

The Catholic Record. Published Weekly at 464 and 466 Richmond Street, London, Ontario.

REV. GEORGE R. NORTHGRAVE, Author of "Mistakes of Modern Infidels," THOMAS COFFEY.

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.

London, Saturday, March 4, 1899.

"ACTS OF PAUL."

It is stated that in Egypt some tattered papyrus has been discovered by a German resident which was secured by Dr. Carl Schmidt and sent to the Library of the University of Heidelberg.

THE SALVATION ARMY.

According to statistics given by the New York Independent, the Salvation Army has remained stationary in the number of adherents during the past year.

RELIGIOUS FREEDOM.

Mr. J. S. Elkington, who is a minister of the Society of Friends, Philadelphia, which is usually known by the name of Quakers, in an interview with a representative of the Montreal Witness, strongly advises the Protestant denominations of Canada against being too hasty in their efforts to convert the Doukhobors who have settled in the North-West to their various forms of belief.

RESULTS OF PRIVATE JUDGMENT.

A recent issue of the New York Independent says that religious statistics reveal the existence of forty-eight denominations in the United States, but adds that many of these are subdivided into numerous minor sects.

devil takes up his residence within hogs, and that therefore all hogs should be killed. Recently eleven hogs were killed by two Zionites, who were thereupon prosecuted by neighbors, but as one of the hog killers was part owner of the hogs, he was acquitted.

THE CATECHISM OF THE FREE CHURCHES.

The new "Catechism of the Free Churches of England and Wales" which was announced with quite a flourish of trumpets as a great step toward uniting into one all the so-called Evangelical churches appears to have fallen very flat on the churches for whose benefit it was composed.

The boast was that it was to unite, by a federal union at least, all the Free Churches of Great Britain, and it was taken as a matter of course that where Great Britain's Evangelicalism showed the way, all the American and Continental churches which claim to come under the designation Evangelical would follow.

It did not require the foresight of a prophet to foretell that such a creed as the committee of the Free Churches has succeeded in hatching out would be unacceptable to those for whom it was intended.

It is the Toronto Presbyterian Review which makes the above damaging admissions; yet we remember that not so very long ago, only a few years, while we were defending Catholic doctrine against certain attacks which were published in the Review, we were very sharply taken to task for having stated that at the present day many Presbyterians, and particularly many of the Presbyterian clergy, do not believe in the Presbyterian standards of faith.

With regard to the new Catechism itself, it does not appear that it will be accepted even by any one of the sects that are supposed to have had a hand in its compilation. Their organs almost with one accord repudiate it as "too weak or too thin," and agree

that it would be nonsensical to use it for the instruction of their children, so the boasted new Union Church with sixty million adherents to its creed is but a freak of the imagination after all!—a mere "medley of disjointed things!"

CHURCH AUTHORITY.

Recent sermons delivered by the Rev. Dr. Benjamin F. DeCosta, one of the most learned and prominent of the Episcopalian ministers of New York city, have very much excited other ministers of various Protestant denominations, and have elicited much acrimonious discussion; but the interminable variety of the positions taken by the Doctor's assailants have only accentuated the points on which he insisted as showing the failure of Protestantism as a system of religion.

Regarding private judgment, he says: "Private judgment furnishes as many judgments as there are men and women in the world. It is puerile for those who deny individual opinion to pretend to believe in any Church. The Church must be everything or nothing, and with the majority of sectarians in our country, it is nothing but the butt of ridicule. The sooner these religionists stop pretending to believe in the Church idea and retire from the whole Church business the better it will be for the world."

"What the world needs today is the Church that speaks with authority, the Church that knows the truth and does not fear to tell it."

This might easily be taken for Catholic teaching uttered by a Catholic priest. It is the teaching of Holy Scripture that the "Church of the living God is the pillar and ground of truth." Therefore it teaches with authority. It knows the truth and does not fear to promulgate it. But this characteristic does not pertain to any of the sects. It belongs only to the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church. No other Church can pronounce definitely that it teaches without admixture of error all that Christ taught. The sects all acknowledge an admixture of error in their doctrine, and their liability to err is part of their essential teaching, inasmuch as they all acknowledge that we are not to look to the authoritative decisions of the Church, or of any Church for the final decision of any doctrinal difficulty, but solely to what each individual deduces, or imagines he can deduce, from the words of Scripture.

As every individual imagines he finds in Scripture the doctrines which he has preconceived, and is authorized by the rule of faith invented for his use by Protestantism to follow this course, Dr. DeCosta is right in maintaining that private judgment leads to innumerable absurdities, and is, by all rules of logic, itself absurd.

The system of religion founded upon such a rule of faith must be also absurd as well as uncertain in its teachings. This is set forth by Dr. DeCosta in the following terms:

"To say that uncertainty must be the prevailing characteristic of Christianity is to say that Christ organized His Church and sent it forth to the world like a ship at sea with out ballast, rudder or compass. As a matter of fact, too, hardly a single private judgment religionist pretends to have a helmsman. Every body on board is helmsman, and we all know how they steer."

Dr. DeCosta is not the only prominent Protestant clergyman who has recently pointed out the danger of this principle of private judgment as the basis of religious faith. Thus Dr. Carman, the Canadian Methodist General Superintendent, at the last General Conference of his Church, held in Toronto in September, declared: "there are those who, while admitting that the blocks of the Scriptural edifice are right, say that it (the Scripture) was nurtured by human weakness."

The Superintendent thus declares that the judgment of individuals leads to the demoralizing consequence that the Bible itself, the very basis of Christian truth, is a precarious and frail foundation of belief. But his remedy is precisely that which Protestants in general are not willing to accept. He wishes to set up the authority of the Church as the barrier against the wanderings of the human intellect in matters which regard Christian faith.

He said, in continuation: "Thus the way is opened to slip out block after block of the Bible. And they call this learning! We want none of it. We want not their order in our institutions, nor the baleful shadows of their false lights, the echoes of their discordant doubts."

the attack was thus thrown on the shoulders of a common no-Popery fanatic, Sir Samuel Smith, who is of little account in the House. Sir William Harcourt has further incurred the displeasure of the brute force anti-Ritualists by writing a letter to the Times, in which, while not departing from his former expressions of disapproval of Ritualistic practices, he nevertheless declares that they are not a matter on which legislation would be proper.

On the occasion we have referred to another clergyman in the Conference, the Rev. Chancellor Burwash, of Victoria University, plainly laid down the principle, in opposition to Dr. Carman's pronouncement, that neither the Conference nor the Church has the right to restrict the conclusions reached by men of learning. He said:

"The old methods of work are giving place to new. New ideas are taking the place of the old ways of thinking. He maintained that the Church must keep pace with the advances of learning and must change to keep up with recent discoveries, otherwise it will have no hope to be the Church of the future."

It is needless to say that the Chancellor cannot be driven from his position, if it is to be admitted that the right of private judgment in the interpretation of Scripture is the rule of Faith which Christ meant to be supreme; but if Christ has established a Church to teach His truth to the end of time, with certainty and infallibility, Dr. Carman was right in maintaining that the authority of the Church should be respected even by the learned. But in this case it is clear that the Church which possesses this authority is not Methodism, which had its beginning only a little more than a century ago. Only that Church which has existed continuously since the time of Christ, and which exists to day in all her primitive vigor, can claim to be the possessor of that authority: that is to say, the only possessor of such authority is the Catholic Church. She alone can preserve Christianity from disintegration and division into sects maintaining the most discordant views, because her authority alone has been derived directly from Christ and indubitably handed down throughout her nearly nineteen centuries of vigorous existence.

Here we may notice a theory which many Protestants have maintained, that sects are inevitable in Christianity, and that it is not even desirable that they should cease to exist.

This theory has become almost explicated among Protestants themselves, since Protestantism has become a missionary religion, which has been the case only recently. It is now seen that in the face of the heathen world a divided Christianity has no power to convert those groping in the darkness of heathen superstitions, and therefore that such a religion cannot fulfil the mission imposed by Christ on His Church to teach all nations. Yet some cling to this fallacy in spite of the contrary teaching of reason and experience. We, therefore, deem it advisable to give Dr. DeCosta's convincing argument in refutation of it. He says:

"To say that a divided Christianity is inevitable is to deny the power of Christ, thus rendering His body headless. This is that practical atheism in the foul slough of which sectarianism is wallowing to day. The real situation is being realized by men of the best intelligence all over the land, who are asking for an authoritative religion, and are rapidly coming to believe that they can have what they want."

This cannot be had by any patching up of man-made religions; nor by the issuing of colorless catechisms the object of which is to conceal the differences of the creeds of various sects under an ambiguous form of words, which everyone may interpret as he sees fit, but only by submission to the one Church which Christ instituted and which has remained unchanged and unchangeable for nineteen centuries, and which will continue to teach the same doctrines to the end of time in accordance with Christ's command.

THE ANTI-RITUALISTIC MOVEMENT.

Much indignation has been expressed by the anti-Ritualists against Sir William Vernon Harcourt on account of his sudden defection from their cause. It was their expectation that he would lead the attack on the Ritualists in the House of Commons, but before the matter was brought up he left for the Continent, leaving the impression that his sudden departure from England was for the express purpose of being out of the way when the discussion on the subject would come up in the House. The leadership of

Church is not responsible for this state of affairs, but the worldly-mindedness of those who neglect the precepts of religion.

Even from an early date evil influences have been at work, not only in France but in every Christian country, to counteract the ordinances of faith, and in France there has always been an undercurrent antagonistic to the Catholic Church. The Church does not coerce man's free-will, and thus Arianism was prevalent in the south of France for centuries. The Abbiglian heresy was received with favor during the middle ages, and the principles of Voltaire found quick root in the soil in the latter part of the last century. These principles have not yet been rooted out, but infidelity has its home chiefly in the cities where worldliness prevails. In the rural districts, religion has a vigorous growth, as Mr. Symonds himself acknowledges, saying: "In the rural districts there is a deep religious spirit." Any visitor to France may witness the fervor of that spirit in the devotion of the people as they assist at Mass on Sundays and holidays; and this may be seen even in the cities, where both standards are erected—that of Christ, and that of the enemy of our salvation—and where there is a perpetual conflict between religion and unbelief.

Here we must remark that though there is so much practical unbelief in France, Protestantism has no foothold, as out of the whole 40,000,000 of population of the country, including the large cities, where there are many foreign Protestants, the total number of Protestants is less than 500,000, though there is complete religious liberty, and Protestant ministers are in receipt of larger salaries from the Government than Catholic priests, so that they may be able to support their families.

The non-Conformists in the country are certainly very much opposed to the Ritualistic movement, but the speeches of the non-Conformist members of the House of Commons indicate that it is not their desire to put down Ritualism by legislation. The way which commends itself to these representatives of non-Conformist sentiment to deal with the matter is to disestablish the Church, and not to interfere with the individual liberty of Church members.

The argument is freely used by the anti-Ritualists that the Church, being the creature of the State, should conform itself to the general will of the people, but this mode of reasoning does not commend itself to the non-Conformists, who see the absurdity of a more majority of a Parliament, composed of men of all beliefs, forcing a certain system of doctrine and worship upon the Church. The remedy they seek to apply is disestablishment, which will leave all free to follow their own course, and not the imposition of either a creed or a liturgy. It is probable, therefore, that disestablishment will be the remedy which will sooner or later be applied in order to get the Church out of its present disorganized condition: then both Ritualists and Low Churchmen will be free to follow their respective likings.

THE CONDITION OF RELIGION IN FRANCE.

Our attention has been directed to the synopsis of an address delivered by the Rev. H. Symonds on the condition of France, and the missionary work of Dr. McCall, as reported in the Peterborough Evening Review of the 21st ult.

The speaker referred to the scepticism prevalent in France and the wonderful spread of the Reformation in that country until the Huguenots were nearly "obliterated," leaving us to understand that the obliteration was effected by ruthless persecution by the Catholic Church.

Careful readers of history know that such statements are misrepresentations of the facts. It is true that three, and even two centuries ago there was a very prevalent opinion among both Catholics and Protestants that their respective religions should be propagated by force, and there were frequent persecutions for conscience sake, but the Catholic Church never gave her sanction to the principle of persecution, and when such persecution occurred in Catholic countries it was the result of political exigencies and influences. In France there was a religious war carried on with varying bitterness from 1550 to 1570 because the Huguenots entertained the design to overthrow the legitimate succession to the throne, and the regrettable dissensions were afterwards renewed, with occasional intermissions, until 1685, the period designated by Mr. Symonds when the Huguenots were finally obliterated by expulsion from the country. During these troublesome times there were lamentable excesses on both sides, the details of which need not be mentioned here.

Mr. Symonds next spoke of the prevalence of scepticism and infidelity in France. "Thousands in Paris, alone," he says, "have no religion." This is unfortunately true, but the Catholic

Church is not responsible for this state of affairs, but the worldly-mindedness of those who neglect the precepts of religion.

Even from an early date evil influences have been at work, not only in France but in every Christian country, to counteract the ordinances of faith, and in France there has always been an undercurrent antagonistic to the Catholic Church. The Church does not coerce man's free-will, and thus Arianism was prevalent in the south of France for centuries. The Abbiglian heresy was received with favor during the middle ages, and the principles of Voltaire found quick root in the soil in the latter part of the last century. These principles have not yet been rooted out, but infidelity has its home chiefly in the cities where worldliness prevails. In the rural districts, religion has a vigorous growth, as Mr. Symonds himself acknowledges, saying: "In the rural districts there is a deep religious spirit." Any visitor to France may witness the fervor of that spirit in the devotion of the people as they assist at Mass on Sundays and holidays; and this may be seen even in the cities, where both standards are erected—that of Christ, and that of the enemy of our salvation—and where there is a perpetual conflict between religion and unbelief.

Here we must remark that though there is so much practical unbelief in France, Protestantism has no foothold, as out of the whole 40,000,000 of population of the country, including the large cities, where there are many foreign Protestants, the total number of Protestants is less than 500,000, though there is complete religious liberty, and Protestant ministers are in receipt of larger salaries from the Government than Catholic priests, so that they may be able to support their families.

It is not true, as Mr. Symonds says, that "there are now large defections from the Church of Rome, many of the clergy becoming Protestants." There is no such movement, and though it has been asserted before that this is the case, those who have made these statements have refrained from giving localities and figures to show that there have been such defections, for the reasons that they are only imaginary. As there are fully 40,000 priests in France, there is no obligation for us to enquire where these defections are to be found until they are localized by those who allege them. The Catholic sentiment in France is known to be growing stronger from day to day, and one of the best evidences of this is the fact of the growing influence of religion in the Chamber of Deputies, which though it was decidedly irreligious a quarter of a century ago, is now as decidedly Catholic in its prevailing sentiment.

Mr. Symonds also boasts of the great progress of the McCall Protestant missions throughout France. This is also to a great extent an exaggeration. In Paris, where there is a great and a cosmopolitan population, it is no wonder that Protestant hospitals, homes for children, and schools should be at work on a pretty extended scale, and the same may be true of other large cities, but there is no serious defection from the Catholic Church, and the boasted work done in the way of Protestant missions falls far short of that unostentatiously done by the Christian Brothers in educating youth, and in conducting industrial schools, and by the Sisters of Charity in charitable works of every kind.

Mr. Symonds boasts that Dr. McCall has received from the President of France the cross of the legion of honor on account of his humanitarian work. Possibly this may be the case. We will make enquiries into the matter in due time, meanwhile we would remind that gentleman that not a year passes during which such honors as this are not paid to humble Sisters who have distinguished themselves by their deeds of charity either on the battlefield or in the hospitals by performing heroic works of mercy, though these ladies are of so retiring a disposition that they would prefer to do their work in secret without attracting the notice of the high civil authorities. If one Protestant gentleman has received such an acknowledgment from the President of the French Republic it does not prove that his work surpasses that of the scores of nuns who have, without seeking it, received similar recognition.

It is confusion to say that in all religions there is truth. Religion is one, not many; and the one only religion imperishably pervades the darkest aberrations of the human intellect: it has been, and is, universal at all times and amongst all the races of mankind.—Cardinal Manning.

MALLOCH NOT A CATHOLIC.

During the course of the series of sermons preached recently by Rev. Dr. Fallon, O. M. I., of Ottawa, on "Anglicanism" he referred to an article which had appeared in an English magazine, written by Mr. W. H. Malloch, who, he stated, is a Protestant. This letter was denied by anonymous correspondents of the city press, insisting that Mr. Malloch is a Catholic. To end the dispute, Dr. Fallon put the question squarely to that gentleman, who has sent him the following reply:

Dear Sir—In answer to your letter of the 27th of January, I beg to say that Loyal Anglican is in error when he speaks of me as a member of the Roman Catholic Church. I have always tried to make it clear in what I have written, that when I have endeavored to show that the reality of a supernatural religion being granted the Roman Catholic Church alone is organically coherent form, I have written as one who studied whether I am a Catholic or not, and I am an Anglican. I believe that everyone in England, who is not a member of any other religious body, is regarded technically as a member of the Church of England. In this technical sense I am certainly a member of it also, and I vote against its disestablishment. I may, in fact, call myself an Anglican politically, but I am certainly not a member of it in a philosophical or theological sense. I beg to remain, Faithfully yours, W. H. Malloch.

P. S.—In the letter to the Citizen, which you forwarded me, Loyal Anglican alludes to my speaking of the English Church as "our Church." He has in view, I suppose, my article in the Nineteenth Century. The phrase was there used in the headlines at the request of the editor, because the full title, "Does the Church of England teach anything?" contained more letters than could be got into the top of the page. Its occurrence there has merely a typographical, not a theological significance. W. H. M.

A PIECE OF BIGOTRY.

We mentioned in our column a few weeks ago the vacancy which had occurred in the Police Magistracy of the town of Lindsay. We are pleased to be able to state that the Ontario Government have appointed to the position Mr. William Steers, who is well known as an able barrister, skilled in all the sinuosities of the law.

The following extract from a recent issue of the Lindsay Post will lay bare a piece of meanness and narrow-mindedness on the part of the Town Council of Lindsay which would be incredible amid the growing intelligence and liberality of the people of Ontario were it not attested by evidence which cannot be gainsaid. The Post says:

At the special meeting of council held last evening in the clearing of the following resolution was introduced by Aldermen Horn and Southern, and was adopted by council: "That the municipal council of the town of Lindsay respectfully request Mr. S. J. Fox, M. P. P., to bring to the notice of the Ontario Government the fact that the corporation of Lindsay is required by the Statutes (Chap. St. Sec. 2, Sub-sec. "h") to pay an exorbitant salary to the Police Magistrate of the town, viz., \$1,000, and that the sum of \$500 per annum is all that the Council should be called upon to pay for said services, and that the clerk be and is hereby instructed to prepare a statement of the receipts and expenses of the police department for the years 1897 and 1898, to be forwarded to Mr. Fox with a copy of this resolution, and that the corporation seal be attached to this motion."

A resolution similar to the above was introduced in last year's council by Dr. Burrows, but was very coldly received. To understand the circumstances of the case it is necessary to bear in mind that when Dr. Burrows, last year, offered the resolution that the Police Magistrate's salary should be reduced, it was expected that the successor to Mr. D. J. McIntyre, who then filled the office, would be a Protestant, and so the motion was indeed "coldly received" as the Post remarks. But Mr. Steers, who has been appointed, is a Catholic, and there lies the secret of the sudden anxiety of the council for economy.

It so happens that under the recent law prescribing cumulative voting there is no Catholic in the Lindsay Council, as the Catholics of the town, though forming a very large percentage of the population, had no wish to concentrate their votes; and this fact has given certain members an opportunity to put their A. P. A. proclivities into active use. It is known that one of the promoters of the scheme openly boasted that as the new Police Magistrate is a Catholic he "would manage through the Council so lower the salary as to make the office not worth having." The resolution given above is the result of wire-pulling, with this object in view.

The minimum salary of a police magistrate is fixed by law, according to the population of the municipality, and it is not to be supposed that the Government will make itself the cap of a clique of bigots to inflict injury on a worthy and competent official, by special legislation; nor even if the council of Lindsay mean spirited to pay a proper salary the necessary officers of the town, least a contract already entered should be faithfully fulfilled.

We understand that at least one of the promoters of the present scheme would be glad to get the office in question at some future time, so to suit aspirations, possibly the Government