

The Catholic Record.

Published Weekly at 424 and 426 Richmond Street, London, Ontario.

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

EDITORS: REV. GEORGE R. NORTHGRAVES, Author of "Mistakes of Modern India."

THOMAS COFFEY, Publisher and Proprietor, Thomas Coffey.

Messrs. Luke King, John Nigh, P. J. Neven and Joseph S. King, are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transact all other business for the CATHOLIC RECORD.

Rates of Advertising—Ten cents per line each insertion, space measurement.

Approved and recommended by the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa, and St. Boniface, the Bishops of Hamilton, Peterborough, and Ogdensburg, N. Y., 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.

Arrears must be paid in full before the paper can be stopped.

When subscribers change their residence it is important that the old as well as the new address be sent us.

London, Saturday, April 8, 1899.

A BEAUTIFUL CUSTOM.

A despatch from Vienna states that, according to the usual custom on Monday Thursday, the Emperor Francis Joseph of Austria washed the feet of twelve oceanographers. The ceremony was witnessed by many noble men and women, and the members of the diplomatic corps. After the ceremony the Emperor strung around the neck of each of the old men a bag containing money. This act of humility is kept up in imitation of our Lord's washing the feet of His disciples. It is not an empty ceremony, therefore, but is a reminder to the monarch that rich and poor, Emperor and subject, are equal before God, and that their souls are equally precious in the sight of God—a lesson needed much by those who are high in authority.

THE PASSOVER.

The great Jewish festival of the Passover, instituted in the time of Moses to commemorate the exodus of the Israelites from Egypt, and their delivery from bondage, occurred on Sunday, March 26, and continued during Holy Week. The 26th was the 14th day of the lunar month nearest to the Vernal Equinox, which is the day appointed in the Mosaic law for the celebration of the feast, which was duly celebrated by the Jews in Toronto and elsewhere throughout Canada and the United States. As the resurrection of our Lord took place on the Sunday after this Jewish festival, it is properly celebrated on that Sunday, which occurred this year on April 2. The feast of Easter, which has been celebrated ever since Christianity was established, and the date of celebration of which was definitely fixed by the Council of Nice in 325, is a monumental and historical testimony to the truth of the fact of Christ's resurrection from the dead, and of the consequent divinity of the Christian religion which is attested by this and other miracles wrought by our Saviour Himself and His Apostles and disciples.

THE LINDSAY POLICE MAGISTRATE'S TRACK.

We some weeks ago made reference to the action of the Lindsay Town Council in proposing the reduction of the Police Magistrate's salary from \$1,000 to \$500, and from information received we were led to believe that the motives of the majority in passing the resolution were dictated by anti-Catholic feeling, because the new Police Magistrate is a Catholic.

We have since been informed by those who ought to know the truth of the matter that the movement toward reducing the salary was dictated not by any such feeling as our first information led us to believe, and we gladly inform our readers that we have been mistaken in attributing to the majority this unworthy motive, as they were influenced by a desire for economy, this tendency to economize having manifested itself before Mr. Steers was appointed to the Magistracy.

We willingly make this correction in regard to the majority in the Council, nevertheless it remains true that at all events one member of the Council boasted that as the present holder of the office is a Catholic, he would make it not worth having. Our charge of bigotry is therefore freely withdrawn as regards the council generally, but not as regards this particular individual.

DIVORCES IN CANADA.

The Divorce Committee of the Senate last week reported in favor of granting a bill of divorce to David Stock of Toronto, authorizing the annulment of his marriage to his wife Mary Stock. The applicant prayed that the usual fees required in such cases be remitted, on the plea of poverty, and the Committee also recommended that his petition should be granted. Senator McMillan opposed the grant-

ing of the petition, "as there are too many bills of this kind." He very properly stated that he does not wish it to be understood that the Senate should make a distinction between the rich and the poor, but he did not wish to see the number of these applications increased. In the past, the fees had been sometimes remitted in cases wherein the wife had applied for a divorce, but this was the first instance where the fees were proposed to be remitted on the application of a husband.

On behalf of the petitioner, Senators Loughhead and Mills said the fees ought to be remitted. The wife of the petitioner had deserted her husband and married another man, and both offenders had been imprisoned for bigamy. The injured husband of this delinquent wife is an employe of the Toronto Gas Company and has a very small salary. The Honorable David Mills declared that though he supported the present petition, he does not want to see any laxity in the granting of divorces. During twenty years, he said, the Canadian Senate had granted one hundred and ten divorce decrees, while during the same period 400,000 had been granted in the United States.

We certainly admit that Canada is to be congratulated that so few divorces, in comparison with those of our neighbors, have been granted, but even so we have had 110 too many—both because they are contrary to the divine law, and because they destroy the sacredness of the marriage tie, and the peace and permanency of families. We should be sorry to see Canada fall into the laxity of the United States in this matter, but it is one of the characteristics of Protestantism to tend to laxity, and it is to be feared that this cheapening of divorce is the introduction of the wedge to the same end.

We are far from desiring to see it made easier for the rich than for the poor to obtain divorces, but we would rejoice if the obstacles were the same in both cases, and that this would be effected, not by making it easier for the poor, as the present tendency is, but by refusing to grant divorces in any case.

The bill for granting the divorce in the present instance passed its first reading, and will most probably pass the second and third as well. It will be opposed by the Catholic members of Parliament, and a few Protestants, but not by enough of the latter to prevent its passage.

THE CHURCH IN EUROPE.

Our esteemed contemporary the Presbyterian Review of Toronto is highly elated over an alleged "general movement towards Protestantism" which it states to be in progress "in different parts of Europe." It says that "a short time ago it was announced that the German Catholics of Austria proposed to go over to Protestantism in a body with a view of identifying themselves more closely with the great majority of their kin in the German Empire."

It is true that such a statement was made by the telegraphic correspondent of the press on this side of the Atlantic, but it is too absurd to be seriously considered.

There has for many years been a race jealousy in the Eastern and Southern provinces of the Austrian Empire between Germans and Czechs which has frequently broken out into actual disorders with the purpose of giving one party or the other the mastery. Recently some of the German party proposed that they should go over to Protestantism in a body, but there has been nothing to justify the statement that anything of the kind is about to happen. The London Times correspondent, indeed, stated that such a movement is contemplated, but this is merely his exaggerated representation of the case.

It has frequently happened, as may be seen by Church history, that schisms have occurred through political embroilments, and it would therefore not be very extraordinary if something of the same kind were now to occur in Austria; but at all events the present so-called movement has not attained any degree of importance as yet, and there is every reason to believe that it will be abortive; nevertheless it has been recently declared by the Austrian Evangelical bodies to be of no religious significance, as it is a political and not a religious movement.

Our contemporary likewise states that in Prussia there have been recently numerous conversions to Protestantism, and but few from Protestantism to the Catholic Church. We cannot at the present moment positively assert whether the figures it gives for the year 1895 are correct or not, as

we are not aware that any accurate census was taken for that year. We suspect that the statistics given are fictitious, for it is a certainty that the Catholics of Germany gained very nearly 2 per cent. in their ratio of population between the last two authentic censuses. This proves that even if it were true that in Prussia there is a small loss to the Church, there is considerable gain in the whole German Empire, and the theory of our contemporary that the general tendency of Europe is toward Protestantism is thus refuted. It is certain however by recent official statistics which are within reach that the Catholic Church in Prussia is really progressing and not retrograding, for there are 4,719 parishes, of which 135 were recently erected, and the total number of Catholics in the kingdom is 11,000,000, being nearly double what it was 50 years ago.

STILL DRIFTING.

A recent meeting of Methodist ministers held in the city of New York, at which four hundred ministers were present, and a Bishop, indicates that Methodism is rapidly diverging from the moorings of its traditional and very firm faith in the truth and infallibility of the Bible as the word of God.

One of the leading preachers of the city, the Rev. G. Parker Cadman, pastor of the Metropolitan Temple, in an address on the Bible, gave utterance to views on this subject which would not astonish us if found in the writings of Tom Paine or Colonel Ingersoll, whose whole efforts are directed toward destroying Christian faith, but which, uttered amid an assemblage of so-called Christian clergymen of a denomination which has been in existence only a little over a century, and which has always hitherto boasted of the fervor of its Christianity, is truly astounding.

Mr. Cadman, in what has been called a very learned and eloquent address, actually laid down the strange proposition that "the inheritance and infallibility of the Bible are no longer objects of belief among reasoning men," and that "the true source of inspiration is neither a book, nor a church, nor a ministry, but the living Christ Himself."

The latter part of this assertion is something which in some sense might be maintained, for it is a proposition most ambiguously constructed, but, in the sense in which the speaker intended it to be taken, it is evidently a most dangerous error leading to utter infidelity. As a matter of course, Christ, as one of three divine persons from whom inspiration must come, is the source or cause of inspiration, and the thing inspired is the result or effect. The Bible is the effect of inspiration; but this is not what the Rev. Cadman means. He means to deny that the Bible is inspired at all, or that Christ established an infallible Church. Of course we could not expect a Protestant minister of any of the denominations (except a High Churchman) to express a belief in an infallible Church, as this would condemn Protestantism in its very foundation; but we have been so accustomed to hear Protestants boast that their religion is based upon "the Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible," that we cannot but be shocked when we find a large gathering of ministers applauding vociferously such a direct attack upon the Bible as Mr. Cadman made, yet we are informed in the report of the proceedings that this was the case on the occasion referred to. We would like to know what claim Methodism or any form of Protestantism has on public belief if the Bible be not an infallible book.

But Rev. Mr. Cadman and those who applauded him appear not to be conscious of the absurdity of the position they have taken. They profess to place their trust in "the living Christ," but what can they know of Christ if the New Testament is a book not worthy of complete faith in its teachings? There is no other book from which a knowledge of Christ can be primarily derived, and if the New Testament is but a tissue of fables, then the whole fabric of Christianity comes to the ground. The history of Jonas swallowed by a whale comes in for a large share of Mr. Cadman's ridicule. He does not believe in it as a history, yet he confesses that it may be a piece of useful and pious reading if it be taken as a parable referring to the death and resurrection of Christ. On this point, however, he at present suspends judgment. How can he know anything about the resurrection of Christ if the whole Bible is but a doubtful piece of

history, or collection of parables somewhat resembling Aesop's fables?

But a few years ago Methodists were very stalwart defenders of the truth of the Bible, but it is evident that they have wandered far from this in an incredibly brief period. They are evidently on the down grade, equally with other sects.

"If in the green wood they do these things, what shall be done in the dry?"

THE RITUALISTIC WAR.

Lord Halifax presided at a mass meeting held in London, England, under the auspices of the Church of England Union on Tuesday, Feb. 28, at which the question of the agitation against Ritualism in the Church was earnestly discussed. The meeting declared that "Parliament has no right to determine the doctrine, ceremonial or discipline of the Church of England, which from the beginning had no idea of separation from the Catholic Church." It was contended that at the Reformation no new Church was established, and that the doctrines held by Ritualists, being in agreement with those of the Catholic Church, are not heretical and should not be condemned.

The meeting passed a resolution to the effect that, "We protest against the spoliation of the Church, but we are not prepared to barter its principles for the sake of establishment or endowment."

Little doubt can be entertained of the sincerity of Lord Halifax and of many of those who are in agreement with him, and on this account it is freely said in England that this avowed policy of the Ritualistic party will lead soon to a disruption of the Church and perhaps to disestablishment.

The laity are still clamoring for the suppression of Ritualistic doctrines and practices, and there is no doubt that the majority is still on the side of Low Churchism, though the clergy, to the extent of about one-half of their whole body, are more or less advanced in Ritualism, the good effects of which on their congregations they have observed. It is sure that Ritualistic practices have excited a considerable amount of devotion in the Churches which have adopted them, and the results seen in much better attendance at the Church services where these practices are adopted. It is no wonder, therefore, that the clergy cling to them with pertinacity, and their resolutions passed at last week's meeting indicate that they are ready to set at defiance all who join in the battle against them. It appears very probable, however, that the Ritualists will be forced to secede from the Church if they wish to continue their High Church services. Should this be the result of the agitation, it is believed that they will probably form a separate Church organization with services suitable to their advanced ideas of how Public Worship should be carried on.

Lord Halifax, and the Church Union, which is a Ritualistic organization, have a lofty idea of the right of the Church to independence from State interference or control, but they ignore entirely the fact that the Church of England is essentially a creature of the State. Its creed was determined by Parliament, and so were its ceremonies in worship and its disciplinary laws. It is very true that the State has no right to interfere with such matters, if the Church were truly the Church established by Christ. But the fact that the State did actually decide all these matters in the first place shows that the Church of England in all its forms of High, Low and Broad Church, is essentially a human, and not a divine organization. It can never become a divine institution by merely patching on to it a ceremonial or a creed borrowed more or less fully from the Catholic Church, which is admitted by the Ritualists at least to be truly divine.

The only satisfactory way in which the Ritualists can settle their trouble is by submitting to the authority of the Catholic Church. It is indeed probable that if the present agitation against Ritualism be continued, the matter will end by a large percentage of the Ritualistic party joining the Catholic Church unreservedly. They may not do this in a body, and it is still less likely, from present appearances, that the Church of England will submit as a body to the authority of the Pope; but individual Ritualists will see in large numbers the absurdity of their present position. They are out of accord with the Church of all ages and nations to which they aspire to belong, and of which they even claim to be members, inasmuch as they assert that they are a branch of the universal or Catholic Church, and at the same time, they are at disagreement with the majority of the members of the Church to which they actually belong, and had

but little hope of bringing the majority to their side in the face of the determined opposition now being organized against them.

Mere disestablishment will not better their condition from the spiritual point of view, any more than from the temporal standpoint. If they institute a secession Church, they will still be a distinct body from the Church which they admit to be the most important branch of the Church of Christ. Surely they are the "other sheep" of which Christ speaks, as being not of His fold. But He desires to bring them to His fold that "there may be one fold and one shepherd."

The prayers of devout Catholics should be offered to our merciful Saviour, that the sincere souls among these seekers after truth may be brought to a knowledge of the truth, and become members of the fold of Jesus Christ.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

"Old Subscriber" of St. Albert, Alta., asks information regarding the difference between a Bishop and a Vicar Apostolic. The Episcopate, or the office of a Bishop, is the highest of the sacred orders, and is the plenitude of the Christian priesthood whereby the powers of confirming the faithful, ruling the Church of God, ordaining its ministers, and consecrating objects pertaining to divine worship, are conferred upon a priest. The Roman Pontifical enumerates the duties of a Bishop thus: "It behooves a Bishop to judge, to interpret, to consecrate, to ordain, to offer sacrifice, to baptize, and to confirm." This enumeration embraces his principal powers as a priest, and those which he possesses over and beyond the priesthood.

The powers of a Bishop are of two kinds, namely, of order and of jurisdiction. The powers of order of a Bishop are those whereby he can administer sacraments which are beyond the powers of a priest, and they pertain essentially to the Episcopal order. The powers of jurisdiction authorize a Bishop to rule a definite ecclesiastical territory which has been determined by the Pope, and his See is fixed to a certain Church which the Pope alone has power to erect into a Cathedral.

A Vicar Apostolic is usually, though not necessarily, a Bishop by order; but while the titular Bishop by canon law governs the diocese to which he is appointed with complete jurisdiction, the Vicar Apostolic governs the territory assigned to him only in the name of the Pope, and he has the jurisdiction which the Pope specially confers upon him. Of course he cannot confer the sacraments which belong to the Episcopal office, unless he be a Bishop by consecration. He may also fix his residence in whatever part of his diocese he deems most suitable.

From this explanation it will be understood that when a Vicar Apostolic is promoted to be titular Bishop he must receive Episcopal consecration, if he be only a priest; but if he be already a Bishop, no such consecration will be needed. He needs only to be duly appointed and to take formal possession of his cathedral.

A Prefect Apostolic has jurisdiction similar to that of a Bishop or Vicar Apostolic, but in order he is only a priest. This dignity is appointed where the Catholic population is sparse.

"T. J. M.," of Graham, asks whether a good knowledge of the Latin language can be obtained without the aid of a teacher, and what books would be the best to start with; also how it should be studied.

As in the study of all languages, and indeed of all sciences, the aid of a competent teacher is much to be desired, it is the same with Latin; nevertheless by diligent study the difficulties may be overcome even without a teacher. The pronunciation should, however, be ascertained from a teacher, if possible.

Two distinct modes of pronouncing Latin are in vogue, the Anglicised and the Continental. The former is usually taught in the English High schools and universities, but the Continental pronunciation is used by the Church in all her services. A choice between these pronunciations should be made when the study is begun.

Compared with most other languages, the Latin language approaches the phonetic type, and therefore when the correct pronunciation of the letters is once ascertained, it will not be difficult to pronounce the words. The difference between the long and short vowels is, however, a difficulty without the direction of a teacher, but even this may be overcome by a careful study of

the rules of prosody which are to be found in all good grammars of the language. For the books to be used, we would recommend Bullion's Grammar, Arnold's Exercises, the Epitome of Sacred History and Quintus Curtius—to be followed by other books when the student has made considerable progress. Some of these other books are Cicero's Orations, Caesar's Commentaries, Virgil, Horace, etc.

BENT ON EVANGELIZING THE DOUKHOBORS.

Mr. Ernest A. Crosby of New York writes a letter which appears in the Globe of the 27th ult., on the movement which has been initiated among some Canadian sects to convert the Russian Doukhobors to their special forms of belief.

He calls attention to the fact that these Russians who have settled in our North West have this distinctive characteristic that they put literally into practice the injunction of our Lord not "to defend themselves, to serve in the army, and to take the lives of their fellow-men." He continues:

"In their lives they rank easily as the chief of living Christians send them forth. He more correct to say, as the only living Christians. Now what will these missionaries teach these disciples of Christ? They all interpret the sermon on the Mount in the Pickwickian sense. They recite like parrots that we are to turn the other cheek, but they neither practice it nor teach it. They say: 'Love your enemies,' and approve of showing that love with bombshells."

The Baptists are the first in the field to move toward sending missionaries to convert these industrious and peaceable immigrants, and the Presbyterians and Methodists appear to be considering seriously the advisability of competing with them in this field of missionary labor. Mr. Crosby's sarcasm is therefore evidently directed specially against the ministers of these three denominations, and with considerable effect. All these denominations hold that each individual ought to interpret the Bible for himself without resting his belief on any Church authority, and if the Doukhobors understand the words of our Lord to mean that it is never lawful to bear arms, why should these sects interfere with, or endeavor to change their belief on this point?

Mr. Crosby infers that these sects are more in need of being taught Christian truth by the Doukhobors, than are the latter of learning it from the missionaries of other Protestant denominations, who show so much anxiety to convert them. He says:

"If there are to be any missionaries, let these Russian Christians send them forth. Surely we have need enough of them. Let them go to the South where the Church of Christ is preaching the forgiveness of enemies, and sanctioning the avenging of Gordon—to Mania, where she is blessing the slaughter of brave patriots, and telling men to turn the other cheek. . . . Finally, let us hope that the misguided men with beams in their eyes, who attempt to convert the Doukhobors, may have no success."

It is one of the remarkable results of the Protestant principle of private judgment, that every sect imagines that the results of its own interpretation of the Scriptures are alone true, while the interpretations of all the rest are nothing but anti-Christian delusions. In all solid reasoning absurd and contradictory consequences are acknowledged to refute the principle from which they flow, but when such consequences come from the religious principle of private judgment its upholders appear to cling to it with increased tenacity.

It is surely a strange result of the so-called Reformation, which has been proclaimed to be the means whereby the Christian religion was to be renewed and restored to its primitive purity, if after three and a half centuries of its active work it has need itself to be purified and reformed by missionaries from Russia, a country which never accepted the teachings of Luther and his Reformation.

If this be the case, what meaning can we attach to the promises of Christ that He should remain with His Church all days, even to the end of time? Yet if we are to believe Mr. Crosby, the Reformation has succeeded only in propagating a false theology!

The various contradictory systems of Protestantism are an irrefragable proof that they are all equally founded upon a false principle, and that the truth as taught by Christ is to be looked for only in the Catholic Church which teaches always and everywhere the same revealed truths, and which taught them before Luther and the Reformation were even dreamed of.

In regard to the peculiar doctrine of the Doukhobors that it is unlawful to serve in the army, we may here say a few words. In St. Luke 14, we are informed that soldiers came to our Lord to ask Him what they should do. He answered them with special reference to three faults to which men of their calling are particularly prone: "do violence to no man; neither cal-

umniate any man; and be content with your pay." Thus our Lord practically asserts that their occupation is a lawful one, inasmuch as He does not condemn it, but condemns only the faults into which men of that occupation are liable to fall.

An unjust war is, of course, to be condemned, but just as it is lawful to repel, and, if necessary, to kill the unjust aggressor who seeks to take away our life, so civil society may lawfully wage a just war, for instance, to repel the unjust attacks of another nation, to obtain reparation for a serious injury inflicted, when reparation can be obtained only by that means, or to restrain greedy nations from openly violating the rights of others.

It is true that war is a very great evil and misfortune, and entails much suffering upon humanity, but circumstances may arise in which it becomes necessary, and the military occupation is, therefore, not merely lawful, but meritorious, in proportion to the magnitude of the sacrifices made by the soldier for the sake of the general good of the people of his country. The Doukhobor peculiarity of refusing to serve in the army and to share in the common burdens of the people is therefore not a commendable one, though it may be endured for a time until in the natural course of events they become assimilated in manners to the people among whom they have taken up their abode.

REV. DR. BRIGGS AND THE RE-UNION OF CHRISTENDOM.

The Rev. Dr. Charles A. Briggs, formerly a Professor of the Presbyterian Union Theological Seminary of New York, but who some months ago renounced Presbyterianism and became a member of the Protestant Episcopal Church, is now before the public in a new character, namely, as the advocate of a wider Christian Unity than the majority of Protestant ministers have dreamed of in all their talk about the re-union of Christendom.

Most other Protestant clergymen speak of the re-union of Christendom without even a thought of including within it the Catholic Church, which of itself comprises within its fold many more members than all the sects together, even if we throw in with them the Schismatical Oriental sects, which in doctrine and ritual closely resemble the Catholic Church. But Dr. Briggs sees the incongruity of such a union as would leave out the only Christian Church which has always existed since Christ established a Church, and which is still the religion of the world. Such a union would be like Shakespeare's play of Hamlet with Hamlet left out. But Dr. Briggs hopes that Catholics and Protestants alike will so modify or smooth down their respective beliefs that they will no longer clash with one another. Thus he says:

"I know three prominent Protestant theologians of different denominations, who have deliberately rejected the Protestant doctrine of justification by faith and adopted the Roman doctrine as set forth in the decrees of the Council of Trent. This movement has only to go on, and you will have unity."

Surely, if Protestants would adopt one by one the doctrines of the Catholic Church, as the Ritualists have done in the Church of England, they would soon be in close proximity to the Catholic Church, and unity might be the next step. But the Catholic Church cannot follow this course in order to become assimilated to Protestantism. The difference is that Protestants have a free path before them to choose what doctrines are suitable to their whims for the time being, and are not so solicitous about what has been revealed by God, whereas Catholics possess the truth and must adhere to it without compromise or modification. This has always been understood by Catholics, and the recent letter of Pope Leo XIII. on so-called Americanism sets forth this immutability of Catholic doctrine with the greatest clearness and emphasis possible. Dr. Briggs adds:

"If the Roman Catholic will only recognize the authority of the Bible as he ought to, and Protestants will recognize the authority of the Church as they should, they will not have so much objection to one another. Whatever differences there may have been will eventually disappear."

The doctor is quite mistaken in supposing that Catholics do not recognize the Holy Scripture as God's word. It is Protestantism which has belittled it, and which is every day more and more undermining its authority even to the denying of its truth and infallibility. We had an instance of this in the doctor's own case; for, was it not for his impugning the divine authority of Scripture that he was repudiated by the Presbyterian General Assembly of the United States, though he was upheld by his fellow professors of the Union Seminary? And were