

The Catholic Record.

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

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

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

THOMAS COFFEY, Publisher and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY, Messrs. LUKE KING, JOHN NICH, and P. J. NEVEN, are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transact all other business for the CATHOLIC RECORD.

Rates of Advertising—Ten cents per line each insertion, a year \$1.00.

Approved and recommended by the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa, and St. Boniface, and the Bishops of London, 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.

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

London, Saturday, April 28, 1894

THE JESUITS TO RETURN TO GERMANY.

At last, after a period of persecution covering nearly a quarter of a century, the Reichstag has passed through the third reading a bill for the repeal of the last of the persecuting laws of Germany, the majority being 168 against 145. The bill was supported by Centrists, Alsations and Poles, who, though differing in political opinions, are one in regard to questions which affect the Church.

By the repeal of the Jesuit exclusion law, Germany asserts anew its adherence to old traditions; for even at a time when political intriguers who felt themselves condemned by the morality of the gospel as asserted and expounded by the Jesuits, took their revenge by endeavoring to have them expelled from Catholic countries, Frederic of Prussia and Catherine of Russia fully recognized the worth of that illustrious order and sustained them against all enemies in their dominions.

CHRISTIAN UNITY. The movement among some of the Protestant denominations to effect a union between them has so far materialized that a journal is published in New York in the interests of union, and a number of clergymen of different denominations are contributors to it, including Dr. Parkhurst, Bishop J. P. Newman (Methodist), Rev. C. C. Salter, and others.

There are some curious features in the principles of the Union League, and though these have been very generally accepted by those who are desirous of union, as being the only basis on which a union can be effected, it does not appear to us possible that any denomination can really accept them, so subversive are they of the very union they are designed to bring about.

The first principle as set forth in the Church Union, is: 1. Whatever occasion may have existed in times past for the division of the Church into separate denominations, we hold that the efforts of Christians should henceforth be positive and continuous towards an actual and visible oneness.

This proposition is worthy of notice chiefly because it is a mode of shaping revealed truths to suit the changing notions of men. It would seem that there was occasion in times past for the division of the Church into separate denominations.

We are not greatly surprised that this view should be held and maintained, for it is no uncommon thing for us to read in the various denominational organs the thesis seriously maintained that it is not only reconcilable with the Christian idea of the Church that there should be divisions into sects, but that it is expedient that such should be the case.

The Government took no part in the debate, thus leaving their supporters free to vote on either side. This was of itself a change of attitude, as Chancellor Von Caprivi had hitherto resolutely opposed the repeal of the law.

It is said that the Bundesrath or Federal Council will reject the Bill, just as the English Lords rejected the Irish Home Rule Bill. This, however, is but speculation, and it is most probable that the Council will yield to the will of the nation as expressed by the Representative Chamber; and this is the more likely to be the case as the Council is usually in accord with the Emperor's policy, which is now inclined to liberality.

However, now that the nation has pronounced so positively in favor of repealing this last vestige of Bismarck's intolerance, the opposition of the Council will certainly disappear in time, and the Jesuits will shortly reappear in Germany to renew the work which they have been so ably performing.

By the repeal of the Jesuit exclusion law, Germany asserts anew its adherence to old traditions; for even at a time when political intriguers who felt themselves condemned by the morality of the gospel as asserted and expounded by the Jesuits, took their revenge by endeavoring to have them expelled from Catholic countries, Frederic of Prussia and Catherine of Russia fully recognized the worth of that illustrious order and sustained them against all enemies in their dominions.

CHRISTIAN UNITY. The movement among some of the Protestant denominations to effect a union between them has so far materialized that a journal is published in New York in the interests of union, and a number of clergymen of different denominations are contributors to it, including Dr. Parkhurst, Bishop J. P. Newman (Methodist), Rev. C. C. Salter, and others.

There are some curious features in the principles of the Union League, and though these have been very generally accepted by those who are desirous of union, as being the only basis on which a union can be effected, it does not appear to us possible that any denomination can really accept them, so subversive are they of the very union they are designed to bring about.

The first principle as set forth in the Church Union, is: 1. Whatever occasion may have existed in times past for the division of the Church into separate denominations, we hold that the efforts of Christians should henceforth be positive and continuous towards an actual and visible oneness.

This proposition is worthy of notice chiefly because it is a mode of shaping revealed truths to suit the changing notions of men. It would seem that there was occasion in times past for the division of the Church into separate denominations.

We are not greatly surprised that this view should be held and maintained, for it is no uncommon thing for us to read in the various denominational organs the thesis seriously maintained that it is not only reconcilable with the Christian idea of the Church that there should be divisions into sects, but that it is expedient that such should be the case.

principles, we hold that the evangelical believers and congregations of each locality should aim to manifest to the world their essential unity in faith and spirit.

Is not this a direct appeal to individual pride, the pride which sets up the private judgment of man above the revelation of God?

In the Church Union for March there is an article on Denominationalism, by Rev. John P. Hale, which evidently embodies the principles on which the Union League desires to bring about the unity of Christianity, and therein we find the above principle somewhat more fully explained. The writer says:

"I think I have stated fairly this underlying principle of denominationalism. It declares that men have the right to determine the conditions of the Church's membership and ministry. And therein I believe it is essentially and dangerously in the wrong. The Church is a divine institution entrusted to men's care, not for lordship or partizanship, but for stewardship. It is not their prerogative to make conditions."

It is almost needless to point out to our readers the fallaciousness of these assertions. The Church made conditions or laws when the Apostles decreed at Jerusalem "that you abstain from things sacrificed to idols, and from blood, and from things strangled;" and in making this decree they declared, "it hath seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us." (Acts xv: 28, 29.) The disciplinary decrees of the Church are therefore binding on the faithful. Doctrines are not to be invented by the Church, as they are to be such as were revealed by Christ to be taught to all nations; but the Church has authority to pronounce upon their orthodoxy, and "he that will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as the heathen and the publican."

Protestantism, or denominationalism, as the Church Union expresses it, has subverted this authority, and in the same paper another writer describes the result:

"Tell it to the Church. What Church? Every one knows that discipline is at an end in the Church of God, because the deposed clergyman, or excommunicated layman, steps across the street and is welcomed into fellowship. That is one point. Another is that division into fragmentary parts is a wasteful expenditure. I have seen the thing time and again where six or seven starveling religious bodies were each contending for the supremacy of the town, and each jealous of the other."

The remedy for this state of affairs is not to construct a man-made Church made up of all existing Churches, still adhering to their fanciful creeds, but to return to the one fold and submit to the authority of the one Church which Christ instituted.

Of the third principle of the Church Union but little need be said. It is as follows:

3. We hold those churches to be evangelical which, maintaining the Holy Scriptures to be the only infallible rule of faith and practice, do believe in the Lord Jesus Christ (the only-begotten of the Father, King of Kings and Lord of Lords; in whom dwelleth the fullness of the God-head bodily, and who was made sin for us, though knowing no sin, bearing our sins in His own body on the tree, as the only name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved.

This is a principle which would admit Catholics into the proposed Union, if we could only assert with our lips, and others do, what in practice we deny. The Holy Scriptures are indeed infallible, but they are not the only infallible rule of faith and practice. St. Paul commands the Thessalonians to stand fast, not only to the teachings learned through his writings (Scripture), but also to those learned by word, the traditions and teaching of the Church. (2 Thess. ii, 14.) It is by the teaching of the Church, and not of Holy Scripture, that Protestants themselves have learned what books constitute the New Testament, that they know that children should be baptized, and that the Lord's day or Sunday has been appointed as the Christian day of rest to be sanctified instead of the Jewish Sabbath.

ONE of our ministerial brethren recently declared that Catholics adore the images of saints. The first of all gospels is this, "that a lie cannot endure forever." His efforts to ridicule the "poor, deluded Catholics" were doubtless appreciated by his auditors. Ridicule, says Carlyle, is intrinsically a small faculty. It is directly opposed to thought, to knowledge so-called; its nourishment and essence is denial, which hovers only on the surface, while knowledge dwells far below. Moreover, it is by nature selfish and morally trivial; it cherishes nothing but our vanity, which may in general be left safely enough to shift for itself.

THE POPE AND THE CZAR.

The Mail of the 13th ult. makes reference to a bitter attack upon the Vatican by an Austrian-Polish organ, the occasion being the publication of the important Encyclical letter recently sent by the Holy Father to the Archbishop and Bishops of Poland.

The paper in question is the Dziennik Polski of Lemberg, which says: "This encyclical has come like a thunderbolt to us Poles. The Papal remarks on the convention of 1882 are to us like a chilling gust of wind. They sound like a mockery of the sufferings of millions of oppressed Catholics in Russia. "Mr. Pobiedonostzeff could not have written differently. It seems impossible that the head of the Catholic Church could have heard the wail of distress that came from the murdered Russian Catholics. But the Vatican diplomacy has attained its object, and in the interests of the Franco-Russian entente a brutal blow has been struck at the Catholic Poles."

We are aware that the Infidel papers of the continent, and especially of Germany and Italy, have attacked the Holy Father with great virulence in reference to Poland, though we have not seen the article of the Dziennik Polski in particular. It is enough for us to say, however, that there is no justification for the grossly abusive language attributed to that journal and for the further coarse remarks of the Mail.

The supposition that the Holy Father would sacrifice the interests of the Catholic Poles to gratify Russia is most preposterous. Pope Leo XIII., equally with his predecessors, has labored to the utmost extent possible to ameliorate their condition, and to induce the Czar to treat them as would a fatherly Prince who has the welfare of his subjects at heart, instead of oppressing them as slaves or beasts of burden. He has not fully succeeded, but it is clear to every one that the condition of the Polish Catholics would at the present time be much worse than it is were it not for the efforts made by the Pope to conciliate the Czar during the whole period of his pontificate.

The cruelty with which the Russian Poles have been treated, not merely under the present, but under every Czar who has occupied the throne since the partition of Poland, has been beyond what humanity can endure, and it is difficult for one in the position of the Holy Father, who must regard the Poles as his beloved children, to preserve any degree of cordiality with the tyrant who afflicts them.

We are not greatly surprised that a Pole like Mr. Pobiedonostzeff, who is beyond the power of the Czar to do him harm, should express himself with hate whenever the name of the ruler of Russia is spoken of in his presence; and it is probable, besides, that he is one of those Poles who are glad to seize any opportunity to abuse religion, and to speak with disrespect of the Pope and the priesthood. Others of this class besides Poles live without religion, and as religion reproves their vices, they hate it and endeavor to destroy its influence.

But it must be borne in mind that the position of the Pope is a most responsible one. He has to guard equally the interests of Polish and Russian Catholics, not by sacrificing those of either one or the other, but by weighing them according to the standards of right and justice.

The Pope is guided by the law of God in his writings and his dealings with the Czar; but the latter, according to the traditions of his dynasty, imagines that his will must prevail over all other considerations. In religion, he is the head of his Church, and the law of God must bend to suit his desires. Hence the duplicity of Russian diplomacy is proverbial, and it is hard for the Pope to arrive at any practical conclusion in his dealings with the despot.

It is but a short time since a few aged Sisters, the youngest of whom is about seventy years of age, and nearly all of whom are infirm and ill, were driven from their home in Kroze or Krosche, Lithuania. These were the few survivors of those ladies who were allowed to remain in their house when convents were suppressed by the Government in 1863. In addition to this tyrannical treatment of nine aged nuns, the convent church, which was attended by the people, was violently closed, and the congregation, who had received a promise from the Czar himself that their case would be taken into consideration, and therefore expected that no such violence as was threatened would be inflicted, resisted the invasion of the church

by Cossacks, under the impression that the latter were acting under orders not issued by the Government. The poor people, numbering more than one hundred old men and women, and small children, girls and boys, were actually shot down in the church by the Cossacks or knouted unmercifully, or drowned in the river near by.

This is only a specimen of the treatment to which the Russian Poles are habitually subjected. Possibly the details of such infamous events are not made known to the Czar in person, but he is not thereby excused from responsibility for acts which are the outcome of his system of Government. It is hard, therefore, for the Pope to conduct negotiations at all with the autocrat, much less to arrive at satisfactory conclusions with him. The British public especially ought to feel the truth of this, as a petition to the Czar on behalf of the persecuted Jews, adopted by a public meeting in London, a few years ago, was returned without any notice being taken of it, more than that the Russian press remarked that England ought to redress the wrongs under which her own subjects were suffering before meddling so obtrusively with the affairs of other nations.

It is to be feared that any treaty to which the Pope and Czar might agree will bear little fruit. Yet the Pope is not to be blamed if he endeavors to conciliate the tyrant, and thus lead him to a more merciful course. This he has done in the encyclical to the Polish Bishops; but it is not true to say that he has in any way compromised the Poles or injured the cause of Poland. There is nothing in the encyclical which can be construed as having this tendency. It treats almost entirely of the importance of Christian education and Christian faith. Beyond this it recommends order in society, peace among the people, and respect for the laws and lawful authority. These are the broad principles of Christian ethics which it is the Pope's duty to inculcate; but he does not justify tyranny, nor recommend that tyranny be patiently endured.

The conciliatory policy of Pope Leo in the past much benefited the Poles both spiritually and materially; and even Protestants reaped the benefit by being less persecuted than before. In 1882 many laws detrimental to religion were repealed, and freedom was given to establish several Catholic colleges and seminaries free from Government interference to their detriment. In 1888 many vacant Sees were allowed to be filled, and in 1890 the Government was so impressed by a letter from the Pope to the newly-appointed Bishops, inculcating obedience to the laws as long as they were not at variance with the rights of the Church, that the Governor of Samogizia was severely reprimanded for arbitrarily threatening to banish the Bishop of the diocese.

From these considerations it will be seen that Mr. Pobiedonostzeff's strictures are as unjust as they are impudent.

ANOTHER BOGUS JESUIT OATH.

A new bogus oath has been issued by the A. P. A. of the United States as the oath taken by the Jesuits on their admission to the order. This new forgery is altogether different from that which has hitherto been circulated by no-Popery papers as being the authentic article. The former forgery will be remembered by our readers as having been published in the Toronto Mail some years ago. It was also aimed at Protestants whom it was supposed the Jesuits were to exterminate, but it did not propose to deal with them precisely in the Dahomeyan style which is adopted in this new specimen of what a lively imagination can produce. Here is the oath as published by the Courier-Journal of Louisville, Kentucky.

"I do further promise and declare that I will, when opportunity presents, make and wage relentless war, secretly or openly, against all heretics, Protestants and Liberals, as I am directed to do, to extirpate them from the face of the whole earth, and that I will spare neither age, sex nor condition, and that I will hang, burn, waste, boil, flay, strangle and bury alive these infamous heretics, rip up the stomachs and wombs of their women and crush their infants heads against the walls, in order to annihilate their race. That when the same can not be done openly, I will secretly use the poisonous cup, the strangulating cord, the steel of the poniard, or the leaden bullet, regardless of the honor, rank, dignity or authority of the person or persons, whatever may be their condition in life, either public or private, as I at any time may be directed so to do by an agent of the Pope or Superior of the Brotherhood of the Holy Father of the Society of Jesus." At the conclusion of the oath

the novice "receives the wafer from the Superior and writes his name with the point of his dagger dipped in his own blood, taken from over his heart."

In justice to the Courier-Journal we must state that it gives no credit to this foolish document, nevertheless it states that "however silly such publications may be, and however evident their falsity, there are thousands of persons who will be intensely horrified at such diabolical cruelty as that above set forth, and will direct all the intense power of hatred and prejudice against supposed plotters of these nefarious designs."

CATHOLICITY SEEN THROUGH PROTESTANT SPECTACLES.

The Christian Standard of Cincinnati had in an issue of recent date a very impartial and manly article on Catholicism. The writer, John Brandt, points out four lessons that the Catholic Church can teach those of other beliefs.

Respect for the Church is the first lesson. "Catholics love and respect the mother Church. Catholic artists devote their industry and genius to painting pictures for her. Catholic sculptors are taught that the highest inspiration and greatest models should be for the Church," etc.

The writer is correct in asserting that Catholics respect their Church. They guard and cherish their faith as the most precious legacy bequeathed them by their forefathers, and they recognize that faith is not their's but God's, and that they have no right but to protect it.

The Church is no mere institution upreared by human hands and preserved in its existence by Government wealth and patronage, but an organization framed by a God whose all-sheltering arm shall shield her, unto the consummation of all time, from the onslaughts of her enemies. Hence they who have the priceless treasure of Catholic faith are undismayed by hostile opinions. They have peace and light—peace for the soul, exposed to sorrow and the vicissitudes of time, and light to guide them safely heavenwards to the gate of eternity. True, her sculptors have sought and obtained inspiration in her tenets, and even they who have refused her their allegiance owe their immortality to her influence.

The charities of the Church excite the admiration of the writer. "Her charities are world-wide," etc.

We are very happy to give this article a reference, since it but indicates the growth of impartial criticism among our separated brethren.

DEMONOLOGY OR JUGGLERY?

By a report given in the London Free Press of the 17th inst. we learn that at a session of the Ministerial Association held at Victoria Hall on the previous day a discussion was held on the subject of spiritualism which was chiefly remarkable for the indefiniteness of the principles by means of which it was expected to arrive at a conclusion.

The Rev. Mr. Smith read a disquisition on this much-debated subject, but it would appear that he threw but little light upon it, as the Rev. Mr. Murray, who spoke after him, said: "He has taken for granted things that he should have proved. I do not think that his paper is either logical or very satisfactory. His premises do not agree with his conclusions, at all." The Free Press also remarks that the paper . . . was really only a rehash of arguments generally opposed to the dogma of spiritualism. We must say, however, that even if it were only a rehash, it might have been a very effective blow to the spiritualist delusion.

Mr. Murray then related several incidents which were said to be spiritual manifestations, and which, while appearing to be authentic, are also seemingly inexplicable by any mere juggling; the inference being that they must have been the acts of supernatural, or perhaps rather infernal, beings. These were performed while the medium was bound in a cabinet, and consisted of apparitions of supposed spirits of deceased persons, some of whom were known to the audience, and others unknown. Among these were "the famous spirit Katy King," a policeman, and an Indian. The last two appeared while Mr. Murray was present, and he declares that there were in the room, certainly, only two persons, beside the medium, himself and a friend, and that no living human being came in by the doors or windows of the room that night. He also witnessed the appearance of an old acquaintance, a member of his congregation, and this apparition