be a strong incentive to men to do likewise.

There is no doubt also that strong family affection is a preventive of suicide, though probably not so strong as the conviction of faith, of which we have already spoken. It is true that there is often strong family affection even where there is no religion, and those who have this sentiment may often be prevented by it from being guilty of suicide, even when they are suffering from what they consider to be an intolerable humiliation, or severe depression; but merely natural affection is usually not sufficient to enable the sufferer to bear his troubles to the end. Christian faith and the conviction of duty are necessary to make the ties of natural affection solid and strong.

It is the universal experience that where there is no religion, families are easily broken up, divorces are common, children are separated from or abandoned by irreligious parents, brothers and sisters, even parents and children, grow selfish and forgetful of their most sacred obligations.

In addition to all this, even that despondency which is usually the cause of suicide is a product of irreligion for the most part, for religion affords effectual consolation in sorrow, while irreligion holds out no future hope to the despondent.

From all this it is not much to be wondered at that Colonel R. G. Ingersoll published an essay in the *New York Herald* some few months ago in which he maintained openly that suicide is no sin, but is a happy means whereby the despondent may obtain that rest which they so much need.

In fact it is noticeable that the suicide mania followed immediately upon the publication of Mr. Ingersoll's defence of the act. It would seem that many persons only needed the bad excuse which the noted infidel gave for the crime to determine them to commit it. There can be no doubt that he is of all men the one most responsible for the now raging suicidal mania. It is, of course, difficult to prove positively that in any particular instance self-murder was committed because of Col. Ingersoll's article on the subject, but the facts point strongly towards his responsibility, the more especially as in one instance two persons, a young man and a young woman, committed suicide in Central Park on the 20th of August, by agreement, and in the pocket of the young man was found Colonel Ingersoll's article on the subject cut from the *New York World*.

The responsibility of Col. Ingersoll in this instance would be clear enough if this were all the evidence to bring the matter home to him; but there was in addition a letter signed by the two self-destroyers showing that it was through the free-thinking principles which the colonel has so persistently propagated that the crime was committed. They wrote: "We are both free-thinkers, and don't care which cemetery we will be interred in." They seem to have taken this method to show their devotedness to infidel principles.

The best antidote to the tendency to suicide is to remember that it is a crime against Almighty God, and that it will surely be punished with everlasting fire.

CHRISTIAN REUNION.

Under the title "Reunion of Christendom," a recent number of the *Advertiser* of this city published an article from the *New York Christian Union* having reference to the terms on which Protestant denominations might or would be admitted to unite with the Catholic Church. The *Christian Union* says that in an address delivered by Cardinal Vaughan, that eminent prelate stated that in order to effect a union, "there are three things which the Roman Church would surrender," viz., "She would allow her priests to marry; she would give Communion in both kinds; she would allow the Mass to be said in the vernacular."

In the *CATHOLIC RECORD* of the 6th and 13th inst. we published in full the excellent address of the Cardinal, and it is needless to say that there is not in it anything like that which is attributed to him by the *Christian Union*. When a statement is said to have been made by any Protestant divine,

in reference to doctrine, sible to say that such state not have been made, how ordinary they may be; know by experience that of contradictory assertion made by Protestant clergy; the same denomination; b so with Catholic divines, w belief and practice of guide them. Even if seen the address in question assert confidently that H had not stated that the U tuted to him; but with the address before us, the tr what His Eminence said is He stated that

"There are compromise cessions which the Ch not accept; there are o she is free to adopt. Fir not accept re-union on a b mon formularies or creeds, one is left free to give o pressed in them his own d interpretation. Unity of Catholic Church, repudiate est and mechanical. must be based upon Christ divine teacher."

On the three points indic *Christian Union*, it would for the Church to make o because they are matters, or doctrine, but solely of Church government, and them the Church may legi deems proper or most Under certain contingenc fore, she might make con garding them.

For good reasons the C made the laws as they sta points; but before it can that she would change the have to be shown that th good reasons for change ex

It is not an article of priests must be unmarried article of faith that the s bacy is the more perfect embraced for God's sake article is simply the doctrin by St. Paul in 1 Cor. vii, effect: "He that is witho solicitude for the things th the Lord, how he may p But he that is with a wife for the things of the wor may please his wife, and he For this reason, the Church priests from among those w ing to take the vow of gre tion, and she will not read her discipline in this regard

There are also good rea laws of the Church on the points. Those laws may b but it would be difficult to they will be easily chang very solid reasons be show for making such changes. of doctrine, however, th Church cannot make any c she must always continue t faith as it was commanded b be taught to all nations. exact words of Cardinal V regard to the celibacy of t etc., are these:

"The Church is free for some greater good to ad and modifications in her and in legislation which times and circumstances. power over her own commu and over questions of disci as clerical celibacy, commu both kinds, over her liturg language in which the clothed. Nor would she hes to make concessions, as she past, for the sake of some could it be shown to surpa adhesion to the points of d be relaxed."

The same article of the *Union* also says: "So long as the High Ch byterian puts the Presbyte and Assembly above the Bi High Church Anglican t book and the rubrics abov and the Roman Church the of the Pope above the Bib long as other Christians insi right of private judgment in pretation of the Bible, pu and the individual conscient ecclesiastical authority, so lo union of Christendom cannop ated as an immediately event."

As regards Anglicans, Pre and other Protestants, the c the *Christian Union* are co they are not correct as reg Catholic Church. The Catho does not place the author Pope above the Bible, but proves the authority of the the Catholic Church insists t be received equally with the Bible; and again, the Pop authority to inform us wha meaning of the Bible is. above the Bible, but with t and not every private indi the authorized doctrinal int the Bible. It is therefore that the authority of the P cepted as part of divine E