

The Catholic Record.

Published Weekly at 481 and 483 Richmond street, London, Ontario.
Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

EDITORS:
REV. GEORGE R. NORTHGRAVE,
Author of "Mistakes of Modern Infidels,"
THOMAS COFFEY.
Publisher and Proprietor, Thomas Coffey.

Messrs. Lusk, King, John Nigh, P. J. Neven and Miss Sarah Hanley are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and to transact all other business for THE CATHOLIC RECORD.
Agent for Newfoundland, Mr. T. J. Wall St. John's.

Advertisements—Ten cents per line each insertion, and one dollar for the first insertion. 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.

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

Agents and collectors have no authority to stop your paper unless the amount due is paid. Matter intended for publication should be mailed in time to reach London not later than Monday morning. Please do not send us money. Orders and marriage notices sent by subscribers must be in a condensed form, to insure insertion.

LETTER OF RECOMMENDATION.

UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA,
Ottawa, Canada, March 24, 1901.

To the Editor of THE CATHOLIC RECORD,
London Ont.:
Dear Sir: For some time past I have read your admirable 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.

Believe me, to remain,
Yours faithfully in Jesus Christ,
J. D. BALCONIO, Arch. of Ottawa,
April, 1902.

LONDON, SATURDAY, FEB. 6, 1904.

COL. ARTHUR LYNCH'S RELEASE

Just a year ago Colonel Arthur Lynch, who had been elected member of Parliament for Galway, was tried before the Lord Chief Justice in London on the charge of high treason, and was found guilty by the jury after half an hour's consideration of the case. When asked if he had anything to say why he should not be sentenced to death, he replied: "Thank you, I will say nothing."

There was no attempt on the part of the defence to deny that Lynch had supported the Boers during the recent war in South Africa, but his counsel contended that his naturalization as a Boer burgher was prompted solely for the advantage he would thus secure for journalistic purposes, and not with treasonable intent. Subsequently he actively supported the Boer cause in the belief that he was a legally naturalized subject of the Transvaal Republic.

Sir Edward Carson, the Solicitor General, maintained that Col. Lynch joined the Boer army as a "discontented Irishman, committing thereby a most cowardly and most serious act of treason. His naturalization," he said, "was a flimsy pretext which could in no way excuse him."

The Lord Chief Justice summed up the case very briefly, stating that, whatever the purpose might be, it is an unlawful act for a British subject to join the King's enemies in time of war, and naturalization during war-time affords no excuse for acts of hostility to the British forces. In regard to overt acts of hostility, he said, "there was abundant evidence that Arthur Lynch had committed them."

Justice Wills, in pronouncing sentence, said: "No civilized community had ever failed to punish severely every defection from loyalty, whether in the way of open warfare or secret intrigue. Lynch had joined the country's foes in the darkest hours of his country's fortune, and had shed the blood of his fellow subjects who were fighting for their country, and had sought to dethrone Great Britain from her place among the nations, the only palliation which could be offered being that it has been the fashion for some years to treat lightly matters of this kind, and men had been encouraged to play with sedition and treason. The nation had treated with contemptuous indifference speeches and acts of sedition; but it is one thing to talk sedition, and quite a different thing to bear arms in the ranks of the country's foes."

The Colonel was sentenced to be hanged, and later on was declared to be incapable of serving in Parliament, to which he had been elected for Galway.

By the King's mercy the sentence of death was commuted to imprisonment for life, though it was expected that after some time he would be set free.

The sad condition of Ireland was in the meantime recognized by all parties in Parliament, and the land tenure was changed by the recently passed Land Purchase Bill, which gives to the Irish tenant that interest in the land of their country of which they have been deprived for centuries, and it was generally deemed a sufficient reason for showing further clemency to Col. Lynch, that a peace between England and Ireland had been effected by the passage of the Land Purchase Act which had removed forever the greatest of the grievances under which Ireland had suffered for centuries.

It was admitted by all that Col. Lynch's acts of disloyalty were the consequence of the sufferings which Ire-

land had so long endured, and it was believed to be a suitable sequence of the Land Purchase Act that clemency should be extended to one who thought that, by fighting against England in Africa, he would be promoting the cause of Ireland. Accordingly, the Colonel has now been released, the term of his imprisonment having been actually one year.

Besides, a general amnesty was extended to the Boers at the ending of the South African war, and it was deemed unnecessary to keep one prisoner alone in durance for having fought in that war, and therefore Col. Lynch has been released. It is understood that the King himself was anxious for this ending of the matter, and that he was fully determined on the Colonel's release.

Colonel Lynch was sent to South Africa by a Paris journal as its war correspondent, and in this capacity he was allowed as a non-combatant to pass through the British lines to the Boer headquarters. It was then that he became naturalized as a Boer, in the hope that he might be allowed to pass freely from one army to the other in the interest of the paper by which he was employed. Soon after this he became desirous of taking an active part in the war, and he organized an Irish brigade for service in the Boer cause. This brigade, however, was very largely composed of foreigners of every country of Europe, so that it was an Irish brigade only in name.

After the war, Col. Lynch was elected to Parliament for Galway, though it was well known that he could not safely return to the country. Yet he seems to have imagined that the charge of high treason would not be urged against him; and he actually did return with the intention of taking his seat in the House of Commons. He was arrested as soon as he set foot on British soil, and his trial followed as a matter of course. It may be presumed that he would not have been disturbed at all only for his election—and probably he would not have thought of returning to Great Britain at all if he had not entertained some hope that he would have been allowed to take his seat in Parliament.

Previously to his election for Galway, viz., in 1891, he had made an attempt to enter Parliament as member for the same constituency, but he was unsuccessful, failing by 50 votes to gain the seat.

REV. DR. BRIGGS AND ANGLICAN ORDERS.

The Rev. Dr. Briggs, formerly professor of Biblical Exegesis in the Presbyterian Union Theological Seminary of New York, but who was more recently ordained by Bishop Potter as a "priest" of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States, recently startled the members of the Protestant Episcopal Church Club by a statement which he made in regard to Protestant ordination in general, and Anglican orders in particular. He said:

"I am quite ready to accept ordination by the Pope of Rome. I believe my Presbyterian ordination was valid, and that it was a humiliation which the Protestant Episcopal Church ought not to have put upon me when it required me to start as a layman, even to be confirmed, in order that I might enter into the ministry of one of the two Churches to which I now belong. I am convinced that if the unity of Christians depended upon ministers of all bodies submitting to ordination by the Roman Catholic Bishops that almost all of them would submit. I would for one. The Protestants do not regard the ordination of their ministers as a sacrament and a sacrifice. I wish they did in the same sense that Rome so regards it."

Continuing, the rev. doctor said he agreed in substance with the judgment of Pope Leo XIII., that Anglican orders are invalid in the sense that Episcopalians consider them, and he urged the Club to use its influence to have the Episcopal Church get down off its pedestal and begin to recognize other people who, ecclesiastically, are fully as good as they are.

He said further that "in the matter of continuity, Anglican orders hang upon a very slender thread," and in his belief "it was the act of God in cutting short the life of Queen Mary, and not any act of holiness or wisdom on the part of early Anglican leaders that gave the Church of England Bishops, and made it national."

There is a good deal that is incomprehensible in these utterances, yet there is also a vein of truth running through them which gives them pungency.

The claim of the Church of England to possess orders which are superior to those of Presbyterians is preposterous. It is founded on the hypothesis that the first Anglican Bishops received their orders from one or three of the Catholic Bishops who were deprived of Queen Elizabeth of their sees. This claim bears on its face its absurdity. It is true that an attempt was made by Matthew Parker, the first Anglican Archbishop of Canterbury, to obtain

Episcopal consecration from the Bishop of Llandoff, Wales, but the latter was terrified from acceding to Parker's request, by the threat of excommunication by his superior, the Primate of Canterbury, and there is no valid evidence that any orders were received by Episcopal consecration at the hands of any Catholic Bishop. The Lambeth Records, which were produced as evidence of this half a century later, have internal and external marks that they were fraudulent, and convicted for the purpose of supplying a missing link in the chain of evidence which should make the new claimants to Episcopacy, Bishops according to law. The required link was, however, supplied in another way, which certainly did not supply Apostolic succession, though it enabled them to take possession of their sees by force. This was the Act of Parliament which declared them to be truly Bishops, and they and their successors were thus made Bishops by Act of Parliament, and not by succession from the Bishops of the Catholic Church. Dr. Briggs is, therefore, right in saying that their continuity hangs by a very slender thread.

It is true also, as the doctor virtually says, that Presbyterians are as truly ordained to the Christian ministry as the so-called Bishops and priests of the Church of England. Both are clergymen by the civil laws of their respective countries, Scotland and England, and by no other way. Neither can truly claim that they received ordination after the manner in which the Apostles transmitted the authority to "dispense the mysteries of Christ." This mode of the transmission of orders is declared by St. Paul in his epistle to Titus.

"For this cause I left thee in Crete that thou . . . shouldst ordain priests in every city as I also appointed thee."

In reference to other matters, Dr. Briggs is evidently very much astray. Catholics do not call ordination "a sacrifice;" but it is a "sacrament." Priests are ordained to offer sacrifice, as St. Paul says, (Heb. viii. 3.) "Every high priest is appointed to offer gifts and sacrifices: wherefore, it is necessary that he should have something to offer;" but their ordination is a sacrament, not a sacrifice.

The priesthood of the New Law have the sacrifice of the Mass to offer, which Christ instituted at His Last Supper, saying: "Do this for a commemoration of Me," and "as often as you shall eat this bread and drink this chalice you shall show the death of the Lord until He comes." (St. Luke xxii. 19-21 Cor. xi. 25, 26.)

It is also clear that the rev. doctor is in error in his supposition that the ministries of all Christian Churches stand upon the same footing, as the Catholic Church can unmistakably trace the uninterrupted succession of its Episcopate and priesthood from the Apostles and from Christ, which none of the Protestant sects of which he speaks can do.

Another thing which we must class among the incomprehensible things stated by the rev. doctor is the statement that he now belongs to "two Churches." We should have supposed that he laid aside his Presbyterianism when he became an Episcopalian, but it seems we were mistaken. We suppose he is now to be regarded as a "Presbytero-Episcopalian," a new species of religionist which naturalists have not yet described.

THE DIVORCE EVIL.

A large number of the ministers of New York and Rhode Island of different denominations, but especially of the Protestant Episcopal Church, have formed a league with the object of making it a difficult matter for divorced persons to marry again. The line, however, on which this effort will be made is not uniform. One hundred and fifteen ministers of Rhode Island have declared that they will marry only the innocent parties to divorce suits, which means that only the parties who have sustained the wrong on account of which the divorce was granted will be remarried by them. Eighteen ministers will not remarry divorced persons under any circumstances: sixty three will not remarry those who according to the rules of their respective Churches, ought not to have sought for a divorce.

In New York similar methods are to be followed, according to the rules of the Churches to which the ministers belong.

We have no doubt that these resolutions will work for good so far as they go, by producing some moral effect; but as very few ministers can be expected to fall into line when the movement is limited to the voluntary action of individuals, we cannot expect that the divorce evil will be really stayed or checked to any considerable degree by this partial movement.

The mistake was made when Protestantism in the first instance opened the way to divorce by authorizing the

divorce of Henry VIII. from Queen Catharine of Arragon, and by permitting the polygamous marriage of Philip Landgrave of Hesse.

It is not possible to undo the evil thus begun unless the Catholic teaching of the indissolubility of marriage be fully adopted, a thing which Protestantism can never effect; and further, it must be admitted once for all that polygamy is not to be permitted under any circumstances.

THE ELECTION OF POPE PIUS X. AND THE AUSTRIAN VETO.

The Diary of the Roman Curia publishes the official report of the ballots cast for the election of a Pope after the death of the Holy Father Pope Leo XIII.

According to this report, there were seven ballotings. This agrees with what was published already at the time of the election. There were sixty-two Cardinals present, all of whom voted at each balloting.

At the first ballot, Cardinal Rampolla received 24 votes, Cardinal Gotti 17, Cardinal Sarto 5, and the remaining 16 votes were divided among 10 other members of the Sacred College.

At the second ballot, Cardinal Rampolla received 29, Cardinal Gotti 16, Cardinal Sarto 10, and the other 7 votes were scattering.

When the third ballot was about to be taken, Cardinal Puzyna announced that the Emperor of Austria wished that Cardinal Rampolla should not be elected to the Roman Pontificate.

Though this was expressed as a wish, it was well understood by all the Cardinals that it was intended as a veto on Cardinal Rampolla's election.

The Cardinal himself thereupon declared that it would be most pleasing to himself that he should not be chosen, but he strongly insisted that no layman had any right to interfere with the unrestricted right of the Cardinals to elect whomever they thought proper. Cardinals Oreglia and Perand also protested in vigorous language against such interference. The vote being then taken, Cardinal Rampolla received the same number of votes as at the previous ballot, 29, but Cardinal Sarto's vote was increased to 21.

At the 4th ballot taken in the evening, Cardinal Rampolla received 30 votes, being one more than in the morning, while Cardinal Sarto's vote rose to 24. From this forward Cardinal Sarto's vote increased till on the 7th ballot he received 50 votes, being 8 more than were necessary for his election, as a two thirds' vote is necessary under the law by which the election of the Supreme Pontiff is regulated.

It cannot be known whether the veto of Austria had any effect in preventing some of the Cardinals from giving their votes to Cardinal Rampolla, but the fact that he received his largest vote after the announcement of the veto makes it probable that the announcement had but little weight; yet it may have been that some of the Cardinals would not desire to enter into conflict with a powerful Catholic monarch like the Emperor of Austria, and that the veto thus had some influence. It is greatly to the credit of the body of Cardinals that the right of veto was repudiated by them and that when several Cardinals protested against it, the applause was general. However, the matter did not end here. On December 10th Count Golochowski, addressing the Hungarian delegation, declared that the three Catholic powers, France, Spain and Austria, had exercised the right of veto for centuries, though he admitted that it was not conceded by any ecclesiastical law; but custom, he contended, had confirmed the right, and he added that "Austria has no intention to abandon its right."

But will the Holy See yield the point? There is every reason to believe that it will not. Within a few days of Count Golochowski's announcement, the Holy Father called together the Cardinals of the Curia to deliberate whether or not the Veto had become a right established by custom, and whether it should be abolished. The Cardinals agreed that the Veto is an abuse, and that it had never become a right to any State inasmuch as it was never consented to by any Pope, and without the Pope's consent it could never become a law or a right. In fact, the Veto has been specially repudiated by Bulls issued by Pius IV., Gregory XV., Clement XII., and Pius IX., though it has not been named as a Veto in these Bulls. Pius IX. was especially explicit on the point, as he declared that Papal elections should be conducted "without any interference of lay power of any degree or condition whatsoever."

The Cardinals of the Curia, after stating these facts, besought the Holy Father decisively to put an end to a usurpation which under the present circumstances of the Church in its relations to civil powers, has become intolerable, and they have even asked that the sentence of excommunication, to be incurred by the very fact, shall be pronounced against any person, whatever his dignity may be, who shall presume to convey, to any future conclave, a Veto issued by any civil potentate or authority.

It is stated that the Holy Father has already drawn up a document embodying these views of the Curia in their entirety; and though this document has not yet been promulgated, it is said that it will be promulgated before another Conclave is held; and thus it may be taken for a certainty that the Veto shall never again be brought before the College of Cardinals when they assemble for the election of a Supreme Pontiff. The defiance of the Austrian statesman has thus been met by a counter blow with a promptitude unexampled in history, and that counter blow must be as effectual as it is direct.

It is stated that Italy was also preparing to claim the Veto right, which it never yet exercised; but the Pope's promptitude will effectually stop any such new claim, as it abolishes even the claims which have some pretension to antiquity.

There is no State which has protected the Holy See since it has specially needed protection; and it would be the greatest of incongruities if the Holy See were bound to grant a privilege which was never even tacitly allowed to any state which had not honored and protected the Papedom to an eminent degree.

The Italian Minister of Foreign Affairs, answering recently an interpellation by Senator Paterino, declared that the Italian Government had no part in any negotiations for the exercise of the Veto. Notwithstanding this denial, there is good reason to believe that it emanated from the triple alliance, and that Austria fulminated it because coming from a Catholic power in fairly good odor at the Vatican, it would be more likely to be efficacious. However this may be, it is somewhat satisfactory to find that the Italian Government now openly repudiates having had anything to do with the matter, as it will thus be more difficult hereafter for Italy to claim such a right which it deserves less than any other power, Catholic or Protestant.

tolerable, and they have even asked that the sentence of excommunication, to be incurred by the very fact, shall be pronounced against any person, whatever his dignity may be, who shall presume to convey, to any future conclave, a Veto issued by any civil potentate or authority.

It is stated that the Holy Father has already drawn up a document embodying these views of the Curia in their entirety; and though this document has not yet been promulgated, it is said that it will be promulgated before another Conclave is held; and thus it may be taken for a certainty that the Veto shall never again be brought before the College of Cardinals when they assemble for the election of a Supreme Pontiff. The defiance of the Austrian statesman has thus been met by a counter blow with a promptitude unexampled in history, and that counter blow must be as effectual as it is direct.

It is stated that Italy was also preparing to claim the Veto right, which it never yet exercised; but the Pope's promptitude will effectually stop any such new claim, as it abolishes even the claims which have some pretension to antiquity.

There is no State which has protected the Holy See since it has specially needed protection; and it would be the greatest of incongruities if the Holy See were bound to grant a privilege which was never even tacitly allowed to any state which had not honored and protected the Papedom to an eminent degree.

The Italian Minister of Foreign Affairs, answering recently an interpellation by Senator Paterino, declared that the Italian Government had no part in any negotiations for the exercise of the Veto. Notwithstanding this denial, there is good reason to believe that it emanated from the triple alliance, and that Austria fulminated it because coming from a Catholic power in fairly good odor at the Vatican, it would be more likely to be efficacious. However this may be, it is somewhat satisfactory to find that the Italian Government now openly repudiates having had anything to do with the matter, as it will thus be more difficult hereafter for Italy to claim such a right which it deserves less than any other power, Catholic or Protestant.

ANOTHER STRANGE SUPERSTITION.

There is a "Divine Healing" community at Shiloh, in the woods of the State of Maine, which, though not connected with the Eddyite and Dowiette frauds, is in several respects similar to both of these, and especially so in this feature, that in them all in the healing of diseases and infirmities, all recourse to physicians and the use of medicine are strictly forbidden. This sect is called by the strange name of the "Holy Ghost and Us Community."

The Rev. F. W. Sanford is the authority in this sect, and, hidden in the woods as it has been, this modern Moses has exercised an absolutism over his deluded followers which throws into the shade the doings of the Chicago Elijah, John Alexander Dowie, but with this difference, that Sanford has not the money power of the Chicago impostor.

Somewhat over a year ago the Rev. N. H. Harriman of Boston published in a Portland paper, The Press, an account of the doings at Shiloh. He belonged to the community, but became disgusted with it for the reason that its chief exercised over his devotees a rule of terror to such an extent that they had become physical wrecks, and were in consequence completely incapacitated from offering any resistance to their stern ruler.

The Rev. W. C. Stiles was sent by a New York paper to investigate the condition of the people of the "Holy Ghost and Us" sect, and his report bears out fully the statements of the Rev. Mr. Harriman.

The temple of the sect is a great building on Beulah Hill overlooking the Androscoggin river, and some smaller buildings are near by in which most of the people of the sect live, though others are at greater distances. These buildings were erected by means of incredible sacrifices on the part of the Rev. F. W. Sanford's dupes: some women having walked from Boston to add the amount of their fare to the building fund.

Many members of the sect were turned adrift after giving all their possessions into Sanford's hands. One man was expelled because his soles had run away from the settlement, and he could not induce them to return. This man had to pay \$3,000 into Sanford's hands. He was sent forth penniless and ragged, wearing an old pair of slippers made of pulp waste, and died in an old forest camp of smallpox, contracted at Shiloh. The people of Lisbon Falls supplied his widow with food and shelter to save her from starvation, but not a devotee of the "Holy Ghost and Us" community ever enquired to learn the fate of man or woman.

Miracles are said to have been wrought by the Rev. Sanford, such as the growing of shortened limbs, cancer cures, consumption and other cures, and even one dead woman was said to have been raised from death; but these cures could not be verified by any authentic testimony.

Sanford arranged many times for funds to be brought to him at a particular moment when it would seem that the funds came in answer to his prayers.

He would assert that God would provide a certain amount, say before 12 o'clock, noon. A meeting would be held before the appointed hour and he would call upon the brethren to pray, thus:

"Shall we let the great God be proved a liar? Pray, brethren pray." So they pray, they groan, they mean on their faces, they call hysterically on the Almighty. Four minutes, three minutes, two minutes to twelve! Then, hallelujah! the telegram! Some one rushes up to the desk with it. Breathless silence! "Praise the Lord. Unknown benefactor says he will give all that is lacking." Hysteria reigns, and this blasphemous gets glory to himself as a man who holds the very keys of the Kingdom of Heaven."

Rev. Mr. Styles declares:

"There are in every Church, perhaps, restless emotional spirits, overstrained, visionary and millenarian in their views. Some of them, apart from these tendencies, are good workers, and nearly always they are sincere. To these people who need judicious checks on their nervous tendencies, Sanford supplies instead, the spur. They are excitable: he excites them. . . . They like wild singing, noise, out-of-door meetings: he arranges and conducts them. Many of these people, left unmolested, would remain edifying and spiritually safe under the ordinary influences of the gospel. Under the hypnotism of Sanford they fall on their faces, they groan aloud, utter moans like dumb animals in pain, rise and fling their arms about wildly. Women shriek and dishevel their hair. . . . All the evidences of diabolic obsession appear at these dreadful meetings."

Sanford arranged many times for funds to be brought to him at a particular moment when it would seem that the funds came in answer to his prayers.

He would assert that God would provide a certain amount, say before 12 o'clock, noon. A meeting would be held before the appointed hour and he would call upon the brethren to pray, thus:

"Shall we let the great God be proved a liar? Pray, brethren pray." So they pray, they groan, they mean on their faces, they call hysterically on the Almighty. Four minutes, three minutes, two minutes to twelve! Then, hallelujah! the telegram! Some one rushes up to the desk with it. Breathless silence! "Praise the Lord. Unknown benefactor says he will give all that is lacking." Hysteria reigns, and this blasphemous gets glory to himself as a man who holds the very keys of the Kingdom of Heaven."

Rev. Mr. Styles declares:

"There are in every Church, perhaps, restless emotional spirits, overstrained, visionary and millenarian in their views. Some of them, apart from these tendencies, are good workers, and nearly always they are sincere. To these people who need judicious checks on their nervous tendencies, Sanford supplies instead, the spur. They are excitable: he excites them. . . . They like wild singing, noise, out-of-door meetings: he arranges and conducts them. Many of these people, left unmolested, would remain edifying and spiritually safe under the ordinary influences of the gospel. Under the hypnotism of Sanford they fall on their faces, they groan aloud, utter moans like dumb animals in pain, rise and fling their arms about wildly. Women shriek and dishevel their hair. . . . All the evidences of diabolic obsession appear at these dreadful meetings."

Surely all this is evidence of diabolic rather than of divine influence, nevertheless weak-minded persons are duped into the belief that they are under the influence of the divine spirit while these things are being enacted.

It is surely true that there is no religious fraud which will not have its dupes where once every man is left to follow the impulses of his own imagination, instead of the divine authority of the Church which Christ established on earth to teach His gospel unerringly to all mankind. This authority is found only in the Catholic Church which He commands all to hear under penalty of being as the heathen and the publican.

Rev. Mr. Styles states that in that small Shiloh community, where it is claimed that miracles were more frequent than were performed by Christ and His Apostles, there is a higher death-rate than in any city in Maine. Twenty deaths occurred in twenty months: six of small-pox, two of diphtheria, and others of various curable diseases.

Within a few months sixty persons were turned penniless out of this community after being deprived of all their earthly possessions.

One man had given a white chariot and a pair of white horses to the supreme prophet, and not being allowed to take them away, he sent an officer to get them, whereupon they were given up without resistance. For the most part, these deluded people received nothing back of all they had given to the prophet. They are too much broken down in health and spirit to demand their rights. Here again there is a likeness between the cases of Landoff, Dowie, and Mrs. Eddy, inasmuch as all are wealthy from the hard earnings of their dupes; but Sanford has few votaries in comparison with the other two, and is therefore less wealthy.

CHURCH MUSIC IN THE NEW WESTMINSTER CATHEDRAL.

The Most Rev. Dr. Bourne, Archbishop of Westminster, was received by the Holy Father Pope Pius X. in a farewell audience on Dec. 11th before the Archbishop left Rome for Milan. The Pope took special interest in the character of the music which should be used in the new Westminster Cathedral, expressing his wish that the historically Catholic Gregorian music should be used, and not the figured style which is more suitable for theatres than for Churches. He desires that special attention should be given to the training of a body of chorists whose chant should rival the Anglican choirs at Westminster Abbey and St. Paul's, and it is said that the Archbishop intends fully to carry out the plan laid down for his guidance by the Holy Father, and indicated in the Holy Father's recent decree on Church music.

MARRIAGE.

M., Cornwall, Ont., asks:

"If a Catholic person be married to a Protestant by a Protestant minister, can he or she be admitted to Holy Communion in the Catholic Church?"

It is always wrong, and a sin, for a Catholic to be married by a Protestant minister; for he who does this recog-