

The Catholic Record.

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

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

REV. GEORGE H. NORTHGRAVES, Author of "Mistakes of Modern Infidels."

THOMAS COFFEY, Publisher and Proprietor, Thomas Coffey, Messrs. Luke King, John Nigh, P. J. Neven and Joseph P. 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 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 Tuesday morning. Advertisers 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, February 12, 1898

In our issue of January 22nd there appeared an editorial note having reference to the illness of Rev. Father Doyle, the learned Paulist. This was an error, as we intended to have referred to the retirement of the editor of The Rosary Magazine, Rev. Father J. L. O'Neill, who is a member of the Dominican order. Father O'Neill has been forced to retire from the editorship for a time on account of illness.

THE TORY MINIMUM

The British Government is busily engaged in preparing a local government scheme for Ireland, which, it is hoped, will be satisfactory to the people of that country instead of Home Rule, which they have hitherto demanded. The Conservatives have come to the conclusion that a reform in this direction must be conceded, but they declare that the interests of the loyal minority must be safeguarded to the fullest extent. It is, therefore, proposed that, though the Irish County Councils shall be allowed large powers of local government, the viceroy in council shall have power to deal summarily with flagrant cases of abuse of power and injustice. The control of the police is not to be given to the County Councils, and applications for compensation for malicious injuries are to be left either to the grand juries or to the courts of law. It does not seem that those provisions will suffice to satisfy Ireland's demands, though they may greatly ameliorate the present condition of affairs. They will probably be accepted as concessions which will prepare the way for a real Home Rule measure.

IRISH CATHOLIC UNIVERSITIES.

The declaration having been several times made by Mr. Balfour and other members of the British Government, that the time has come when it is necessary to establish a Catholic university for Ireland to meet the just demands of the people, the Orange press are protesting loudly that they will never submit to the appropriation of "Protestant money" for a Catholic educational institution. If we may be allowed to use a form of speech which attributes religion to so material a substance as money, we may call attention to the fact that there was no complaint from the same papers when Catholic money was taken, as it has been and is yet, to support the Protestant universities, and a system of education to which Catholic ratepayers have conscientious objections. The whole population, Catholics and Protestants alike, are compelled to pay for the maintenance of Protestant professors, for the supply of Protestant text books, and for keeping up Protestant religious services. The Orangemen do not measure with the same measure they would wish to be employed for themselves.

THE CATHOLIC PRESS.

We notice by our American exchanges that the clergy of the Archdiocese of San Francisco recently presented to Rev. Father York, editor of the San Francisco Monitor, an address accompanied with a purse of \$800, as a tribute to their fellow priest, who so ably defends the cause of religion in the Monitor. We congratulate the Rev. Father York on this evidence that his labors are appreciated by his co-laborers in the ministry. He well deserves their confidence and esteem, for he has made the Monitor one of the ablest and most vigorous Catholic papers in America. The Monitor is also duly appreciated and highly approved by the Archbishop of San Francisco, the city in which it is published.

The due appreciation of Catholic papers is in accordance with the spirit and wish of the Episcopate of the United States, which in a pastoral letter, issued by the Third Council of Baltimore, thus recommended a good support of the Catholic press by all the Catholic people of the country:

"If the head of each Catholic family will recognize it as his privilege and duty to contribute towards supporting the Catholic press, by subscribing for one or more Catholic periodicals, and keeping himself well acquainted with the information they impart, the Catholic press will be sure to attain to its rightful development and to accomplish its destined mission."

SATURDAY OR SUNDAY.

The Rabbi Gries, one of the prominent Jewish Rabbis of the United States, has created a considerable sensation by proposing that Sunday should be observed by his nation instead of Saturday. He maintains that neither the Sabbath nor the Christian Sunday is of divine origin, though it was the intention of God, when giving the decalogue, to have one day kept sacred out of seven, and that the idea of the Sabbath is of more importance than the particular day on which it is to be kept. He infers that it is desirable to keep the same day as Christians here, so that there may be a real Sabbath, which is not the case with the Jews at present. If the Sunday be kept, he holds that Jews will be able to devote the whole day—morning, afternoon, and night—to rest and the service of God.

A HAPPY OCCASION.

That was a happy gathering at the Chateau Frontenac, Quebec, on the occasion of the banquet tendered the Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick by his friends and admirers. What rendered the event all the more pleasing was the fact that politicians of every grade, people of all nationalities as well as of all creeds, assembled to do honor to the Solicitor-General. This is as it should be. We have too much acrimony in Canadian politics, and the sooner we get out of this old rut the better. The Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick deserves the honor paid him. He is a type of politician which, we regret to say, is not very common. Too many men go into politics solely for the purpose of gratifying an inordinate ambition, and they are often actuated by the hope of gaining thereby more than their honest day of the world's goods. In the Solicitor-General we have one who is a credit to his creed and to his country. It is true that he is ambitious, but his ambition is a lofty one, surrounded and guided by the best and purest of motives—love of country and an earnest desire to promote its best interests.

RITUALISM CAUSES TROUBLE.

A disturbance occurred last week in the Church of St. Hubertas, Bishops-gate, London, owing to the introduction of ritualistic observances there. The vicar is an old man who lives at Hastings, out of the parish, and the curate, who was recently appointed, introduced holy water, the incense, stations of the cross, incense and other practices in use among Catholics. This angered a portion of the congregation who had been accustomed to the Low Church forms of worship, and a mob gathered who are said to have turned the church into a bear garden with their howls, declaring that the church was being used for a dirty confessional and for debauching. Those who sustained the clergyman endeavored to put down the unseemly demonstration, and the controversy became almost a riot. Such epithets as scoundrels, liars, drunkards were freely exchanged between the contending parties. At last a resolution was adopted favoring the ritualistic practices, those sustaining the clergyman being a majority of the congregation, but it is announced on behalf of the minority that the quarrel will be continued, and the majority have called upon the police to preserve order for the next occasion when there will be service.

A PARALLEL CASE.

An incident which has just occurred at Poughkeepsie, N. Y., shows how much reliance is to be placed in the liberality of a Protestant majority in educational matters, when fanaticism is appealed to for the purpose of harassing Catholics who attempt to conduct Catholic schools efficiently.

Many of our readers will remember that for several years the schools of Poughkeepsie have been carried on in a manner satisfactory to both Protestants and Catholics. There is a large Catholic population in the town, but instead of keeping up a system of independent parochial schools, the Catholics agreed to put their schools under the Public School Committee, and to conduct them in accordance with the requirements of the Public school law. This was done, and the

Catholics rented their school houses to the Public School Board at a nominal rent of \$1 per annum. The Catholic Sisters, who are certificated teachers, were employed by the Board, and religious teaching took place after legal school hours.

This arrangement has been gall and wormwood to the ministers, and they have made every effort to bring it to an end. It is now probable their purpose will be effected, as complaint was lodged at their instigation against the Sisters, to prevent them from wearing their community garb in the school-house, and the Superintendent has stated that when the matter will be officially before him he will order the Sisters to be dismissed.

If the Catholic children be sent to the Public schools under these circumstances, the Board will be obliged to build new school-houses for their accommodation, so that in this way the bigotry of the ministers and of the Superintendent will be visited on the people of the town. The lesson to be derived from the incident shows what may at some time be expected from the Manitoba majority, if the Catholics of the Province give up their constitutional rights in order to accept as a favor and by subterfuge what is theirs by law and equity.

ONCE AGAIN.

Father Pardow was practically at odds with the multitude as any opponent while he stuck to abstract theological questions, but when he ventured the assumption that the Church kept the Bible easily within the reach of the people, and that the price lists of the Roman Catholic book-stores in Canada would easily verify this, he threw himself open to a shower of replies from people who had made every reasonable effort to procure a cheap copy of any Bible which the Roman Catholic Church has without ambiguity approved.—Montreal Witness.

In the discussion of many questions the editor of the Montreal Witness displays a candor which is really admirable; but when treating of matters Catholic, we regret to say it, there is ever perceptible a narrowness and an unfairness which is exceedingly discreditable. It is a common—indeed, we may say, a favorite—belief of the average Protestant that Catholics are not permitted to read the Scriptures. The editor of the Witness appears to hold the same view, and no matter what the evidence may be to the contrary he will still proclaim that Catholics are not permitted to read the Bible. Will the editor of the Witness kindly inform those people who claim they showered letters upon Father Pardow that in the bookstore attached to the CATHOLIC RECORD office they can, from 7 o'clock in the morning until 6 in the evening, purchase any number of copies of the Scriptures. We have them at all prices and in all bindings, from \$1.00 to \$7.00, and we consider it no trouble to show goods. The book we offer at \$7.00 is 12x10 1/4, beautifully illustrated, and weighs twelve pounds, and a copy of the CATHOLIC RECORD is sent free for one year to the purchaser. We do not think there is a Protestant Bible of the same quality sold at an equally low figure. Will he also please say that there is not, to our positive knowledge, a Catholic bookstore in Canada in which copies of the Holy Scriptures are not for sale. If he wishes to test the truth of our statement we would ask him to take a walk, only a few blocks from the Witness office, to the store of Messrs. Sadlier, on Notre Dame street, and he will be convinced that those who showered the letters on Father Pardow simply stated in those letters what was contrary to the truth. Furthermore he will find that in every Catholic bible appears a letter from Pius IV. in which he says that "the faithful should be exhorted to the reading of the Sacred Scriptures." Where is the ambiguity here? It is a pity that a paper wielding such influence as does the Witness should so frequently bear false witness against its Catholic neighbors.

CATHOLIC EDUCATION IN NEW YORK.

At a meeting of priests held in New York a few days ago, statistics were read showing the work done by the Catholic parochial schools of the city and State. In New York proper, where many of the children attend the Public schools, the number in attendance at the parochial schools was 37,821, and in Brooklyn over 50,000. If to these we add 4,422 pupils attending the colleges and academies we have a total of over 92,243 for greater New York. Interest on property debt and cost of maintenance of the parochial schools for the year amounted to \$522,668. The value of the parochial school property is set down at \$1,574,000.

In the whole State, the number of pupils attending the Catholic schools is 129,945, and with 10,000 in colleges

and academies, the total reaches 139,945.

These schools are entirely supported by the voluntary efforts of the Catholics themselves, who tax themselves thus in order to secure a Catholic education for their children, though they pay the Public school tax likewise.

These figures put in a strong light the gross injustice done to Catholics by obliging them to pay for the education of Protestant children, while they are making such great sacrifices for the education of their own. There are, however, a few schools in the State, as at Poughkeepsie, which are recognized as part of the Public school system, and thus the injustice is somewhat moderated in these localities.

The injustice of which we have spoken is the same which is perpetrated in Manitoba, though in the Canadian province it is not on so gigantic a scale. But comparing the wealth of the two localities, the injustice inflicted on the poorer people of the province, greatly exceeds that done in New York.

The New York city parochial schools are admirably conducted, and so great is their success that the children attending them take first place in the annual competitive examinations year after year, when the children from all the schools compete together.

THEY WERE NOT DIVORCES.

The following item appeared recently in a number of the daily papers, being an account of the supposed duties performed by the Congregation of Cardinals at Rome which deals with matrimonial causes:

London, Jan. 21.—The Vatican statistician announces that last year the Congregation of Cardinals received 491 applications for the annulment of marriage, took about half of them into consideration, and cut the bonds in only six cases. Old-fashioned ideas as to the sanctity of marriage still rule at the Vatican.

We are thus informed that the Vatican adheres to the old-fashioned ideas on the sanctity of marriage, which is true. Marriage was elevated by Christ to the dignity of a sacrament of the New Law, and man was forbidden to annul the tie which God had joined, and the Catholic Church still maintains this ordinance of our Blessed Lord, old-fashioned and obsolete though many Protestants of to-day imagine it to be.

The writer of the cablegram, however, is evidently mistaken in regard to the divorces said to have been granted by the Congregation of Cardinals, for it is well known that such divorces are not granted at all when marriages have been duly contracted and consummated.

This being the case, it may be presumed that in the 490 cases in which divorces are said to have been asked for, even if the number be correctly stated, at least those cases which were seriously considered were not petitions for divorce, but merely representations that the supposed marriages were null and void from the beginning. Of course if there exists an impediment which nullifies marriage, there is no marriage at all, even when the marriage ceremony is performed. The parties to the supposed marriage in such a case are free to contract other unions, where no impediment exists. Thus if a man who has a living wife attempts to contract another marriage, the supposed second marriage would be null. There are also cases of kindred and affinity wherein marriage is prohibited by divine or ecclesiastical law, and the Church has for good reasons made some other impediments.

But public order demands that at least in cases where any doubt exists there should be an authority to decide whether the marriage was a real one or not. The Congregation of Cardinals referred to above has authority to investigate such cases, and to pronounce upon the validity or invalidity of marriages which have been thus contracted; that is to say, it has authority to decide whether or not any impediment existed which nullified a supposed marriage, but it grants no divorces to those who have been truly married.

We deem it necessary to make this statement, as it might be supposed from the despatch which has been so widely disseminated by the papers, that the Catholic Church grants divorces, which is not true, and the smallness of the number of cases in which it is said to have been decided adversely to the validity of the marriage proves how strictly the law laid down by our Blessed Lord is observed by the Church. But when there was a preceding impediment which nullified a marriage, it is clear that it was the duty of the Congregation of Cardinals to declare the marriage null, and to set it aside. But this does not constitute what is understood by divorce. It confirms, in

stead of militating against the fact that the Catholic Church does not allow a marriage once consummated to be dissolved except by the death of the husband or wife.

The bonds in the six cases referred to in the press despatch were not cut, but if the cases occurred at all, invalid bonds were declared by the Congregation to be void from the beginning.

THE MANITOBA SCHOOL QUESTION.

Much has been said by some of the papers regarding the advisability of Catholics relying on the generosity of the people of Manitoba to grant to Catholics in practice the liberty of education which is guaranteed by the Constitution, instead of insisting on the rights thus guaranteed.

In sustaining this view these papers tell us that the Protestant majority in Manitoba will be sure to act as liberally as the Protestants of Ontario and Nova Scotia have done.

In regard to the Protestants of Ontario, it must be noted that the rights of Catholics were secured when Ontario and Quebec were united under one Legislature, and when, therefore, Catholics formed very nearly one-half of the population of the united provinces, though they were but a small fraction of the population of Ontario. It was this fact, and not the spontaneous generosity of the Protestant majority in Ontario, which gave Catholics the School Act of 1863. That Act was passed chiefly by the votes of Lower Canadian, both the Catholics and the Protestants of that Province being in favor of it. The Catholics supported it, because they were strong in the determination that the Catholics of Ontario should have the same justice which was enjoyed by the Protestant minority in Quebec through the generosity of the Catholic majority, and the Protestants of Quebec did the same, because they felt the incongruity and injustice inflicted upon Ontario Catholics, while they enjoyed a system of education according to their desires.

It is not going too far to say that the Catholic Separate School Act of Ontario would never have been granted, or anything approaching to it, if the Catholics had to rely solely on the generosity of the Protestant majority, for there was undoubtedly a Protestant majority in our Province which was determined never to grant the Catholic demands, and the Province was convulsed from end to end with agitators who opposed those demands so determinedly that a Protestant majority was constantly elected to Parliament to resist them.

In Nova Scotia the case was different. The majority was Protestant both in Parliament and throughout the country, and Separate schools were never granted there by law; but in course of time, by a liberal interpretation of the law, many Catholic schools were in practice recognized as belonging to the Public school system. This liberality was due largely to the fact that Catholics are more numerous in proportion to the population of the Province than are Catholics in Ontario, being more than double the percentage. This fact gave Catholics greater comparative influence, as a larger proportion were constantly in close contact with Catholics, and were more liberally inclined on this account. Besides, there were many localities where Catholics were in the majority, or were at least very nearly half the population. The injustice of inflicting on them a double tax was thus brought more strongly as an object lesson before the eyes of the Protestants, and though a Catholic school system was never conceded, in practice there were many Catholic schools granted to the Public schools.

This may to some small extent be conceded to Catholics in Manitoba, but as the majority in that Province is even more decisively Protestant now than in the case in Ontario, it is not likely that the Protestants there will act as generously as the Protestant majority in Nova Scotia have done. It is, therefore, a fallacy to endeavor to persuade Catholics to let the Manitoba question rest itself when it may please the Protestant majority to grant redress for the iniquitous legislation of 1891. It is not at all likely that redress will be given at all, unless Catholics enforce their rights under the Constitution. The injury has now lasted for six years, and is likely to last much longer unless they be active in asserting themselves. Besides, it is a most unreasonable demand that we should appear as supplicants before a Government which has already spurned all efforts at conciliation, while we have the judgment of

the Privy Council in our favor, showing that we are in the right.

INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC IN CHURCHES.

The question of instrumental music in churches is one which years ago troubled greatly the Presbyterian body, but we had thought that it was definitely settled by the good sense of the present generation in favor of the use of those laws of nature which are God's creation, as a medium of thanksgiving and praise to Him by whom those laws were created.

The laws whereby sound is produced are part of the economy of nature, and it is part of the human constitution to be agreeably affected by its harmonious combination or melody. There can be, therefore, no valid objection to its use in divine worship.

Songs of praise were used under the Old Law, by the sanction of Almighty God, at so early a period as the time when the Israelites were delivered by Moses from their bondage. They were the first act of thanksgiving of the Israelites after their delivery from the army of the Egyptians which pursued them into the dry passage of the Red Sea, whereupon the waters were miraculously made to return to their place, overwhelming the pursuing army. Then Moses and the children of Israel sung a canticle of triumph, saying: "Let us sing to the Lord; for He is gloriously magnified. . . . He is my God, and I will glorify Him, the God of my father, and I will exalt Him." And even at this early period instrumental music was used to accompany the songs of praise, for Mary, the sister of Moses, took a timbrel in her hand, and all the women, also with timbrels, continued the canticle of joy which was begun by Moses and the men. Harps and psalteries, trumpets, cymbals, and other musical instruments were from that time in constant use in and out of the temple of God, and it was for use in the temple that the Psalms of David were composed, that songs of praise and thanksgiving might be employed in the public worship offered to God, for which purpose bands of singers and skilful players on the musical instruments used were appointed to be in constant attendance in the temple of God at Jerusalem.

In the face of such facts it is strange that among those who profess to found their religious belief and practice upon the Bible, any should condemn the use of music and musical instruments. But from a sermon delivered a couple of weeks ago in a Presbyterian Church on Carlton Street, Toronto, it seems that the Knoxonian tradition condemning the use of instrumental music, is still upheld by some worthy descendants of those who in days gone by denounced the "kist o' whistles," by which name those designated the church organ.

The Rev. Mr. Dempster, on the date referred to, announced as the subject of his sermon "a new cart." He explained that this quaint subject on which he intended to speak signified that "when David went to the house of Aminadab to bring thence the arc, he had set it upon a new cart, instead of bringing it up according to the custom appointed by God." He then declared that "the only means which had been appointed by God as the manner in which His praises should be sung was the singing of the Psalms of David as they are sung in his church, by the human voice, whereas by introducing instrumental music the Church had committed the sin of making a cart in which to bring praise to God."

Of course Mr. Dempster means here by the Church the Presbyterian Church, but beside this he included in his condemnation Episcopalians and Catholics, concerning whom he said that the former allow in their church services "whatever is not forbidden in the Bible, and the latter (Catholics) hold to be lawful and permissible whatever is instituted by the Pope or the courts of the Church." Here also, notwithstanding that he had just condemned the Presbyterian Church for using the "new cart," he says: "The Presbyterian position is based upon this saith the Lord."

We may first notice the rev. gentleman's inconsistency in condemning and praising Presbyterian principles in one breath: condemning them because of their introducing what he maintains to be contrary to God's law, and then praising them for austere holding to that law.

Secondly, Mr. Dempster exhibits a religious egotism and self-sufficiency which are truly remarkable. According to the Bible, the Church of Christ is the "pillar and ground of truth,"

and on its practice and may therefore safely be faith and devotional ac Dempster declares the Church of Christ has wrong; and not only the Churches, for it is that in the face of Holy speaks of only one Chr by Christ, Rev. Mr those who believe w those who were m customed to speak of Christ, as if they were ming in their creeds. A preacher, therefore, Churches of Christ hav into error, leaving on ton Street Presbyterian to observe faithfully ments of God!

But Mr. Dempster that God had authorize musical services held law.

He says: "David w He was appointed to G was a prophet, and so Nathan, and music w office, and this clear to the time of Christ, new rule."

This is strange re part of a descendant Covenanters, whom L his history, admits to religion on the Old T than on the New. B here there is no evide that Christ or His A new rule on this s instrumental music. f ore, as lawful under the Old Law, and it w the Church, the pill truth, to regulate it music appropriate to God's service shou Church. The office o was not given to the ster or the Carlton Str

Down to the time o Great we have very the early Christians treat chiefly of doctri be surprised that the music which v churches, but the Church, handed down period, with its ven and canticles, imple used, and there can this music was bot vocal as under the C the fourth century tainly used constant every reason to bel titles, singing, mel hymns mentioned by v. 19 and Col. iii. panned by instrum harps and other m described by St. J. alyse, as being p throne of God, were during the worship Christian Churches haps, we should s forms of worship u employed by the A more lively con heavenly abode.

We should here furation of the innu Mr. Dempster ag Church. Catholics the Pope or the Ch abolish what is but certainly she make use of what add to the digni and to excite rev for the same, ju to the Corinthian tion of them he v in order. (1 Cor. x

But Mr. Dempster byterians permit which is backed declaration, "Th Where will the Scripture a descrii cutty stool wh recent date was terian Churches?"

A FAIR REPLY.

In view of the testants, and esp religious press ac customed to malig hood, it is pleas are some religio not join in the g derous accusation

It will be reme that on Thank President McKi ist, was atten which the Rev. M that clergyman able attack upon ing to them a sy traffic of the Ur the corrupt rule York.

The New Yor