

Published Weekly at 484 and 486 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. LEE, KING, JOHN NICH, and P. J. SEVEN, are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transact all other business for the CATHOLIC RECORD.

London, Saturday, Jan. 27, 1894.

Official.

The Conferences for the clergy of the London Diocese will be held at St. Peter's Palace, London, on Wednesday, Jan. 31, at 2 p. m.; for the clergy of the counties of Essex and Kent, at The Deanery, Windsor, on Thursday, Feb. 8, commencing at 11 a. m.

CRIMINAL LABEL.

We are credibly informed that the Archbishop of Kingston has given instructions to Messrs. Walkem & Walkem, a prominent firm of lawyers in Kingston, to notify the editor of the Toronto Mail of his responsibility for criminal libel, on account of the shamefully slanderous letter published by him in the name of an ex-priest, on the 18th inst., and the equally slanderous preface with which the editor introduces that letter to his readers. It is high time to bring the editor of the Mail to his senses. For years he has been most atrociously slandering the Archbishops and Bishops of this Province, under cover of ex-priests and suspended priests' fictitious narratives, relying on impunity from their Lordships such as he could not expect from any other class of citizens. But, reluctant through high dignitaries of the Church are to appeal for protection to the civil courts, and secure though they undoubtedly may be that no amount of calumny heaped upon them by such men as the editor of the Mail and his hired ex-priests, can succeed in attaching the least stigma to their character, or weakening the loyalty of the faithful to them and their divine office, there is a degree beyond which patience is not expected to go; and there are occasions that seem to demand the summary arrest of systematized calumny. Since the Mail's attack last week was directed only partially against His Grace the Archbishop of Kingston, and chiefly and primarily against the whole hierarchy of Ontario, for the express purpose of bringing disrepute on them all and on their administration, just at the moment when the Mail and P. A. are inaugurating a crusade of calumny against the Catholic Church and Catholic people in Eastern Ontario, it is most opportune and laudable on the part of the Archbishop of Kingston to take hold of this persistent and indiscriminating slanderer and teach him that licentiousness has its bounds, and that even for the hierarchy of the Catholic Church there is protection afforded by the public law of this Dominion.

A HIGH CHURCH MANIFESTO.

Canon Knox Little of London, England, has written an elaborate reply to Archdeacon Farrar's recent virulent attacks upon Ritualism, and sacerdotalism in general. The answer is in the form of an open letter to the Dean of Lincoln, and it may be regarded as the latest proclamation of principles by the High party in the Church. It is divided into four parts, which treat respectively of the following matters: 1, Confession and absolution; 2, Fastings, Communion, and Eucharistic Worship; 3, The Real Presence and the Eucharistic Sacrifice; 4, The Apostolic Ministry.

Archdeacon Farrar attacks all these doctrines as having been borrowed by the Ritualists from the Catholic Church, after having been in disuse among Anglicans for the last three centuries, and he glories in the fact that he is not a priest in the Catholic sense, that is to say, one who offers up sacrifice to God; all of which is perfectly true, though it is also true that the doctrinal standards of the Church of England claim for the clergy of the Church priestly powers, yet so obscurely as to leave a certain vagueness of meaning which seems to be intentional, and which there is good historical reason for saying was really intentional. The object of this was to gather into the folds of the Church the people of England, of whatever shade their belief might be, from the extreme of

Calvinism to the full historic faith of the Catholic Church.

This being the case it is not a matter of surprise that there should be within the Church so many diverse degrees of belief and so many parties—High Church, Low Church, Erastian, and Latitudinarian or Broad Church, besides intermediate ones without number. Of these, the first two are the most aggressive, as they are the exponents of irreconcilable faiths, both of which are of fixed character, the High Church in positive doctrine, and the Low negatively. The other two do not contend so vigorously because they are by their nature not so positive. The Erastian is on principle yielding to the authority of the State on all points of doctrine, and the Transcendentalist, though disbelieving or doubting the most important doctrines of Christianity, is willing to allow the greatest latitude to others, as he desires this for himself.

Thus it happens that the two first named constitute the militant parties in the Church, waging a bitter warfare against each other; and it is now conceded by competent observers that the Ritualists or High Churchmen so predominate that they are almost certain to be in a short time "the Church itself."

The Ritualists are not at all so devoid of support from the Church standards as the Evangelicals or Low Churchmen would have the world to believe. Canon Knox-Little maintains that his doctrine is that of the Church of England.

In regard to confession to a priest empowered to absolve from sin he says that though it is not necessary for salvation, it should in all cases be observed before communicating if friendship with God has been disturbed or interrupted by sin.

There is no disputing the fact that the Church Ritual for the visitation of the sick commands that "the sick person shall be moved to make a special confession of his sins if he feel his conscience troubled with any weighty matter. After which confession the priest shall absolve him (if he humbly and heartily desire it) after this sort."

Then follows a form of absolution by the priest as positive as words can make it, that "by His (God's) authority committed to me, I absolve thee from all thy sins in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen."

There is certainly nothing in the words of our Lord, committing to His Apostles the power of forgiving sin, confining the exercise of this power to those who are sick or infirm. If this power is given to the priesthood at all, it follows that it may be exercised upon those who are in good health equally with the sick, and the Rev. Canon Little has the best of the argument in maintaining that such is the case. But we have, besides, the positive declaration of the form of ordination to this effect when the officiating Bishop is required to say to the newly ordained "priest": "Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a priest in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands. Whose sins thou dost forgive they are forgiven; and whose sins thou dost retain they are retained."

It cannot be made an objection to this view of the case that it is only when the conscience of the infirm person is troubled with some weighty matter that he is required to confess.

Even in this respect there is agreement with Catholics in regard to the jurisdiction of the priesthood, for Catholics admit that merely venial sins may be forgiven without actual confession. As Protestant Evangelicals, however, deny the distinction between mortal and venial sins, and hold that all sins are mortal, the strict interpretation of these words must be that whenever the sick person has committed a sin at all, however small, it is a reason why he should confess.

The Canon maintains that the Eucharist is a true sacrifice, in which Christ is objectively, that is, really, present.

We cannot, indeed, detect in the standard formularies of the Church of England any teaching like this; yet neither is there anything that we are aware of positively contradicting it. It is a doctrine derived from the constant teaching of antiquity; and in June, 1867, a manifesto was issued which was intended to be the declaration of Faith of the High Church party. It was signed by Drs. Pusey, Little, Dale, McConachie, and many others, and in it the statement was clearly made that the Eucharistic sacrifice is not "something apart from the one, all-sufficient sacrifice and oblation of

the cross," but "We believe that as in heaven Christ, our great High-priest, ever offers Himself before the Eternal Father, pleading by His presence His sacrifice of Himself once offered on the cross; so on earth in the Holy Eucharist, that same body, once for all sacrificed for us, and that same blood, once for all shed for us, sacramentally present, are offered and pleaded before the Father by the priest, as our Lord ordained to be done in remembrance of himself, when He instituted the Blessed Sacrament of His body and blood."

Even so far back as the date here indicated, the signers declared that this is the actual teaching of the Church of England, and that any variation therefrom is a "disloyalty to the Church."

It is not to be supposed, however, that the High Church party desired to be quite identified in doctrine with Catholics. It was desired by them to have a doctrine of the Real Presence differing somewhat from that which has always been held in the Church, so that the declaration which was required during penal times in order to distinguish Catholics, and render them subject to the penalties of the law, might be safely taken by them. Hence the doctrine in question specially repudiates the doctrine of Transubstantiation. The High Churchmen have thus adopted instead thereof the Lutheran notion of "Consubstantiation," which has no foundation either in Holy Scripture or the teachings of the Fathers. The true Catholic doctrine is that there is a change of substance in the Holy Eucharist, whereby the bread and wine, actually become the Body and Blood of Christ. The Lutheran and High Church doctrine is that the bread and wine remain with the Body and Blood of Christ after the sacramental words of consecration are pronounced. They agree, however, that the Calvinistic notion of a figurative presence, which means a real absence of Christ's Body, does violence to the words of Christ and the constant teaching of His Church for more than eighteen centuries. It is almost needless to add that as regards the manner of Christ's presence, the High Church teaching is as alien to Christ's words as is the Calvinistic doctrine, though there is an approach to Catholic doctrine in the admission that Christ is really present in any manner.

But to have the Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist, and a real sacrifice, a real priesthood unnecessary, and in this the Ritualists are as deficient as the Low Churchmen who proclaim with Canon Farrar that they are not priests in the sense of a sacrificing priesthood. The Canon goes further and maintains that Christianity has no sacrificing priesthood. If this were true, the prophecy of Malachi would not be fulfilled, that "from the rising of the sun even to the going down, My name is great among the Gentiles, and in every place there is sacrifice, and there is offered to My name a clean offering; for My name is great among the Gentiles, saith the Lord of hosts." (1. ii.) Neither would there be a fulfillment of the prophecy of Isaiah: "In that day there shall be an altar of the Lord in the midst of the land of Egypt, and a monument of the Lord at the borders thereof. It shall be for a sign and for a testimony to the Lord of hosts in the land of Egypt. . . . And He (the Lord) shall send them a Saviour and a defender to deliver them. And the Lord shall be known by Egypt, and the Egyptians shall know the Lord in that day, and shall worship Him with sacrifices and offerings, and they shall make vows to the Lord, and perform them." (Is. xiv., 19, 20.)

A FLIGHT OF IMAGINATION.

The Montreal Witness sounds "A NOTE OF WARNING TO THE PROTESTANT ELECTORATE" of the Dominion from the fact that Bishop Cameron of Antigonish, Nova Scotia, and Father McDonnell, a "French Irish" priest from St. Denis, St. Hyacinthe county, Quebec, arrived in Ottawa a few days ago, and that "the Bishop was driven to the residence of Sir John Thompson, where he is the guest of the Premier."

It is not at all a matter for surprise that the learned and much beloved Bishop of Antigonish, who is a warm friend of the Premier, should be his guest while visiting the Capital; but the Witness interprets the event as indicating that "an effort is to be made to whip the hierarchy of the Dominion into line in support of Sir John Thompson in the ensuing general election." The statement is made that Rev. Father McDonnell is an active propagandist of Sir John Thompson's cause

in the Province of Quebec, and that an influential priest of Ontario was expected to meet the Bishop and Father McDonnell in order to agree upon the plan to be pursued.

It is needless to say that this is all purely imaginary on the part of the Witness and its Ottawa special correspondent. It is not customary for the Catholic hierarchy to be whipped into line in politics, and there will be nothing of the kind attempted. We presume that the individual members of the hierarchy, like other citizens, have their private political leanings, but they have not attempted in the past to force them upon their flocks, nor are they likely to do so in the future—for this is what is implied in the despatch from Ottawa as published in the Witness.

It is to be remarked that no such news as all this was published by the other daily papers, and we all know that the latter are quite as energetic as the former in obtaining the latest intelligence from the capital.

We should add here that the Witness despatch is evidently founded upon the supposition common to that journal and the Mail of Toronto, that there is "a solid Catholic vote" at the disposal of the hierarchy, to be sold by them to the highest bidder in the Dominion and Local Legislatures, which is a pure fiction.

We must add also that the only efforts to whip in "a solid vote" were those made by the Methodist Bishop or General Superintendent Carman of the Methodist Church, Dr. Douglas, the itinerant political preacher, and others of their class "to whip in" the Protestant vote to carry out their plans for ruling Parliament and the various Legislatures. The present attempt of the Witness is merely the drawing of a red herring across the scent to distract public attention from the actual state of the case.

At the same time that we make these comments on the statements of the Witness, we shall not conceal our belief that if the doings of the P. P. A. were to find favor with a very large section of Protestant electors, it might have a tendency to secure a pretty compact Catholic vote on the other side; but this is not likely to be the case, as the great bulk of respectable Protestants give no countenance to the dark lantern organization. We may here remark too that it is scarcely consistent for the Witness to condemn half heartedly the P. P. A. one day, and a few days after to add fuel to the flame which that organization has kindled, by publishing such baseless reports as the Ottawa despatch which gives occasion to our present remarks.

REV. PROFESSOR McVICAR'S PÆAN.

There has been much flourish of trumpets over the public renunciation of his faith made by Mr. Louis J. Papineau, Seigneur of Montebello, in Montreal, on the 10th inst., referred to in the last issue of the CATHOLIC RECORD.

The Rev. Principal McVicar, of Montreal, declared at the ceremony of apostasy, that it was "a memorable night, and he would venture to say the event of that night would be a great factor for good. The name of Papineau, even if it were only whispered, would be carried to the end of the earth and would be respected and honored by all who studied history to a good purpose. He rejoiced in the progress of truth and the spirit of toleration among all classes, and the growth of a disposition to emphasize the good qualities of all. He rejoiced also that his fellow-countrymen of French origin are more and more disposed to cherish liberty in all relations of nationality and religion, and to appeal to one authoritative source of God's word. He prayed that everyone might have free access to the Word of God."

We have no disposition to heap opprobrium on Mr. Papineau for the step he has taken in abandoning the religion of his fathers, for he is, of course, quite free to deny his religion, and to apostatize from it: he is a free agent, responsible to God, however, for his acts. Yet it is nauseating, for his acts, to read the fulsome flattery with which that gentleman is besetted at what ought to have been a purely religious ceremony—a ceremony in which God, and not man, ought to have been the object of worship. And the flatterers are supposed to be the ministers of the God of truth: this makes the whole transaction all the more nauseous. It is, indeed, as Principal McVicar tells us, because Mr. Papineau is his father's son, not on account of any remarkable qualities in himself,

that his "conversion" is regarded as a historical event in the existence of Presbyterianism in Quebec!

It has frequently occurred that Protestants who have occupied the highest positions in the land have become Catholics, and this has been the case with some in our own Canada. Some have been converted on their deathbeds, others when a brilliant career was in prospect before them, to which their conversion would be likely to be an obstacle. The conversions in such cases could have arisen from no other cause than conscientious conviction. Yet we are not aware that there was any special boasting on the part of the Catholic priests who took part in receiving such persons into the Church that the event marked any great era in the history of religion. They became Catholics for their own salvation's sake, not with the expectation of being any extraordinary windfall to the Church; but it appears that the Rev. Mr. McVicar, Chiniquy, and the other Presbyterians ministers who received Mr. Papineau into their body, regard such an event in quite a different light; but perhaps this is because it is an extraordinary phenomenon that so prominent (because wealthy) a person as Mr. Papineau sees fit to join them.

But it appears that conscientious conviction of the truth of Presbyterianism had little to do with Mr. Papineau's conversion. The real cause is to be found in the following circumstances:

About a year ago it was determined by the Archbishop of the Diocese, and the *cure* of Montebello, in union with the popular vote, to erect a new church in the parish. To this Mr. Papineau was opposed, and he published an open letter to the press in which it was stated that in Montebello, as well as other parts of the Province, the *cures* have "extravagant ideas" with regard to the construction of churches, and that their cost is a grievous burden on the taxpayers. He also asserted that frequently, in order to have new and costly churches, the *cures* had "destroyed beautiful architectural monuments." Before writing this letter Mr. Papineau had objected that a new church was unnecessary in Montebello, as by the expenditure of a "small sum of money the old church could be repaired and made adequate to all the requirements of the parish for many years to come." His views did not prevail, and he openly threatened to renounce the Catholic Church unless they were adopted; and the Montreal *Witness*, which we may presume to be well acquainted with Mr. Papineau's motives, informs us that "he carried his threat into execution," the reason assigned being that "the only way he could avoid being made to contribute towards the new church was by renouncing Catholicism, and this he threatened to do."

We are told afterwards, indeed, that "it appears, however, from his address to-night (10th inst.) that he had also reasons of a conscientious character, and that the church trouble was merely the occasion of his conversion."

The "reasons of a conscientious character" were, therefore, altogether of recent discovery, becoming known, in fact, only when it was evident that to create a sensation there should be other reasons put forth besides those which were already known to the public, namely, that he could not dictate to the Bishop, clergy, and laity the character of church accommodation which was necessary for the wants of the parish, and that it was too costly for a rich man to remain a Catholic in a Province where by the will of the people all Catholics are obliged to contribute towards church buildings in proportion to their means. Principal McVicar and his colleagues may yet find that Mr. Papineau's wealth will not be such a bonanza to Presbyterianism as they evidently expect. He became a convert for private financial reasons, and he is not likely to become over-generous, unless for a while he may make a show of being so for mere shames sake, to put into the background the real cause operating towards his conversion. There is, at all events, nothing more alien to the spirit of Christianity than this puffing up of so-called converts, especially of wealthy ones, as if they were necessary to religion, instead of religion being necessary to them; and the fact of doing this by the ministers of any religion leaves the suspicion that the religion itself is purely a worldly affair. A clergy conscious that their religion is that of Christ would never dream of thus pandering to the vanity of their converts. They would find more consolation in the fact that in their Church

the words of our Divine Saviour were verified: "The poor have the gospel preached unto them." And at all events Mr. Papineau has nothing about him to make him so wonderfully remarkable, whatever may be his religion, except that it has been made clear that he has abandoned the Catholic Church through pride and an inherent spirit of rebellion because he could not rule supreme within it.

Much stress has been laid upon the supposed fact that the Province of Quebec is supplied with beautiful and costly churches, and that thereby the people are oppressed, because they have to contribute towards building them. We can assure those journals which have put forward this view of the case so persistently that Catholics, both the clergy and the laity, are not accustomed to build costly churches beyond the means of the respective congregations; and as in Quebec the vote of the people is requisite before such works are undertaken, it is extremely unlikely that in any particular case they would plunge themselves recklessly into debt. In the case of Montebello, it is acknowledged that nearly all the parishioners are in favor of the new church which it is proposed to build. They are probably better aware than the Protestant journalists of Ontario whether the tax they are imposing upon themselves is beyond their means or not. It must be remembered that the people of the locality are nearly all of one faith, and the case is not to be compared with that of building a church in either a town or country place in Ontario, where the people are divided into half a dozen or perhaps a dozen different denominations, and require, therefore, so many different church buildings. Where there is but one faith a larger building is necessary, and if the people make it a beautiful structure, it is because they are animated with the spirit of the people of God who co-operated with Moses and Solomon in making the tabernacle and the temple worthy of Him in Whose honor they were built. The objections raised by Mr. Papineau and the Ontario and some Quebec journals against it savor of the objection raised by Judas Iscariot with the anointing of our Lord's feet with precious spikenard by Mary Magdalen: "Why this waste? Why was not this ointment sold for three hundred pence and given to the poor?" The Evangelist tells us that Judas said this, not because he cared for the poor, but because he held the purse, and was "a thief and a robber."

THE DOWN GRADE.

It will be remembered by many that thirty years ago a great sensation was created by the publication of "Essays and Reviews," a volume issued by a number of prominent Church of England clergymen, the purpose of which was to undermine faith in the historical credibility of the Bible, and to introduce a free and easy interpretation of Christian doctrine. A similar volume with a similar purpose has just been issued by a number of Congregationalist ministers, under the title "Modern Congregational Theology." We notice that the Evangelical clergy, so-called, are much disturbed by the appearance of this volume, which indicates the wide extent to which Latitudinarianism has spread among the Protestant clergy of all denominations.

A passage from Professor Bennet's essay, in which "the tyrannous and misleading authority of tradition" is strongly denounced, is particularly disagreeable to the more conservative theologians of nearly all the sects, as indicating the writers' total unbelief in the universally accepted dogmas of Christianity, and especially in the Bible, for it is well understood that the authority of the Bible as God's word has only tradition and the infallible authority of the Church of God to sustain it. But the authority of the Church as a divinely appointed teacher has been repudiated by Protestantism from its first beginning, and this repudiation has been incorporated so plainly in the standards of belief of nearly all the Churches that it is impossible now for any of them to deny that it is of the very essence of Protestantism to repudiate Church authority as a satisfactory foundation for our faith. Thus we are carefully told by the nineteenth article of the Church of England, that "as the Church of Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch; so also the Church of Rome hath erred, not only in their living and manner of ceremonies, but also in matters of faith."