

The Catholic Record.

Published Weekly at 484 and 486 Richmond street, London, Ontario.
Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

EDITORS:
REV. GEORGE R. NORTGRAVES,
Author of "Mistakes of Modern Infidels."
THOMAS COFFEY,
Publisher and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY,
Messrs. LUTZ KING, JOHN NICH, P. J. NEVES and W. A. NEVES, are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transact all other business for the CATHOLIC RECORD.
Rates of Advertising—Ten cents per line each insertion, agate measurement.

Approved and recommended by the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa, and St. Boniface, and the Bishops of 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.
Arrears must be paid in full before the paper can be stopped.

London, Saturday, April 27, 1895.

AN ECCLESIASTICAL TERRORISM.

The Rev. Isaac J. Lansing, the minister of Park street Methodist church, Boston, last week made a violent attack upon President Cleveland, in an address before the New England Methodist Conference at Salem, Mass. He stated that the President is a drunkard, and that he was intoxicated on several public occasions.

So far from there being any justification for this statement, the charge appears to be utterly without foundation, and when the President's attention was called to it he remarked very warmly:

"This is simply an outrage, though it is not the first time a thing of this kind has been attempted. I cannot avoid a feeling of indignation that any man who makes claim of decency, and especially one who assumes the role of a Christian minister, should permit himself to become a disseminator of wholesale lies and calumnies not less stupid than they are cruel and wicked. I easily recall other occasions when those more or less entitled to be called ministers of the gospel have been instrumental in putting into circulation the most scandalous falsehoods concerning my conduct and character. The element or factors of the most approved outfit for placing a false and barefaced accusation before the public appear to be, first, some one with baseness and motive sufficient to invent it; second, a minister with more gullibility and love of notoriety than piety, greedily willing to listen to it and gobble it; and, third, a newspaper anxiously willing to publish it. For the sake of the Christian religion I am thankful that these scandal mongering ministers are few, and on every account I am glad that the American people love fair play and justice, and that in spite of all effort to mislead them they are apt to form a correct estimate of the character and labors of their public servants."

It appears to have become quite a craze with many Protestant clergymen of an inferior mental calibre to make such personal attacks upon persons whom they deem proper to select as their victims, and they seem to hold that the sacredness of their calling exempts them from the ordinary obligations of charity to which all Christians are bound.

We have had examples of the same kind in Canada. We have had occasion several times to protest against ridiculous and false accusations made against many of our public men in Canada, under cloak of religion; and the parties who have made these attacks have usually been those in high positions in the Methodist Church. It appears to be the peculiar characteristic of prominent Methodist divines to push themselves into notoriety by making unwarranted attacks on public men, but in Canada there was evidently some other motive than the mere desire to meddle with politics. Most of the attacks made here on our public men were caused by innate hostility to Catholics, and the late Sir John Thompson was their special object, for no other reason than that he, a Catholic, had attained his position through his integrity and ability. In the United States, however, it does not seem that hostility to Catholics is the chief motive of these personal attacks, but rather the itch of meddlingness. Only a few days ago a minister was found guilty of criminal and malicious libel for offering up a prayer in which he attacked the character of a young woman not of his congregation, for whom the prayer was ostensibly offered up that she might be converted. He set up the defence that his act was a purely religious one, which was privileged; but the judge very properly ruled that religious worship should not be made a cloak for the commission of unwarranted and illegal libel.

It would seem that these clergymen have no religious dogmas or Christian morality to inculcate, and that for this reason they try to attract a crowd to listen to sensational utterances against private individual character, or to sermons on such subjects as the "Tribly Craze," or the "Marriage of American

Heiresses to Titled Foreigners," instead of the great truths of Revelation.

A curious circumstance in connection with this subject is the fact that the Protestant religious press have generally not a word to say in condemnation of the course of these errant clergymen. They are on the watch for any utterances from the Catholic pulpit bearing upon religious questions, and they are ready to attribute every word uttered by any Catholic priest to a desire on the part of Rome to seize control over the Government of the country, and to deprive Protestants of their civil rights. It is seldom they get an opportunity in this way; but we had an instance of this kind within the last few weeks when a Quebec parish priest told his parishioners not to employ a certain Protestant doctor. The priest afterwards apologized to his congregation for his unwarranted language; but some of our Protestant religious contemporaries thought proper to interpret the occurrence as an aggression emanating from Rome; and they have not withdrawn their comments on the matter since the priest apologized for his mistake. We have yet to hear that any of the Methodist ministers who have made unjustifiable attacks upon private character, especially when Catholics were the object of those attacks, have made any serious apology for their conduct. It is true that Rev. Mr. Lansing has made what he calls an apology in President Cleveland's case, but the apology had better not have been made at all, for in it he reiterates his former statement, by saying that it was based "on the testimony of eye-witnesses."

We do not wish to follow the example of the Protestant papers in captiousness, so we shall not say that the ministerial meddlesomeness of which there has been so much of late is the consequence of any set desire of the Methodist Church to establish a despotism over the consciences of the public, but we certainly do think that the boasted individual independence of every minister from ecclesiastical control, is bearing fruit in producing a more intolerable tyranny than any from which these mountebanks profess to have emancipated themselves and their congregations. It is to be hoped that President Cleveland's exhortation of Dr. Lansing will be a salutary lesson to such clerical despots for the future.

A NUT FOR MR. MCCARTHY AND HIS FOLLOWERS.

Appropos of Mr. Dalton McCarthy's recent statement to the effect that Catholic schools are everywhere of inferior grade, and his inference that Catholic education should be suppressed, we have no doubt it will interest that gentleman, and others who, like him, are accustomed to make the same assertion, to hear of the result of a debate which took place on the 19th of March at Washington, D. C., between three students of Columbian, and three of Georgetown universities.

Columbian University is a public institution, receiving State aid, while that of Georgetown is Catholic, being under charge of the Jesuits, who are supposed by Mr. McCarthy and his following to be the inculcators of vice and ignorance. Georgetown University, of course, receives no encouragement from the State Government, and we are informed that the Columbians had all the arrogant confidence that as students of a secular university they would carry off the honors with ease, as against students coming from a school which they looked down upon as far inferior to that in which they were educated.

The subject of debate was a question of national finance, namely: "That bonds hereafter issued by the United States Government shall be paid, principal and interest, specifically in gold."

The Columbians had the affirmative, the Georgetown young men the negative, and the question was argued with undoubted ability on both sides; but the judges, without a dissenting voice, awarded the victory to the Georgetown Silverites.

The judges were three members of Congress, well known for their ability and their knowledge of financial matters, namely, the Hon. Messrs. Cotton, Gardiner, and Hume. Mr. Henry Beck, the President of the Georgetown Debating Society, acted as chairman, and the debate was conducted in presence of a large and highly intellectual audience comprising friends of both universities, wearing the colors of their favorite sides.

The debate was the first of a series which is arranged for during the season, and this is the second series of debates between the students, the first

having taken place in 1894, with the result that the Georgetown students scored three successive victories.

It is a remarkable fact that notwithstanding that it has been over and over again repeated by the enemies of religious education in Ontario, that the students of Catholic institutions of learning "spend too much time in prayer, ever to become secular scholars," these prayerful scholars have gained the victory on almost every occasion where they have come into competition with secular students throughout the United States. This has occurred in New York, Rochester, St. Louis and elsewhere, and now Washington is to be added to the list. Surely such facts ought to explode once for all the favorite theory of the McCarthys.

INTOLERANCE REBUKED.

We have pleasure in being able to announce to our readers that the election in Haldimand has resulted in the utter defeat of Mr. Dalton McCarthy's follower, Mr. Jeffrey McCarthy, who contested the constituency on the no-Popery ticket, the issue being that no faith is to be kept with Catholics.

Haldimand is a thoroughly Protestant constituency. There are fewer than seventy-seven Catholics in every thousand of the population, and if any where in Ontario it might be expected that the ultra-Protestant and anti-Catholic policy of Mr. Dalton McCarthy would be endorsed, it might be in Haldimand.

The issue was plainly set before the county, whether or not the action of the Dominion Government should be endorsed in notifying Manitoba that it had inflicted an injustice upon the Catholic minority, and that the injustice should be remedied. On this issue the electors of Haldimand have given their verdict, and it is to the effect that the engagement made with Manitoba when it consented to become a Province of the Dominion is to be kept.

At the previous election, Dr. Montague's majority was 78; but with the issue presented by Mr. McCarthy, the electors have raised these figures to 617.

Mr. McCarthy has constituted himself the special advocate of the policy to suppress the Catholics of the Dominion, and especially those of the Province of Quebec. To carry out this policy, he has openly proclaimed that the French language must be abolished, by violent methods, and also Catholic education; and we have been assured over and over again that Ontario wants only the opportunity to pronounce its opinion, and that Mr. McCarthy's views will be endorsed.

For three years Mr. McCarthy has been declaring that the Dominion Government durst not open a constituency in Ontario in order to test its strength with him. As it is well known that there is a noisy, if not a powerful, faction in the Province which is always ready to respond to a no-Popery appeal, we confess that there was a lurking suspicion that Mr. McCarthy's boasts had some foundation in fact; but the Haldimand contest has proved their emptiness.

The Government opened the constituency at a critical moment—the moment when it decided upon maintaining Catholic rights in Manitoba, and we must give it due credit for having plainly declared, through Dr. Montague, that it will maintain them. The county of Haldimand has declared that, thoroughly Protestant as it is, it is in favor of the Government's position. It is not to be carried away by any foolish appeals to passion and hate against a minority on account of their conscientious religious convictions.

The Canadian Confederation was built up on the basis of a mutual desire on the part of all the Provinces entering into it to work for the common good. With so much conflicting interests and prejudices, the work could not be successful unless predominated by a spirit of toleration and a readiness to concede something to others. This spirit should operate, especially in the matter of the religious convictions of our neighbors; but it is precisely in this matter that fanatics will allow no divergence from their own views.

We speak of toleration and concession in regard to the religious convictions of others. We do not mean by this that our religious convictions should be feeble, or that faith should be weak; but we mean that we should be ready to allow to our neighbors the same liberty to exercise their religion which we desire to enjoy ourselves. We are not to suppress a single article of our own faith, or a single practice

of our religion, nor are we to cease to maintain it with all the earnestness of conviction; but we are not to force our belief upon others under pains and penalties.

Viewed in the light of these self-evident principles, the right of the Manitoba school question becomes perfectly clear. Attorney-General Sifton of Manitoba, Mr. Dalton McCarthy, and a host of Torontonians stumped the county of Haldimand proclaiming to the electors that the Catholic hierarchy of Quebec desire to force a Separate school system on Manitoba, against the will of the people of that Province. This representation of the case is a fraud on the intelligence of the people. There is no desire on the part of Catholics to force Separate schools upon those who do not want them. If the Protestants of Manitoba do not want Separate schools, no one desires to coerce them; but the Catholics of the Province do want Catholic schools; and the proof of this is the fact that the unjust legislation of 1890 has not suppressed those schools. The question at issue is, therefore, whether the Catholic minority is to be coerced into a system of education which they will not have. It is this that the Manitoba Government is attempting, contrary to the compact made when the Province entered Confederation; and there is undoubtedly a faction in Ontario quite willing to back them up in the attempt, otherwise we would not have witnessed the strenuous efforts to elect Mr. Dalton McCarthy's law partner in Haldimand. But the people of Haldimand have shown that they are not to be ejected or brow-beaten into the policy of intolerance, and the very decisive majority of 617 by which Dr. Montague has been elected is a death-blow to Dalton McCarthyism in Ontario—and that is enough, for outside of Ontario and Manitoba, the McCarthy creed is an unknown quantity.

We must say that we had confidence in the general good will and love of fair-play which the people of Ontario entertain, and the result of the Haldimand contest has confirmed us in that confidence.

We heartily congratulate the electors of Haldimand on the rebuke they have administered to the agitators who endeavored to stir up among them a war of creeds and races, and we trust that the Dominion Government will be encouraged by the result to persist in the policy they have announced, through Dr. Montague's election speeches, that the grievances under which the Catholics of Manitoba are now laboring shall be redressed.

The Manitoba school question is not one which affects that Province alone. If it were decided that any Province has the right to override the clauses of the Canadian constitution protecting minorities, the Catholic minority of Ontario and the Protestant minority of Quebec would be equally exposed to the danger of having their existing rights swept away at any moment by any act of their respective Local Legislatures. The remedial order issued by the Dominion Government for the guidance of that of Manitoba is a declaration that the Government will sustain those rights against the vicissitudes of local agitation, and we regard this fact as a guarantee for the future peace and prosperity of the whole Dominion.

We do not entertain any suspicion that the people of Quebec would at any time desire to deprive the Protestant minority of rights which were given willingly and ungrudgingly by a Catholic Legislature. But we cannot say what might happen if the Catholics of Quebec were to see Catholic rights swept away first in Manitoba, and then in Ontario, as would certainly happen after a while, if the intolerance of the Manitoba Legislature were to be successful.

The people of Quebec have shown that they have both spirit and intelligence, and they observe what is going on in the sister Provinces. They would be something more or less than human if they were not tempted to commit reprisals if they saw injustice after injustice committed on their co-religionists everywhere, and we may well believe that there would be reprisals if such injustices were perpetrated. The Protestant school system of Quebec, which is cherished by the Protestants of that Province, would have to be swept away too, if for no other reason than to show that the people of Quebec will not be contented with a one-sided constitution which is to be operated in all cases to harass Catholics and coddle Protestants.

On the same day on which the election took place in Haldimand, by-elections were held also in Quebec West,

Vercheres and Antigonish. The two last named constituencies elected Liberals—Antigonish, the constituency of the late Sir John Thompson, being a loss to the Government. It is almost needless to say that the elections in these constituencies did not turn upon the Manitoba school question, as did that of Haldimand. The candidates of both parties in all these instances declared themselves to be in favor of justice to minorities.

HYPNOTISM AND WITCH-CRAFT.

A curious decision has been given by the Supreme Court of Kansas in a murder case, which recalls the trials for witchcraft which in former days occurred, especially in Scotland and Massachusetts, under form of law, when many unfortunate old women were put to death under charge of having been guilty of the crime of exercising that unlawful practice of which they were accused.

Trials for witchcraft ceased with the spread of education, and the world was in hope that they would not be revived; for though we have no intention of saying that there never is any such unlawful practice, we are convinced that hundreds of innocent persons were put to a horrible death under unjust suspicion. Yet only a few weeks ago a case was reported wherein a woman was tortured to death in Ireland by a family who asserted that she had exercised witchery against a member of the family. To the credit of the people of the neighborhood, it must be mentioned that they were horrified at the act, and condemned the perpetrators of the deed most unreservedly. It was the brutal deed of an ignorant family.

But it appears that in the full light of the close of the nineteenth century, trials for witchcraft, or something very like it, are beginning to be renewed under sanction of a legal tribunal. This renewal has taken place in one of the United States. The circumstances of the case are briefly the following:

A resident of the town of Conway Springs was sued by his wife for a divorce, and expected she would gain the suit, wherefore, he conveyed his property to Anderson Gray, a rich farmer, with the understanding that it should be reconveyed to him after the judgment of the court would be given. This was done to escape the loss of the property, but when the re-transfer was demanded Gray wished to have David Patton removed, as he was the only witness to the transaction, so that he might be able to keep the property.

Gray was a good scholar, and hypnotism was one of his studies. Thomas Patton was one of his subjects, and it is asserted that Gray influenced him to attempt the murder of his cousin, by suggesting to him that David should be killed, and furnishing him with a revolver for the purpose of carrying out the suggestion.

It was known that David was a man who would not hesitate to shoot on slight provocation, nevertheless, both the shot of Thomas, and David's return shot failed to kill. Both men were arrested, but were merely fined and thus let off.

Gray then sought another subject, and found one in Thomas McDonald. Some time after the first attack was made, McDonald asked Gray's advice what he should do, as David Patton had spoken ill of his wife. Gray said: "Kill him!" and he gave him a rifle and a revolver to practice with, taught him to use them, and even cleared a passage through the branches of a tree so that McDonald might have a way to shoot at his victim without an impediment. McDonald accordingly lay in wait for his victim, Gray being not far off, so as to preserve his influence over the assailant. David Patton, passing by soon after, was struck in the lungs by the bullet from McDonald's rifle, and he being immediately sorry for his act, ran up to the wounded man to assist him. Finding him not dead, he declared he was glad of it, and promised to get a doctor, and then finding Gray asked the latter to go for a doctor. He pretended he would do so, but purposely delayed for several hours, waiting for the return of one doctor who was out of town, whereas he might have called another. Partly in consequence of this neglect, Patton died, and in the meantime McDonald informed the sheriff of the death of his victim, and Gray attributed the murder to Cherokee strip boomers. McDonald, however, was arrested, and confessed all, but insisted that he had been hypnotized by Gray, and had committed the murder under his influence.

The jury acquitted McDonald of all responsibility for the crime, but Gray was arrested, tried and found guilty of murder in the first degree, and, on appeal, the verdict was sustained by the Supreme Court.

Necessarily this judgment was based upon the statement of the man who fired the shot, and it appears to us very dubious that his testimony should have had so much weight with judges and jurors.

Can it be said that hypnotism is a demonstrated fact? Perhaps it is; but to us there seems to be a likelihood of fraud in it, and we very much doubt McDonald's story. However, independently of hypnotism, Gray was very guilty if the story be true, and we can scarcely exonerate McDonald; for he should not have subjected himself to hypnotic influence, as we believe the hypnotists admit that a man who resists the influence determined cannot be subjected to it. A man committing a crime while drunk is not legally excused. Should not hypnotism be regarded by the law as similar to drunkenness, in not cloaking crimes committed under its influence?

A DISCUSSION ON AURICULAR CONFESSION.

In a controversy which is being conducted in the *Nineteenth Century Magazine*, Canon Shore strenuously denounces the Ritualists for their introduction of auricular confession into Episcopalianism. He attempts to show that the Anglican Establishment never sanctioned and now "does not enforce in any case what is technically known as auricular confession; it does not even recommend it; indeed the abandonment of all those instructions regarding it which were contained in the earlier service books, and the introduction instead of the primitive practice of general public confession and absolution, is a discouragement of it which amounts to practical prohibition."

On the general thesis, the canon is undoubtedly correct, that the Anglican Church had no intention of encouraging confession, as that Church was constructed on the basis of Calvinism during the reigns of Edward VI. and Queen Elizabeth; yet in spite of this there was a loophole left for the use of those who believed that sacramental confession was necessary as the means whereby sins were to be forgiven; and as it was very naturally thought that consciences would be especially troubled when people were on the point of death, provision was made especially for that occasion, and to this day the minister is told in the Book of Common Prayer that he must move the sick person to make "a special confession of his sins, if he feels his conscience troubled by any weighty matter."

It is noteworthy also, that in this part of the order prescribed for the visitation of the sick, the minister is styled "the priest," in order to invest him with the priestly authority to forgive sin, and he is commanded to exercise this authority on the occasion, the claim being put forth that it is derived from Christ, undoubtedly on the foundation that Christ conferred upon His Apostles the power of forgiving sin when, before His ascension into heaven, He breathed on them, saying: "Receive ye the Holy Ghost; whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven, and whose sins you shall retain, they are retained."

The Ritualists may very well maintain that if this great power has been conferred by Christ upon the clergy, its exercise should not be neglected, and that it will benefit those in good health, as well as the dying. The power conferred by Christ on His Apostles is not restricted to the case of the dying, and if it exists at all, it is applicable to those who are in good health, as well as to those who are sick or in danger of death.

This is sufficient vindication of the Ritualists, who really believe that they have their ordination by succession from the Apostles; but as this succession is a delusion, the authority is also fictitious, and it would be well if Canon Shore could persuade his Ritualistic conferees not to attempt its exercise, since it is at best a travesty on the sacrament of penance as administered in the Catholic Church by real priests who have received their authority from the proper source.

Again, it must be said that Canon Shore's argument that the Church of England has condemned auricular confession by instituting general public confession and absolution, is very far-fetched. The Church of England has not instituted any such practice,