

The Catholic Record.

Published Weekly at 424 and 426 Richmond street, London, Ontario.

Price of subscription—\$1.00 per annum.

Author of "Mistakes of Modern Infidels."

THOMAS COFFEY.

Publisher and Proprietor, Thomas Coffey.

Masses, Luke King, John Rich, P. J. Neven and Joseph A. King are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transact all other business for the CATHOLIC RECORD.

Rates of Advertising—Five cents per line each insertion. Agents measurement.

Approved and recommended by the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa, and St. Boniface, the Bishops of Hamilton, Peterborough, and Oshawa, N. Y., and the clergy throughout the Dominion.

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

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

When subscribers change their residence it is important that the old as well as the new address be sent us.

London, Saturday, February 10, 1900.

ANOTHER HERESY TRIAL.

After about two years of discussion, the Presbyterians have come to the conclusion to try Professor McGiffert for heresies found in his book entitled "A History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age." The American General Assembly so far back as 1898 partly judged his case by calling upon him "to withdraw from the ministry or to modify his views." He has not done either thing, and he is therefore now to be tried.

The accusation against him is that he has reduced Christ to the position of a mere man, and one of his critics says that in doing this the Professor writes with "such an assurance of absolute cocksure certainty" as "can scarcely be found in any other book in English." Yet the Professor is defended by many religious papers, among which the Independent said some time ago: "The Presbyterian Church needs no more trials for heresy just now."

It seems highly probable that this case will be another Briggs case for the Presbyterians, and perhaps with all his eccentricity of dogma the Professor will, like Dr. Briggs, take refuge in Episcopalianism, which has of late constituted itself a safe refuge for just such sinners against faith.

A UNITED IRISH PARTY.

A meeting of all the sections of the Irish Nationalist party was held on Jan. 30th in committee room No. 16 of the Parliament House, London, for the purpose of bringing about a reunion of the party. Mr. Timothy Harrington, member for Harbor Division of Dublin, presided, and the leaders of the three sections, Messrs. Jno. Dillon, Timothy Healy and Jno. Redmond were present with their respective followers. A resolution was passed unanimously declaring the division of the party to be at an end, and that henceforth all the Irish Nationalist representatives should act together as one party. On motion of Mr. Healy, three whips for the united party were elected.

We have always desired to see the reunion of the three factions of the Irish party, and it is a hopeful sign that all have come to see the necessity of such reunion; yet with the present men in Parliament, with whom the spirit of faction has been predominant, we are not over-sanguine that much good will be accomplished for Ireland until after the next general election. However, a good deal is to be hoped for if a united Irish party face the electorate at the polls on that occasion, and the burying of the hatchet now may bring this about.

RITUALISTIC PRACTICES CONDEMNED.

Again there has been a public meeting in London, England, at which ten thousand persons are said to have been present, to protest against Ritualistic practices in the Established Church. Resolutions were passed against the turning of the Communion service of the Church of England into a kind of Mass, and condemning the use of the Confessional as practiced in many Churches. The Earl of Portsmouth presided, and many prominent Lords and Commoners participated in the proceedings, among whom the Marquis of Sligo, Viscount Bangor and others addressed the assembly, urging united action against Ritualistic practices.

It appears that the promoters of the meeting are not satisfied with the decision of the Archbishops that only compulsory confession is objectionable. They also entirely ignore the fact that voluntary confession of sins for the purpose of reconciliation with God is strongly recommended in the Book of Common Prayer. The Standard of Faith of the Church will have to be changed by Act of Parliament before the will of the resolutions can be put into effect. The meeting was held

on the 30th ult. The requisite Act of Parliament cannot be attained without much discussion by a body which is strangely nondescript in the matter of religious belief, and the discussion on the subject will be a curiosity.

MORE FRENCH PERSECUTION.

The French Government has made another move in the drama of the suppression of the Assumptionist Fathers. Not only has it decreed their dissolution as a religious order, but it now declares practically that no one must even sympathize with them without incurring the high displeasure of the Government. The Premier, M. Waldeck-Rousseau, wrote to Cardinal Richard, blaming him for having visited the Fathers to express sympathy with them under the persecution they are enduring. His Eminence answered that his visit had no political aspect, nevertheless the Premier declared to his Cabinet Council that the unusual course of the Cardinal is worthy of condemnation; still no further action appears to have been taken as regards His Eminence. But the stipends of those prelates who wrote to the Fathers expressing sympathy have been suspended: these are the Archbishops of Aix, the Bishops of Versailles, Valence, Viviers, Tulle and Montpellier, and the Vicar of Avignon. Certainly this will not deter the Bishops into lauding the Government for an act of unquestionable tyranny; and their influence will yet be felt in the overthrow of the irreligious rulers of the Republic.

THE TABLES TURNED.

Our readers will remember how merrily some of the papers announced in December, on the authority of the Associated Press agent, that Pope Leo XIII. has made a mathematical error in his decree announcing that 1900 should be kept as a holy year. It was stated that the Holy Father had declared that the year 1900 would be the first year of the twentieth century; but when the decree came to hand it was seen that it contained no such mistake, whereas it made the positive statement that the twentieth century would begin with the year 1901—so that the merriment of our esteemed contemporaries at the Pope's supposed mistake was entirely out of place.

But now the Reverend Robt. Ker, the Anglican rector of St. Catharines, writes to the Toronto Mail and Empire calling attention to the fact that the Church of England in its Book of Common Prayer "reckons 1800 as the first year of the century, and, of course 1899 was the last."

Rev. Mr. Ker continues: "In the face of this ruling you can imagine what a startling surprise it was to many of us to find a learned and chronologically pious body of Toronto Churchmen meeting the other day and fixing a totally different date for the end of the century; in fact, boldly declaring that the century hadn't ended at all."

Further, the St. Catharines rector expresses the opinion that it was the anxiety of the Toronto Churchmen to raise \$1,000,000 as a Church fund before the end of the nineteenth century, which led them thus to run counter to the express declaration of the Church.

In fact, near the end of the Table to find Easter Day, given in the Book of Common Prayer we find the following:

"For the next century, that is from the year 1800 till the year 1899, inclusive, add, etc."

The Emperor William of Germany also proclaimed that we are now in the twentieth century. Thus we have the official testimonies of the Church of England, and of the head of the Lutheran Church, to the very mathematical error which it was falsely pretended had been made by Pope Leo XIII.

RE-ENTER JOHN KENSIT.

Mr. John Kensit, the notorious London bookseller, who has succeeded so well in the advertising of his obscene wares, by leading the physical force movement against Ritualism, has once more rushed into print to announce that he is about to renew the agitation of which he was the champion in 1898. The reason he gives for this is that the (Anglican) bishops "are simply hoodwinking the people," and that there has been little if any improvement since the opinions of the Archbishops of Canterbury and York were issued against "compulsory confession" and the use of incense and lights for ritual purposes.

The Mass and the confessional, he says, are practiced as extensively as ever, and while it is true that incense is not used to the same extent during the Church service, it is burned both before and after, so that it is doubtful whether it is not employed just as much now as before the official adverse opinions were issued.

He declares that the Bishop of London requested him to abstain from his public protests against objectionable Ritualistic practices, and that he has done so for fourteen months "in order to give the bishops an opportunity to stop these practices, but they have done practically nothing, and are not likely to do anything." He will, therefore, resume his active protests at once. His purpose is first to go to certain highly Ritualistic churches in the country to enter his protest there against the proceedings, after which he will visit certain churches of London which he has been watching for some time, to ascertain the extent to which the practices to which he objects are carried on.

Mr. Kensit's readiness to proceed to violence is well known, and in London itself, where it is so easy to gather together a mob in an unexpected place, he had hitherto a certain amount of success in raising a row in many churches, but it is not to be supposed that if he attempts to repeat the same tactics, that he will be uniformly successful. In 1898 many churches where he was expected to raise a disturbance prepared a warm reception for him and his adherents, and in several instances the disturbers of public worship were heavily fined or sent to prison. Still Mr. Kensit got the notoriety for which he was looking; but his rabble may expect to be sometimes worsted by their own weapons. At all events stirring times may be expected should he carry out his threat, and there will undoubtedly be wigs on the green, and broken heads in some of the encounters which will take place.

Much of Mr. Kensit's bluster will, we have no doubt, prove to be merely rhodomontade. We have not forgotten that he made the threat before to raise disturbances in one hundred churches on a certain Sunday in November, immediately preceding Gunpowder Plot Day, but the threat was not carried into execution, because he could not organize his forces for the purpose aimed at, and, on the other hand, there were evidences that many of the congregations to be attacked made elaborate preparations to rout the disturbers. The same thing might easily occur again, and no doubt will occur, except when the congregations will be taken completely by surprise. At all events the upshot of Kensit's threats will be looked for with as much curiosity by many outsiders as by members of the Church of England itself.

We can scarcely imagine that this brute-force crusade will have any real effect in checking the Ritualistic movement amid a community which prides itself on loving British liberty in religion as well as in civil matters, and the probability is that the Ritualistic movement will go forward without being restrained by Kensit's threatenings, and that even its progress may be all the greater on account of the attempted persecution by a rabble.

There is no doubt that the Ritualists are really honest in their conviction that their Church is in need of a return in the direction of the ancient Christianity which was discarded at the Reformation of the sixteenth century, and the threats of violence by a rabble will not terrify them from putting their convictions into practical operation.

ANGLICANISM AND THE MONSTRAL MISSION TO NON-CATHOLICS.

The following letter from the Rev. Dr. A. Barnes administrators a well-deserved rebuke to those ministers of various denominations in Montreal who have raised a very great commotion because a mission has been preached in that city with the object of putting before non-Catholics the true doctrine of the Catholic Church, which is so different a thing from that which most Protestant ministers are accustomed to represent it to be.

Rev. Mr. Barnes writes, of course, from the Protestant point of view, nevertheless he shows very clearly that Catholics are fully justified in setting before Protestants an authentic statement of Catholic teaching.

The Rev. Father Younan, whose explanations of Catholic doctrine have been clearly and logically put forth, has not been aggressive further than to correct the misrepresentations of Catholic teaching which have been the stock in trade of many ministers. In addition to this he has shown the Scriptural and historical or traditional grounds of Catholic belief. Mr. Barnes shows that he and the other missionaries who have pursued a similar course were perfectly justified

in so doing, even if we take no higher ground than the fact that Protestant clergymen have not hesitated to deal aggressively against Catholics. It might be added that they have also dealt unfairly, inasmuch as their representations have been frequently based upon falsehoods. This we say deliberately, as we know it to be the case.

The results have fully vindicated the course pursued by the missionaries who are preaching for non-Catholics especially, under the approbation of Mr. Bruchet, the Archbishop of Montreal; for every night thousands of Protestants attend the lectures in order to hear the truth; and, in fact, we learn that converts to the Catholic faith are numbered by hundreds since the lectures began. The missionaries are simply obeying the precept of Christ to his Apostles to teach all nations all things which He commanded, and if the Gospel preaching bears fruit, it is because God's blessing accompanies it.

By an article which appeared in last week's CATHOLIC RECORD it may be seen that the Anglican synod of Montreal has determined to place before the people their view of the history of Anglicanism, and we have shown that there are indications that the view presented will be a distorted one. In fact it is to be based upon the principle enunciated by the Dean of Montreal that a war to the knife is to be waged against the Catholic Church.

We have no fear of the result. The more the history of Anglicanism is ventilated, the more clear will it be that it is not, as its upholders often now pretend, the Church of England of the second and sixth centuries, established by Fugatus and Augustine, but the Church of the sixteenth century which Henry VIII. established in order that he might have free scope for the indulgence of his evil passions.

The ancient Church of England was the Church of the Christian world, established by missionaries sent by Popes Eleutherius and Gregory, and was in communion with all the churches of Christendom, whereas the modern English Church is a human invention which substitutes unadulterated Caesarism for the principle of unity which Christ established when He committed to St. Peter and his lawful successors the care of His whole flock: "The Church for the whole world."

The Rev. Barnes' letter is as follows: (Toronto Sunday World, January 28, 1900.)

A THEOLOGICAL TEMPEST IN A SECTARIAN TEAPOT.

Editor Sunday World.—In your columns of the 22nd I noticed a bold heading, "Religious War Threatened," and on reading down the column I found that a well known English Church clergyman had said, "If the Archbishop of Montreal, who, it would appear, had given his official sanction to a mission for Protestants in that city, the Protestant ministers seem to have taken umbrage at the idea of a mission to their people, and threatened retaliation." The subject is well worth the thoughtful consideration of Christians in general. My first thought was Why should the Protestant dean be angry at Roman Catholics for starting missions for Protestants, when everybody knows that from time immemorial Protestants of all shades have thought it incumbent upon them to send missionaries to Roman Catholics? The plain truth of the matter is that Protestants have always treated Roman Catholics as enemies of Christianity. It is equally well known that Roman Catholics have considered Protestants as outside of the covenanted mercies of God, and on reading down the column I found that the Rev. Barnes, who is a very strange and a very ignorant man who would deny at least equal sincerity to the Catholic as to the Protestant. The Catholic will rise as early, sit up as late and deny himself comforts as much as the Protestant. Let us frankly admit that the one is as sincere as the other, and the Protestant thinks that the Catholic is in error, the thought is fully reciprocated by the Catholic. Why, then, should the Dean of Montreal be angry at the Catholic mission? He knows that for decades, if not for centuries, Protestantism has been sending missionaries to Catholic people, as if they were destitute of the truths of Christianity. More than that, he knows that Calvinists have been trying to save Armenians by missionaries to "Peshawars," because they considered that all other churches than their own had only an emasculated gospel. Episcopalians have also been trying to reclaim the heathen from their fatal error, and the opponents of each have acted with equal earnestness. And so the farce has been running, not "for one hundred nights," but for one hundred years, and "the end is not yet." The plumed knights of each camp are glorying in their supposed or real victories, and thus the farce goes on.

Sir, it is high time that the Church should settle down to the work assigned to it by the Master. The world was to be Christianized. "Preach the gospel to every creature." "Teach all nations." The modern Church cannot send missionaries to the non-Christian portion of the earth, but she can duplicate teachers at home, where all have been cradled in Christianity. Peculiarities and shibboleths must be grappled though the countless millions should never hear of Christ.

Many men have written "Evidences of Christianity," but the strongest evidence of its divine origin is the fact that it has survived the pranks played by professed followers in its name. Sir, I confess that I was ashamed when I read the threat from the Protestants of Montreal, knowing that Protestantism has always been exerting its strength to win Roman Catholics to its side. When will we accept the simple truth that although Catholicism differs very materially from Protestantism, it contains all the essentials of Christianity, and differs from us only in redundancy. That is, it accepts all that we hold, but adds tenets that we cannot accept. Now, if these additional tenets neutralize what we consider essential, the Church might be said to lack the central principles of Christianity. But is it so? Catholicism accepts the doctrine of inspiration as we do; of the atonement; of the deity

of Christ; of future rewards and punishments; of repentance and faith; of salvation through Christ alone. I speak advisedly, and only what can be proved by authority. When I say that if we could only come closer together we would find that our prayers and our hopes differed little from those of the Catholic. In conclusion, I would say that the sending missionaries to those who believe as fully in the Saviour Christ as we do, whether it be to Catholics, Baptists, Presbyterians, Episcopalians, Methodists or Quakers, seems to me not simply a work of supererogation, but a positive illustration of the old saying that impudence and ignorance are closely allied. A. Barnes.

Toronto, Jan. 26, 1900.

ON "DECAYING NATIONS."

From the Lindsay Watchman-Warrior of the 25th ult. we learn that the Rev. L. S. Hughson of the Baptist church preached on the preceding Sunday a sermon or lecture on the "Perils of Britain," the chief purpose of which was to serve as an occasion for making an attack upon the Catholic Church which was both unjust and uncalled-for.

The lecturer spoke first of the South African war, and of the reverses endured by the British forces at Tugela River and other points, expressing confidence that notwithstanding these calamities they will be, under the dispensation of a wise and bountiful Providence, victorious in the final result.

On this point we have no issue with Mr. Hughson. We take it for granted that the British Government is contending for the just treatment of British subjects, and the establishment of a higher civilization in South Africa, than can be expected under Boer rule, and though we differ from Rev. Mr. Hughson when he states that the war was unnecessary, we deem it not needful to discuss this point. We do, however, object to his reasoning that this or any war should be carried on even though it be unjust.

The Rev. Mr. Hughson's ethics are of a most extraordinary character, and after their enunciation in the first part of his address, we are not surprised at any misrepresentation to which he had recourse as he proceeded.

In plain English he maintains that the Boers sought a locality where they could establish themselves as a free nation, but were driven from place to place by British aggressiveness till at last they found a spot so secluded that they innocently hoped to be left undisturbed in possession thereof.

He adds that Cecil Rhodes, and other speculators, knowing or believing that they would have Great Britain at their back, under the pretext of the necessity of a Cape to Cairo railway brought on an aggressive war of conquest, which might have been avoided by properly conducted negotiation.

The war was therefore unjust, according to Rev. Mr. Hughson; yet the unjust aggressor will have the blessing of heaven in pursuing it to the bitter end, destroying life, devastating and destroying homes and property, and appropriating the hardly acquired wealth of the unfortunate vanquished.

It is scarcely needful to say that such ethics are those of the highwayman, who may think he is justified in appropriating the property of others when it suits his convenience, and that he may kill or commit any crimes to attain his end and to enrich himself.

We are not a little astonished that a clergyman should give utterance to such views under any circumstances; but when they are deliberately enunciated from the pulpit, he certainly brings upon himself the condemnation of God: "Thou shalt not live because thou hast spoken a lie in the name of the Lord." (Zacharias xiv, 3.)

The clergyman who could advocate such a system of morality will not hesitate to adopt any misrepresentation to suit his purpose, for with him surely "the end justifies the means;" hence we are not surprised to find him stating that "the nations which have espoused the Roman faith are to-day in decay, and because of their religion." He gives as instances of this, "Spain, France, and Italy," and adds that because of Ritualism, "England is in danger of taking a similar course."

Now we fully admit that Spain, a country with a small population, was badly beaten in the recent war with the United States; and this is, of course, part of the history of its so-called "decay." Besides, during nearly the whole of the present century, and longer, Spain had the misfortune of being engaged in wars, international and dynastic, which kept her back in national prosperity. These wars were not the consequence of her religion, but their religion enabled the people to endure patiently and with fortitude the ills to which they were subjected.

But in spite of all this there are in Spain the elements which, under careful administration, will make the country prosperous. Before the American war there was a period of

peace of seventeen years in Spain, and during that time the country made remarkable progress, and the people were truly prosperous, happy, and contented, and there is nothing that we can at present foresee to prevent that the same country may now enter upon a period of prosperity to equal that of any European country.

Mr. David Hannay in the August issue of the Pall Mall Magazine 1898 said in his description of the Spaniards that "they are human, and they have their faults, but they will compare favorably with any other civilized people;" and, further on, "the loss of their colonies may be a blessing to the Spaniards in the end, since it may lead them to develop their own country, which is full of natural resources, including a mineral wealth which ought to make Spain rich." We may reasonably hope that after another generation Spain will rank high among the nations, notwithstanding all the hardships she has endured during more than a complete century; but she is far from being a nation in decay.

Italy has been for the last thirty years at war with religion, the Pope being at the present moment practically a prisoner in his own city. We admit that this is an abnormal condition of affairs which has brought many evils upon the country, especially as the present generation has grown up under the disadvantage that a large part of the people had no Christian training in the schools. But this condition was brought about through the greed of kings who have usurped the rights and estates of the Church, and not through any shortcomings of religion. Under this state of affairs we have only to say we must hope and pray for a better condition in the near future. Yet even Italy, so far as present military power is concerned, which seems to be the point chiefly insisted on by the Rev. Mr. Hughson, occupies no mean place among the nations. Even within the last week, Italy bearded the Grand Turk, demanding the release of an Italian girl who had been taken to a harem, and the Turkish government, which only within the last three years defied twice the whole array of the great European powers, yielded humbly on this occasion to Italy's demand. It is to Italy also that we owe much of the scientific progress of modern times and especially in the great science of electricity, as the very names of Galvani and the electric measure volt testify, as well as the recent discoveries of a Tesla and a Marconi, etc.

Let us turn now to France, which Rev. Mr. Hughson also numbers among decaying nations. This is a piece of brazen effrontery which only astounds us. France is known to be one of the most prosperous countries, not merely of Europe, but of the world. She has had her periods of severe trial, but what country has not had such? The United States had such a period during the civil war, and the British Empire has its trial at the present moment.

In the matter of education of the people, France stands in the very front rank of the nations of the world. According to Mulhall's statistical Dictionary for 1892, the attendance of school children to each 1,000 of population was 170; with Protestant Germany next, at quite a distance behind, 140. But here it must be noted that Germany has over 33 per cent. of a Catholic population. Belgium, a country in which Protestantism has scarcely a foothold, and where there has been for a long period a thoroughly Catholic Government, takes the next place, with 135. Great Britain, with Ireland, comes next, with 132. Catholic Austria comes next, with 130. The United States, which boasts of its grand educational system, having just the same figure. Great Britain and Ireland have 123; while Spain, from the same cause of which we have already spoken, stands much lower, at 106; but in later years Spain has made substantial progress, giving the hope that, surrounded by the blessings of peace, her people will make that advance in the matter of education, which only the reign of peace and plenty can promote.

In the matter of morality—which is the special sphere of religion—Catholic countries are notoriously in the first rank, in proportion to their fidelity to the precepts of religion. France and Italy have been somewhat foiled by the infidelity of the past, and they have now divorce among their institutions, but Ireland, Belgium, Portugal, Spain, and the Catholic cantons of Switzerland are incomparably above the Protestant countries in this regard.

We have already drawn this article to greater length than we intended,

and we must bring it to a close as possible. On the question of morality we shall, therefore, content ourselves with quoting from Mr. T. Lin's book on Spain, which is found on the most recent observation statistics.

He states that the Spanish women have been much calumniated, "he says, 'what are the virtues of a woman who does not possess? You soon discover on studying her, you must take all the virtues of most virtuous English women, all grace and wit of the most graceful and witty of French women, and all beauty of the most handsome Italian women to make something approximating to a perfect Spanish lady.'"

He adds that the Spanish woman is, generally, the most virtuous woman on earth, and should be an unhappy one, no one will know it, for she will never complain either to a divorce court or to the apartments of a paramour.

Of the morals of both men and women, the best testimony which is given is the fact also stated by Thiblin, that even in Madrid the called demi-monde does not exist. There are, indeed, a few fallen women in the capital and some few towns; there is more infidelity in a single of Paris or London (and New York Chicago might be added) than in Spain. To this Alban Stoltz adds "outside the seaport towns, it is not a house of ill repute in all."

We need not comment on Mr. son's tirade against Ritualism. Anglican Ritualists can take themselves, but we will say that England become Catholic, and Hughson fears may possibly occur will lose nothing either in knowledge of true faith, or morality, by edging for the supreme head of the Church the successor of St. Peter, who first established Anglicanism. We freely admit and admire the virtues of Queen Victoria, and the virtues of Queen Victoria; we cannot admit that her majesty was appointed by Christ His Church on earth. Neither Mr. Hughson admit this.

THE CONVERSION OF LAND.

It would seem that the sciences never have done inventing theories in regard to the natural Reformation. The Archbishop of Canterbury, at the last meeting of the Diocesan Church Committee, ward this novel justification of existence of the Church of "We did not part from Rome."

"Rome refused to have anything to do with us," and if there be a reunion, Rome will have the first step, and to propose such a reunion as may make for the Church of England to a large extent, but such union is a long way off.

It is perfectly true that the people as a whole did not separate from Rome, even the reign of Charles I., but forced into it by the persecutions which were enacted against and even against all non-conformists or Protestants who conformed to the Church of Rome. It is an undeniable fact who adhered to the Catholic were bitterly persecuted, and the matter of course, could peace with the new religion substituted the ruler of the divinely appointed Church, and in other respects dogmas of the faith been handed down from the Apostles; but other would have been ready to do yielding to persecution, at the primitive faith, the people land certainly did part deliberately, or at least.

The Ritualistic movement half of the present century gives us the conviction that of England would have remained in union with Rome had not been coerced into fangled religion. There is a grain of precious truth of valueless and retarded glican Primates.

Years ago we heard of Anglican divine of London declare that

"We were the first to break union which united the Church, and we should be the right hand of fellowship with a view to the restoration of unity to Christendom."

This sentiment is very from that expressed by the and the movement of a of the Anglicans toward the Catholic Church to that the Primate is not a