

The Catholic Record.

Published Weekly at 481 and 483 Richmond street, London, Ontario.

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

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

THOMAS COFFEY, Publisher and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY, MESSRS. LUKE KING, JOHN NICH, P. J. NEVEY and M. C. O'DONNELL are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transact all other business for the CATHOLIC RECORD.

Rates of Advertising—Ten cents per line each insertion, 25c. measurement.

Approved and recommended by the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa, and St. Boniface, and the Bishops of London, Hamilton and Peterboro, and the clergy throughout the Dominion.

Correspondence intended for publication, as well as that having reference to business, should be directed to the proprietor, and must reach London not later than Tuesday morning.

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

London, Saturday, Nov. 14, 1891.

His Grace the Archbishop of Toronto will lecture in the Cathedral here on Sunday evening next, November 15. The proceeds of the lecture will be given to the Children of Mary to be distributed to the poor.

A LESSON FROM THE BRIGGS HERESY TRIAL.

The Briggs' heresy case, which has caused so much commotion among our Presbyterian friends, has suddenly collapsed. The 4th of November was the day fixed on which the trial was to take place. Dr. Charles A. Briggs recently returned home from Europe to defend his teachings before the court, and from all appearances it was to be expected that there would be a most exhaustive and hotly contested fight between the opposing forces of Orthodoxy and Rationalism; but though the Presbytery had held that it was necessary for the preservation of Christian doctrine that Rationalism should be combated with energy, when it appears in high ministerial circles, and especially when seminaries wherein young ministers are trained. When the Presbytery assembled to hear the prosecution, it only sat a couple of hours and dismissed the prosecution at 6 o'clock p. m.

It will be remembered that the main charge brought against the doctor is that he contends that the present orthodox view prevalent among Presbyterian theologians, that the Scriptures are verbally inspired, and that as they were originally written they are "inerrant," that is to say, infallible, is not borne out either by the Westminster Confession or by Scripture.

Dr. Briggs himself said that "Luther, Calvin, Zwingle and the great Reformers did not hold to the inerrancy of the original autographs. In modern times Van Oosterzee, Tholuck, Neander, Stier, Lange and Dornier admit errors and inaccuracies in matters of subordinate importance. It remained for the representatives of Orthodoxy to claim for the Scriptures what the Reformers did not claim, and what is not claimed for them by the symbols of the Church rightly interpreted."

It is very true, as Dr. Briggs asserts, that he is not the first among Protestants to undermine the authority of Scripture. This has been done by recent Protestant critics to such an extent as to leave very little of the sacred text which has not been rejected as unsubstantiated by so-called modern scientific criticism. One maintains that the works of Moses, so far from being the book of Moses, consist merely of legendary documents and traditions which were gathered together by some unknown writer, and which form a fragmentary history which cannot be any better ground-work for faith than the Iliad and Odyssey of Homer or the poems of Ossian. Job, Isaiah, Esther, Jeremiah, Solomon's Canticle, etc., suffer equally at the hands of these critics. It is therefore very easy for Dr. Briggs to quote eminent "Protestant divines who will agree with him in depreciating the authority of Scripture; and this, notwithstanding the frequent boasts of most Protestants, that they have the infallible word of God to guide them, and that therefore they have no need of an infallible Church to keep them in the right way.

The only impregnable foundation on which the authority of Scripture as God's unerring word can be based is the authority of the Catholic Church. We know, as a matter of fact, that Christ established upon His Apostles a Church which, according to His promise, should never fall away. This Church was established before the New Testament was written, and it is by this Church that the infallible authority of Holy Scripture is known and established. The New Testament Scriptures, written, for the most part, by Apostles, assist us in knowing the Church, but they do not of themselves establish any claim to be the word of God. It was this consideration which led St. Augustine to say:

"If any one fears to fall into error on account of the obscurity of this question, let him consult upon it the Church which the Holy Scripture points out without any ambiguity." (Against Crescensius.)

And again: "I would not believe the Gospel, did not the authority of the Catholic Church move me thereto." (Confessions.)

The position of the Catholic Church in reference to Holy Scripture is, therefore, well defined. She regards it as the word—the infallible word—of God. They are attested by her, and for this very reason they do not set aside her authority to judge of their true sense and interpretation.

But Luther and Calvin and the whole host of Protestant controversialists since their time have pretended that she sets aside the authority of Scripture. She only repudiates the authority of private individuals to usurp her place, and put their vagaries above her divinely authorized doctrinal decisions. The wisdom of the Catholic Church in thus acting is strongly exemplified in the outcome of this Briggs' heresy trial. This whole trial is only one of many proofs that Protestantism, and not Catholicism, is the disintegrating force which is tending to destroy the authority of Scripture. Protestant controversialists have, indeed, maintained that the Catholic Church is an enemy to the Bible, and that their religious revolution alone maintains the plenary authority of God's unerring word.

Those who did not see it before may see it now, that the real effect of Protestantism is to destroy, and not to uphold, what they have hitherto held to be the ground-work of their faith and the anchor of all their hopes of salvation. Luther said of the Catholic Church that she had "buried the Holy Scripture in the mire and dirt, and had blotted out nearly the whole Christian doctrine."

It can be seen from the Briggs' case who has been guilty of burying the Scripture out of sight, and of destroying the doctrines of Christianity. The New York Presbytery has done all this by its refusal to uphold the teaching of an infallible word of God in its principal seminary where young men are to be trained for the ministry.

It is understood that the faculty of Princeton College are the real prosecutors of Dr. Briggs. There may or there may not have been jealousies at work as part of the causes which induced the Princeton teachers to urge the trial; but, at all events, they stand forth as the sturdy upholders of old-time Calvinism, or orthodoxy, if it is to be so called. They succeeded in obtaining a most decisive victory in the General Assembly on the simple question of vetoing Dr. Briggs' appointment as the chief inductor of young ministers in the Theology of the Bible. But we pointed out on a former occasion, that they did not obtain a pronouncement on the more important matter which was really underlying the case. They did not pronounce with the Apostolic energy expressed in the words "it hath seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us," on the important question of biblical inspiration. This was the question which the "watchmen on the walls of Zion" who "never hold their peace" when Christian truth is attacked, should especially have dealt with; but this is what the General Assembly took care to avoid.

We cannot see, therefore, that the Assembly deserves all the credit which has been given to it for valiantly maintaining the truth. But whatever must be thought of the Assembly, the New York Presbytery has given it to be understood that it has no intention to be one of the bulwarks against Rationalism; and we believe that this fiasco is but a specimen of the Rationalistic tendencies of the Presbyterianism of the day.

It is said that the disinclination of the Presbytery to deal strongly with the recalcitrant doctor arises from the fear that the ultimate result would be a split if this course were taken. Probably, too, this would be the case. But what of the aspirations of the various sects to unite into one? Will they take kindly to a sect which shakes hands with Rationalism? If so, they have gone faster than we had thought on the down grade of which Mr. Spurgeon speaks so sorrowfully.

It was recently said by the New York Observer that "if attendance upon the trial were a question of remuneration the members of the Presbytery would prefer to saw wood at fifty cents a half cord than to try Prof. Briggs at \$10 a day." It would appear that the Observer was not far astray in its estimate. But where are John Knox and John Calvin in the meantime? The stern executioner of Michael Servetus would not have let the Professor off so easily. O, Quantum mutatus ab illo!

INGRATITUDE.

The organs of the Government of Italy are endeavoring to make a point against the American Government in connection with the Chilian trouble. The Italia publishes a leading article headed "The Good Yankees," in which it claims that "The United States has one diplomatic rule for Chili and another for Italy. They have virtually closed by the McKinley Bill the markets of their country to Italian wares and products, and now seek to be high suzerain over all America. All Yankees unscrupulously follow politics as a business, even when international affairs are concerned, but the time may come when foreign nations will lay aside petty differences and call the United States to a more exact and precise notion of the law of nations."

We do not wish to discuss the merits or the demerits of the McKinley Bill, but it seems to us that the contention that that measure is in any sense a violation of the law of nations, is a most untenable one. What we wish to draw attention to is the insolent tone adopted by the Italian press in making reference to the United States, a country to which more than any other in the world the Italians are under very great obligations. It has afforded an asylum to the impoverished millions of Italians who have had to fly from their own country since the Garibaldi and the Crispien assumed control of its affairs. It is indeed a picture of base ingratitude to find Italians speaking words of unkindness towards the American people. A large number of the inhabitants of that country come to the United States to find homes and make money. Yankees, on the other hand, when they go to Italy, spend large sums, and American gold aids very materially in the work of keeping the Italian pot boiling.

FRAUDULENT EVANGELIZATION.

A communication which appears in the Montreal Witness of the 3rd inst., from a Methodist minister of that city—Rev. Ed. J. Gruchy—serves well to show how hollow are the pretences of those who are engaged in the so-called work of French evangelization, asserting that they are successfully sapping the influence of the Catholic Church in Quebec, and making numerous converts of the Catholics to the various sects.

The minister declares that he has labored for twenty years as a missionary, and that during that time he has never witnessed a greater victory over "sin and error"—meaning Popery—than one which he relates in his letter. And to what does this one refer which is of such great magnitude? We may leave him to narrate the facts himself. He says:

"A few years ago a French-Canadian family became Protestants, and the father and mother members of our Church, corner of Craig and Elizabeth streets. About three months ago the father was taken very sick, and though a member of our Church, had not experienced a change of heart. It was apparent that his sickness was unto death."

In short, the writer goes on to relate that through the influence of the sick man's relatives, the priests and nuns were induced to visit him to help him during his sickness, and promising to pay all the expenses of his funeral in case of death, "on condition of his return to the Church of Rome;" an offer which was very tempting, as the sufferer was a poor man.

The man, in fine, died a Protestant, being attended on his death-bed by the minister who wrote the letter, together with a few Christian workers.

We must remark, in the first place, the inherent probability—nay, the certainty—that the story is purposely falsified and colored so as to meet Mr. de Gruchy's views, and to prove them. We can safely say that neither priests nor nuns made such offers with such conditions attached as he has stated.

When once the narrator begins to lie to suit his purposes, there is no knowing where the lies end and the truth begins. It is evidently a story concocted for the purpose of drawing money from his gullible fellow-Protestants, to assist him in his so-called work of evangelization by lying—a method which the Apostles, surely, never thought of employing. In fact, his letter closes with such an appeal "to pay the expenses—\$20—for two funerals," to assist "our very poor people," and "to furnish clothing for the children to come to Sunday school."

But there is another point on which Mr. de Gruchy touches which makes his letter more amusing than one would expect from the sad story which we have already transcribed from it. He tells us that it has often been

said that "at the critical hour (of death) the Protestant religion fails to comfort and to save the Protestant. Also that French Protestants who once were Roman Catholics cannot die before returning to the Church of Rome."

Mr. de Gruchy writes his letter for the express purpose of refuting this assertion, and of showing that Catholic perverts may die out of the Catholic Church. He has no money object in view, of course. At least so he would make us believe.

We have heard it said, frequently, that it was never known that a Catholic had become a Protestant on his death-bed, and we believe that this is the case. Protestants, usually those whose lives have been especially virtuous, frequently become Catholics when they are dying, because the Catholic religion pre-eminently points out the way of salvation, leads to the practice of virtue and affords spiritual consolations which are unknown to Protestantism. But we have never heard of a single case of a Catholic abandoning these consolations on his death-bed; nor have we ever heard of any one who has known of such a thing.

But it is evident that the case we have put is a very different one from that presented by Rev. Mr. de Gruchy. He speaks of a man who had for years been an apostate. He acknowledges that he had not been "changed in heart;" that is to say, he was neither a good Protestant, nor a Catholic in any sense of the word. He was simply an apostate from his faith, and he was a nominal Protestant only for the sake of having no religious obligations to perform. We do not suppose that any Catholic would ever say or pretend that such men were ever in a fair way of returning to the true fold, and we do not believe that even Mr. de Gruchy heard such a statement.

St. Paul says that "it is impossible for those who were once illuminated, have tasted, also, the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, etc., and are fallen away, to be renewed again to penance, crucifying again to themselves the Son of God, and making Him a mockery."

We do not assert that the impossibility here spoken of is absolute; but there is certainly a very great difficulty; and it is rather amusing that Mr. de Gruchy should appeal to such a case as evidence of his great success in his missionary labors at converting Romanists.

It is clear that if this person had any real success he would have mentioned it instead of adorning such a case with fictitious circumstances to render it palatable to his readers as a means whereby to coax money out of them for his mission.

It is well known that the pretended successes of French evangelization are a mere sham, and no better proofs that this is the case are needed than those afforded by Rev. Mr. de Gruchy's letter. We think that there is more sense among the people to whom he appeals than to furnish him with funds to carry on his work, which is fraudulent on its very face.

Mr. De Gruchy also boasts, at the close of his communication, that his mission is "very encouraging," that his "congregations are larger than usual;" and that "a good many Roman Catholic strangers attend our Sunday evening services."

He does not pretend that these numerous Roman Catholics whom he hopes to Protestantize have given any sign that they intend to embrace practical Protestantism, if there is such a thing furnished by him; so that his hope is, evidently, merely to destroy in them all faith and practice of religious obligations, as in the case of the convert of whom he first spoke; and this is the work of these French evangelizers. We leave it to the good sense of Protestants to decide whether they do not waste their money when they devote it to such purposes.

With deep regret we notice that the Hon. C. F. Fraser is in delicate health and that his medical advisers deem it imperative that he should go to a milder climate for the winter. He will for the present reside in Denver, Col. Every Canadian will, we are sure, entertain a most ardent wish that the hon. gentleman will return to us fully restored to health. He is one of those men of whom Canada is justly proud. His political career has been a brilliant one, and as stainless as brilliant. We earnestly pray that for many, many years to come the eloquent voice of Hon. C. F. Fraser will be heard in the Legislature of Ontario.

PUT THEM OUT.

A telegram from Winnipeg states that Attorney-General Sifton, on behalf of the Manitoba Government, has written a letter to the civic authorities of Winnipeg to the effect that the Government will guarantee all expenses incurred in connection with all past and future litigation on the appeal of the Separate school question to the Privy Council.

Considering the past attitude of the Manitoban Government in favor of home legislation as against outside dictation, this stand should condemn them utterly in the estimation of all Canadians. It would seem that the ultra-loyalists of that Province, or rather they who make the loudest boasts of the extremeness of their loyalty, are the most ready to dispute the decisions of the courts.

In certain cases it is, undoubtedly, most proper that as long as Canada is under British rule, the last authority recognized by the laws of the country should be appealed to; but this should be done on occasions when the rights of citizens are to be vindicated against tyrannical interference; but even then it is not always incumbent on the Government of the day to take upon itself the burden. But in the present case the Government proposes to interfere, not for the purpose of protecting citizens, but to impose upon them an intolerable tyranny.

It cannot be claimed that an injustice is inflicted on the Protestant majority in the Province by the judgment of the Canadian Supreme Court. The injustice lies in forcing the consciences of the Catholic minority, under penalty of paying a double tax for school purposes. It is not denied that the Winnipeg Catholics are willing to educate their own children properly and efficiently; and this appeal question is for the purpose of inflicting upon them the injustice of forcing them in addition to pay for the education of the children of their Protestant neighbors, who will not contribute a cent towards educating Catholic children in the manner of which their parents approve.

The injustice is manifest. The Protestants claim to be, and perhaps are, the wealthiest among the citizens of Winnipeg. Is the Government to back them up in an attempt to act the part of Paul Clifford towards their poorer neighbors, by making the latter pay for the maintenance of their schools by presenting a pistol at their heads in Paul's or Claude Duval's style?

Throughout this whole transaction the Manitoba Government has shown the utmost disregard of Catholic rights and conscientious convictions. A magnanimous community—nay, we shall say a community having in its composition a spark of generous feeling—would see that common justice demands that the decision of the Supreme Court should be sustained. Even the Toronto Mail virtually acknowledged the other day that the judges ruled according to the law, and the Montreal Witness declared its conviction that they could not have honestly arrived at any other conclusion.

Surely, then, it is not an occasion for the Manitoba Government to step in to invite the Winnipeg Council to pursue their injustice further. Should Winnipeg choose to pursue the matter to the highest court, it should by all means be left to do so at its own risk and expense. This expense should not be borne by the city as such, but by the tyrannical, dominant clique which desires to push its despotism so far.

We believe that there are clauses in the Municipal law which impose the penalty on tyrannical municipal majorities to pay out of their own pockets for their unreasonably incurred law expenses; and these clauses should, by all means, be allowed to operate on the Council of Winnipeg in the present instance, if they really apply to the case, as we believe they do.

But the Manitoba Government steps in not merely to sustain them, but to encourage them. A more intolerable piece of tyranny on the part of both bodies we have never witnessed nor heard of in the history of Canada.

It may be pleaded that there is justification to be found for the course of the Government, in fact that the Dominion Government pays the expenses of the successful prosecution; but this is altogether a different thing. The Dominion Government sustains the cause of liberty of the subject, while that of Manitoba is endeavoring to perpetuate an intolerable burden.

We cannot for a moment suppose that the Municipal appeal, or rather the appeal of the Greenway Government, will be successful. Success in

this case would be the triumph of an injustice which we cannot conceive the Privy Council will inflict. But there ought to be, if there is not, some way to make the individual members of the Government or the Council pay the piper, instead of allowing them to throw the burden on the country, or even the city.

We fear this cannot be done. But we hope that they will at least be punished by the electorate when the proper time comes round again.

We know from the plainly expressed sentiments of Protestant as well as Catholic representative assemblages in Manitoba that the law is recognized by many outside of the Catholic body as iniquitous. Will they unite with their Catholic fellow-citizens to punish the evil-doers? If they do not do so we shall understand the Pecksniffian character of the morality they practice. But we have too high an opinion of the honesty of the majority of Protestants at least to suppose that they will approve of this act of spoliation. Let honest Protestants now show themselves, and the disgrace of Manitoba for wanton injustice will soon be wiped away, and the injustice itself removed.

THE QUEBEC PROTESTANT SCHOOLS.

It is pleasant to remark that in the Protestant Teachers' Convention which took place recently in Montreal there was not exhibited that fanaticism which is so frequently prevalent in Ontario when similarly constituted bodies assemble to discuss the school laws of this Province.

The Protestant teachers declare that there are grievances which affect seriously the efficiency of the schools, and which should be corrected in order that their schools may be placed on a better footing; but there is no pretence that these grievances arise out of religious animosity.

In fact the grievances of which they complain are such as refer to the whole management of the school system, and they are very similar to those which might be found in the Public school system of Ontario, or in any of the United States, when the schools are supposed to be less efficient than they might be.

During the anti-Catholic agitation which not long since swept through Ontario, the fanatics of this Province took especial delight, on the suggestion of a malicious, because disappointed, Toronto newspaper, to represent the Protestants of Quebec as being persecuted for conscience' sake by the Catholics there in the matter of education, and this pretence was made a ground for arousing Ontario into a fermentation of froth and fury against Catholics everywhere, as they were supposed to be fully as bad and as bitter as their Quebec co-religionists.

But now that the Protestant teachers have met, it appears that these grievances on the score of religion are altogether imaginary, being the product of the brains of the Toronto journal and a few Montreal Equal Right irreconcilables.

The Hon. Judge W. W. Lynch is justly regarded as one of the foremost friends of Protestant education in Quebec; and he pronounced in an able address given before the convention upon the defects under which the system now in vogue in that Province is believed to labor. These are chiefly three in number, and the fault that they exist is attributed by the Protestant press to the Protestant Committee of Education, and not to the Catholic majority.

The Richmond Guardian enumerates these defects to be the following: 1st, the committee is accused of having "encumbered the schools with a lot of useless studies—piled up text-books a mountain high, and reduced the practical results to a minimum by attempting to enforce too much regulation, and insisting on too many and absolutely useless studies." The second is, that "the public aid to the schools has, year by year, diminished, until it has reached a point at which it has become practically no aid at all;" and the third is that "the universities and high schools have been nursed and subsidized almost to the point of extravagance."

To these, some of the teachers have a fourth grievance, that the rural teachers by their own omission to attend the meetings of the convention have lost the influence they formerly possessed in the convention, the control of which has passed virtually into the hands of those who live in Montreal. This is also said to be the origin of the present complaints.

These teachers say that the reason for this is that the "convention meets