

The Catholic Record

Published Weekly at 654 and 656 Richmond Street, London, Ontario.

Price of subscription—\$1.00 per annum.

EDITORS:

REV. GEORGE R. NORTHGRAVES, Author of "Mistakes of Modern Infallibility" THOMAS COFFEY, Publisher and Proprietor, Thomas Coffey, Messrs. Luke King, John Nigh, P. J. Neven and Joseph S. King, are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transact all other business for the CATHOLIC RECORD.

LETTER OF RECOMMENDATION. UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA, Ottawa, Canada, March 7th, 1900. The Editor of THE CATHOLIC RECORD, London, Ont.

London, Saturday, March 23, 1901.

THE MISSION.

At St. Peter's cathedral, London, last Sunday, at High Mass, Rev. Father Doherty, S. J., announced the opening of the mission which he and Father O'Bryan intend giving to the people of London for the next two weeks.

At St. Peter's cathedral, London, last Sunday, at High Mass, Rev. Father Doherty, S. J., announced the opening of the mission which he and Father O'Bryan intend giving to the people of London for the next two weeks.

A DISASTROUS RESULT.

The Mrs. Carrie Naton crusade in Kansas has advanced a stage. A jury in Leavenworth has found four men who have participated in the raid on Millwood saloon, guilty of murder in the first degree, for having killed Mrs. Hudson during the illegal attack.

CUBAN DEMONSTRATION.

The Cubans are showing extreme impatience at the continuance of the American occupation of their island, and early in this month a great popular demonstration was held at Havana in honor of the delegates to the Constitutional Convention, the result of whose sessions, it is expected, will be an early delivery from American military rule.

Cuba's war of independence against Spain. The speeches were denunciatory of American rule, and every point made against the United States was vociferously cheered. There is some fear entertained by the more thoughtful class in the city that the demonstration may lead to complications with the Americans.

THE EXISTENCE OF THE DEVIL.

By Detroit papers we learn that there was a discussion in the Westminster Presbyterian church of that city a few Sundays ago regarding the existence of the devil; and though the majority of the congregation were in favor of retaining the belief that there is a devil, the pastor of the church, the Rev. Mr. Clark, caused considerable surprise by stating that Mr. Flick, who maintained that there is no such personage, gave expression to his own opinion on this subject.

It is impossible for us to predict what will be the action of the Presbytery or the General Assembly in regard to the Rev. Mr. Clark's profession of faith, but it is none the less certainly opposed to the teaching of the Westminster Confession, which plainly lays down the doctrine of the personality of the devil, and it may be presumed that the pastor of Westminster Presbyterian Church having laid himself open to a prosecution for heresy before the Church courts, will be put under discipline. It may also be asked how he can justify the virtual statement of the Confession that the Catholic Church is "a synagogue of satan," if satan has no existence. Many complications, therefore, rise out of Rev. Mr. Clark's declaration.

Mr. Flick said that "Christ does not in any part of the Gospel teach belief in the devil." There is no justification for thus separating the teachings of Christ recorded in the Gospel from those of the Apostles and Evangelists as found in the Gospels and Epistles of the New Testament. The entire New Testament, and in fact the books of the Bible as a whole, must stand or fall together as the inspired volume, and if we are free to reject the Apostolic teaching, or the teaching of any part of the Bible, a doubt is thrown equally on Christ's words recorded therein.

Mr. Flick, by making this distinction, and Rev. Mr. Clark by approving of it, undermine the authority of the whole bible as the Word of God. It is not true, however, that Christ does not teach the existence of the devil as a real being, which we presume to be Mr. Flick's meaning concealed under the misleading words "belief in the devil."

Belief that there is a devil is something very different from "belief in the devil," which would imply that we should believe what the devil teaches, and should be his disciples. Assuming that we have rightly gauged Mr. Flick's meaning, we say to the contrary that Christ Himself actually taught that there is a devil. Thus in St. John, viii, 38-49:

"You do the deeds of your father who is of your father the devil, and the desires of your father you will do." And when the Jews urged: "Thou art a Samaritan and hast a devil," he answered, "I have not a devil; but I honor the Father, and you have dishonored me."

In St. Matt. xii, 22, Jesus is said to have cast out a devil, whereupon the Pharisees accused him of casting out devils by Beelzebub the Prince of devils. Jesus in His answer repudiates His having acted under the authority of Beelzebub, but declares that He cast out devils "by the Spirit of God."

The same occurrence is recorded in St. Mark iii, 22-26. St. John, viii, 48, and St. Luke xi, 14-20. In St. Luke x 40-50 He not only casts out devils Himself, but also approves that they shall be cast out in His name.

The passages of the Bible wherein the devil is spoken of as a real being are very numerous, but we shall here mention only one other in which he is certainly spoken of as a being really existing: (1 St. John iii, 8)

"He that committeth sin is of the devil, for the devil sinneth from the beginning. For this purpose the Son of God appeared, that He might destroy the works of the devil."

We need only add that if American Presbyterianism allows its ministers to

express openly their disbelief in a doctrine so plainly revealed, it must be in that state of disorganization which borders upon its utter dissolution as a Christian body.

A TYPICAL GRAND MASTER.

The Orangemen recently held a meeting in Stratford, and the press report goes on to say that the membership was greatly stirred up because there is a movement on foot to alter the King's Coronation Oath so that it may not be offensive to his Catholic subjects. We are not surprised at this. Indeed, we would be surprised were resolutions, along this line not enacted by the brethren. Their mission is not one of peace, but of turbulence: hence, to be true to their origin, the old "No Popery" cry must be kept up.

Bro. D. M. Jermyn is the Grand Master. Bro. D. M. Jermyn is a typical and appropriate Grand Master. He fills the position very well indeed, and the position suits him exactly. Bro. Jermyn is an orator, too. He is full of fire—Orange fire—and has the happy faculty of working himself up to white heat when he meets his brethren and when he calls to mind the fact that his ancestors had to use brass money and wear wooden shoes. In this he differs from Bro. Wallace. Bro. Wallace is always arctic. No matter how animated a discussion may become—no matter how many times "no surrender" may be uttered—no matter how often the name of William may be mentioned—no matter how emphatically it may be stated that "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty;" no matter how frequently reference may be made, with hands thrown aloft, to the glorious, pious and immortal memory—Bro. Wallace never, never thaws, never moves away from the door-step of his cold storage.

Bro. Jermyn is original—very original. In his Stratford speech he said that "about a century after the advent of William of Orange in England the founders of the great American nation wisely safeguarded their future by enacting that no Roman Catholic should serve as President." This reminds us very forcibly of the speeches made by Mr. Dooley to Mr. Henessey in Chicago. If Bro. Jermyn is asked for proof of this assertion he will probably say that Mrs. Jones told Mrs. Brown that her grandfather told her, when she was a little girl in Belfast, that such was really a fact. Orange speeches are most interesting, but there is one sad feature they bring forcibly to mind, namely, that our system of education has not been quite as successful as we expected in expelling ignorance.

THE PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH A DIVORCE COURT.

A motion was introduced into Parliament on the 13th inst., by Mr. Britton, M. P. for Kingston, the purpose of which was the establishment of a divorce court in each of the provinces of the Dominion.

Mr. Britton explained that it was not his object to establish a system whereby divorces should be easily obtainable, but as there are cases in which it is customary for Parliament to grant divorces, he is of opinion that the judges are the proper persons to consider the validity of the reasons, or at least that a judge should take the evidence as referee, for the saving of expense and trouble. It is true that there is a heavy expense incurred under the present system when a divorce is sought, and this is one of the causes, and we doubt not, the chief cause, on account of which the number of divorces granted in Canada is still so small, as will appear especially when we consider how readily they are granted in the neighboring Republic.

With the light thrown on revelation by the teaching of the Catholic Church, we can have no hesitation in saying that divorces ought not to be granted at all. The divine law, applicable even to the cases under which the Canadian Parliament is accustomed to grant divorces, is "What God hath joined together let not man put asunder."

Even from the form used in the marriage contract by all Christian clergymen who use a fixed form, the intention is evidently to make a tie which is dissolved only by the death of one of the parties. Of the form used in the Catholic Church we need not speak, as it is well known that the Catholic marriage is indissoluble.

The Church of England requires the officiating clergyman to ask the man who is to be married: "Wilt thou forsake all other, keep thee only unto her, so long as ye both shall live. The man shall answer: "I will."

And, further, the man is required to say:

"I take thee N. to be my wedded wife, to have and to hold from this day forward, for better, for worse, for richer, for poorer, in sickness and in health, to love and to cherish, till death us do part, according to God's holy ordinance, and thereto I plight thee my troth."

The promise of the woman is identical with this, the gender only being changed.

In this there is no condition annexed that for any cause, even for unfaithfulness on the part of the husband or wife, the marriage shall be dissolved or dissoluble. The contract is for life. It will also be remarked that this is declared to be God's ordinance. It is, therefore, not within the scope of human authority to change it, though the civil effects of marriage, such as the rights of property, and its mode of transmission to the children, will depend upon the provisions of civil law, always presuming that the law has due regard to the natural rights of subjects.

This being the Christian view of marriage, it follows that we should be best pleased with the system which secures the fewest possible divorces, and that a proposition which would increase the number ought not to become law. Now whatever may be Mr. Britton's opinion to the effect that his proposal would not make the procuring of divorces easy, it is evident that it would greatly increase their number, for the simple reason that it would remove the greatest obstacle which now stands in the way of obtaining them. We are, therefore, gratified that Mr. Britton's proposition was withdrawn.

Sir Wilfred Laurier said in substance that frequent attempts had been made to have the present divorce law changed, but they had not been pushed with any great vigor. From this he inferred that the public opinion of the people of Canada is not in favor of establishing divorce courts; perhaps because the facility with which divorces are granted had assisted in making facility of divorce distasteful to Canadians. At all events, it is better to belong to a country where divorces are few, than to one where they are many and easily obtained by law.

Beside the religious aspect of the divorce question, to which we have already referred, divorces beget strifes among families which were already bound in friendship by the ties of affinity, and make it impossible to give proper attention to the rearing of families of children who need the care of both parents. It is thus seen that divorce is contrary to the natural order of things implanted in our being, and destructive of social morality, and, therefore, to the natural moral law.

We notice that the Rev. Canon Welsh of St. James' (Church of England) Cathedral, Toronto, discoursed on divorce in his Lenten sermon on Wednesday, March 13th, taking precisely the Catholic view of the matter, and maintaining broadly that "On the grounds of a higher and more divine compassion the liberty of remarriage should be absolutely and unconditionally refused after separation (of a divorced couple) because it would forever shut the door to a possible reconciliation. Christ's example," he continued,

"Teaches us that we should never sanction anything that would hinder the restoration of a ruined life. If marriage, and what goes before were the subject, not of ridicule, but of prayer, there would be fewer newspaper revelations of domestic tragedies. The only true foundation and safeguard of marriage is that it ought to be regarded as (an image of) the simple union between Christ and His Church, a union in the Lord."

Regarding the efforts to facilitate divorce laws in Canada, and the actual existence of such laws elsewhere, the Canon said: "Happily we have no divorce court in Canada. Unhappily, efforts may be made to establish one. If so, it is possible that our laws may be assimilated to the English laws on the matter, which are simply infamous. They cut at the root of all social purity, because in violation of the teaching of Christ they set up one standard for women, and another for men. There is also danger of the people of Canada being influenced by the laxity in this respect that prevails in some of the States of the American Republic."

Canon Welsh made reference to a passage of Scripture which has been much discussed, and which has been supposed by some to justify divorce for one cause. He says, however, that "the common interpretation which would allow of remarriage in certain cases, is possibly incorrect."

We have no hesitation in saying that this interpretation is incorrect, and we add that it is an error to call it "the common interpretation." That cannot be the common interpretation which is and always has been contrary to the interpretation of the whole Catholic Church for nineteen centuries, which is against the interpretation of the ancient fathers, and which even the Greek Church has for the most part rejected, though it has at times inconsistently acted against its convictions by sanctioning divorce, as not very many years ago occurred in the case of King Milan of Servia.

The interpretation referred to by Canon Welsh is founded upon a misconception of the meaning of the text, but we shall not discuss the passage here at length, for the same reason which is given by the Canon for not so doing in his address, that the subject is too extensive to be discussed here, the more especially as we have already treated it largely enough in this article.

THE ORANGE LODGES ON THE KING'S OATH.

From the Orange Lodges we can expect nothing else than resolutions replete with the bigotry of bygone days. The civilization of the present age has not succeeded in reaching them. Hence we are not at all surprised at a resolution passed unanimously at a meeting of Madoc Lodge of Toronto a few days ago in which is expressed "disapproval in the strongest manner possible of the action of the Dominion Parliament in supporting a recommendation to the British Parliament to have the Declaration Oath of the Sovereign of Great Britain amended by striking out that part which is offensive to Roman Catholics."

The thanks of the Lodge are also tendered "those members who had the courage of their convictions to vote against the recommendation, especially our Grand Master and Sovereign, the Hon. N. C. Wallace, for the able manner in which he showed there was as much need for the declaration oath now as when it was first introduced."

A somewhat similar resolution to this was passed about a month ago by a lodge in our own city of London.

We shall not say anything of the bad grammar of this resolution, but will pass to the consideration of its substance.

The declaration oath was first introduced expressly for the purpose of excluding any Catholic forever from the throne, and it had its most immediate application to King James II, whose chief fault was that he had granted some slight toleration to those who were persecuted bitterly for conscience sake, Nonconformist Protestants as well as Catholics.

The Orange declaration is, therefore, a declaration in favor of returning to the penal laws of the seventeenth century in all their ferocity, as then existing against Catholics and Protestants alike. It proves that the Orange lodges to day are actuated by the same spirit which possessed them when Henry Grattan, himself a Protestant, but a foe to oppression, announced in the Parliament of Ireland that they were a lawless banditti who had sworn in the secrecy of their lodges to exterminate their Catholic fellow-citizens.

Mr. N. C. Wallace, who is so effusively praised in the Toronto resolution, was the leader of the opposition to the resolution of the Canadian Parliament to petition for the repeal of "what is specially offensive to the religious beliefs of any subjects of the British crown." The petition asks no more than this, which is an exceedingly moderate demand, but neither Mr. Wallace nor the Orangemen for whose declaration he spoke, can open their mouths to utter any word without being impotently offensive; and we are not at all astonished that they should wish the offensive words to be retained in the declaration oath. The impotence of Orangemism is, however, made manifest by the fact that out of one hundred and forty-four members present in the House of Commons when the vote was taken, only nineteen had the hardihood to vote that the grievous insult to Catholics which British Sovereigns have been compelled to utter and to swear to for nearly two and a half centuries should be continued.

But the declaration oath is more than an insult. It is a false oath. It implies that the Pope assumes the authority of granting dispensations or licenses to commit perjury, which is a falsehood, and all who approve that such an oath should be required are co-operators in the commission of perjury. Let the nineteen who voted in the negative on Mr. Costigan's resolution, together with the Toronto and London Lodges, show, if they can, that they are not as guilty of perjury by sustaining the oath as the person who takes it, without his excuse, which is that the law of the land requires it from him as the way whereby his succession to the throne is assured. But we have no doubt that King Edward VII. took such an oath much against his inclination. We give him credit for so much good-will and good sense.

We have said that we could not expect anything else from the Orange Lodges than that they should uphold

this bigotry and fanaticism. They have always opposed themselves to the tolerant spirit of the present age, but they endeavor in vain to stay the torrent which is moving onward. But we have the right to expect that a journal like the Toronto Mail and Empire, which finds its way into many Catholic houses, should not follow the lead of the Lodges.

We have before now, several times, called public attention to the persistent bigotry of one of the regular editors of that journal.

We cannot say that in the principal editorial columns of the Mail and Empire that journal advocated strenuously the retention of the offensive oath. On the 14th of February we read that "the occasion" (for it)

"is long past. The danger is no longer in sight. There is no longer an enemy. So far as Protestantism is concerned, the Declaration is like an old blunderbuss rusted through by time, dangerous only to the user—not merely useless and ridiculous, but noxious and dangerous, offending as it does the feelings of nearly ten millions of Roman Catholic citizens of the Empire." So far as now but a savage insult without a shadow of excuse. If the good sense and thoughtfulness which, there is reason to believe, has dominated the course of Edward VII.'s life does not banish this Declaration from his coronation ceremony, the explanation, we are sure, will be that some technicality or red tape or clumsiness of parliamentary movement will prevent the wishes of the King and of the majority of Protestants being carried into effect. Hardly a Protestant would justify the introduction into the coronation ceremony to-day of a declaration grossly offensive to the religious feelings of a Mahommedan, a Jew, or a Hindoo, and if a Protestant's thought is different regarding his Catholic fellow citizens, the explanation can only be found in some mental echo of the far off days of ancient conflict.

After this plain expression of such a common sense view of the matter, we could readily overlook a later expression of opinion by that same journal to the effect that the matter should not have been brought before the Dominion Parliament for discussion.

We maintain that it concerns British subjects everywhere, and we feel the insult in Canada as much as do our fellow-subjects in the three kingdoms, and we consider that the Dominion Parliament has the right to protest against the continuance of the oath.

It is nothing to the point that the government of the Empire once virtually informed the Canadian Parliament that it would manage Imperial matters, and that the latter might attend to Canadian affairs. The question, then, was of justice to Ireland. We believe that the Canadian Parliament did right then to tender a good advice; but on the present occasion there is no doubt that we Canadians are as much interested in the matter as are any British subjects.

We are satisfied, however, with the general sentiments expressed by the Mail and Empire; but we do protest against any of its editorial staff being permitted to use its columns for such approval of the insulting oath as that which appeared on the 9th inst., and which may be summed up in the concluding words as follows:

"The question ought not to have been raised in the Parliament of Canada. I would certainly cast my vote against the suggested change in the coronation oath. It is surprising to find the strong feeling that is being called out among Protestants in Canada on the subject, but I am pleased at it. Remember the boast of the Church of Rome is that it never changes; in other words, like the Bourbons, it can never learn, and never forget."

It is the boast of the Catholic Church that it never changes its doctrines. What God reveals, man has no authority to change. But the editor here suggests that the Church is unchangeable in guile and malice. This is just as insulting as his advocacy of the Declaration Oath. The penny-a-liner is one with the Lodges on this as on every other question.

THE DISORDER IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

"The row kicked up in the House of Commons at Westminster by a few Irish Catholics, will probably bring good results; it will lead to a redistribution of the Irish seats, and the representation of Ireland will be reduced from one hundred and four to its proper proportion of between fifty and sixty. The Irish Parliamentary party is hard up; the three pounds (\$15) a week members have been in the habit of drawing cannot be paid because the treasury is empty. Hence the row, in the hope of reawakening sympathy and raising the wind. The speaker simply did his duty—finding his authority defied by a gang of blackguards he called in the police."

The above extract from the Toronto Mail and Empire of the 9th inst. will not be read with surprise, for, we regret to say, there prevails in that office an intensely anti-Irish and anti-Catholic feeling. Were it otherwise, the management would not permit one of its editors almost every week to make it a special business to play to the Orange gods in the gallery. It is a pity that a prominent newspaper like the Mail and Empire should give employment to a penny-liner of such a mischievous and vicious disposition.

The publisher of a newspaper should lend his energies to the work of creating a sound public opinion and fostering a feeling of amity be-