

The Catholic Record.

Published Weekly at 184 and 186 Richmond street, London, Ontario.
Price of Subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

EDITOR: REV. GEORGE R. NORTHGRAVES.
Author of "Mistakes of Modern Liberalism."
THOMAS COFFEY.
Publisher and Proprietor, Thomas Coffey.

Meers, Luke King, P. J. Neven and Miss Sarah Hawley are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and to transact all other business for THE CATHOLIC RECORD.
Agent for Newfoundland, Mr. James Power of St. John.
Rates of Advertising—Twenty cents per line each insertion, advance payment.
Approved and recommended by the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa and St. Boniface, the Bishops of London, 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 Monday morning. When subscribers change their residence, it is their duty to inform the publisher of the new address.
Subscribers when changing their address should notify this office as soon as possible in order to insure the regular delivery of their paper.
Agents or collectors have no authority to stop your paper unless the amount due is paid. Matter intended for publication should be mailed in time to reach London not later than Monday morning. Please do not send us poetry. Objections and marriage notices sent by subscribers must be in a condensed form, to insure insertion.

LETTERS OF RECOMMENDATION.

Apostolic Delegation,
Ottawa, June 25th, 1905.

To the Editor of THE CATHOLIC RECORD,
London Ont.
My Dear Sir:—Since coming to Canada I have been a reader of your paper. I have noted with satisfaction that it is directed with intelligence and ability, and, above all, that it is founded on a strong Catholic principle and right, and stands firmly by the same time promoting the best interests of the country.

Following these lines it has done a great deal of good for the cause of religion and country, and it will do more and more, as its influence reaches more Catholic homes.

I, therefore, earnestly recommend it to Catholic families.

With my blessing on your work, and best wishes for its continued success,
Yours very sincerely in Christ,
DONATIS, Archbishop of Ephesus,
Apostolic Delegate.

UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA,
Ottawa, Canada, March 7th, 1905.

To the Editor of THE CATHOLIC RECORD,
London Ont.
Dear Sir:—For some time past I have read your estimable paper, THE CATHOLIC RECORD, and congratulate you upon the manner in which it is published.

Its matter and form are both good; and a truly Catholic spirit pervades the whole.

Therefore, with pleasure, I can recommend it to the faithful.

Blessing you and wishing you success,
Believe me to remain,
Yours faithfully in Jesus Christ,
D. FALCONE, Arch. of Larissa,
Apost. Deleg.

LONDON, SATURDAY, JAN. 20, 1906.

"THOU SHALT NOT KILL."

A curious despatch comes from Philadelphia, under date January 5th, which states that Dr. Charles Eliot Norton, of Cambridge, has written an open letter to Miss Anne S. Hall, of Cincinnati, approving of a plan on which Miss Hall and Mrs. Ballington Booth have agreed, to advocate a new mode of dealing with the hopelessly insane, the incurably diseased, and the victims of accidents who are so badly injured that it is agreed that they cannot recover. Instead of placing them under the care of competent nurses who will endeavor to prolong the lives of such patients they are to be put to death painlessly by the most gentle means which can be employed.

Dr. Norton was formerly Professor of Literature at Harvard, and with the poets Longfellow and Lowell made the celebrated translation of the "Divine Comedy" into English. We cannot doubt, therefore, his ability as a literary man, but his letter proves that he is of small account as a moralist. His code of morals is the natural product of the tendency to paganism which is characteristic of present day Rationalistic Protestantism. It is the result of bringing the Law of God to be tried before the court of the private judgment of individuals; but we believe that Protestantism has not as yet reached a depth of degradation so profound as to accept the doctor's heathenish moral code, whatever may happen in the distant future.

Dr. Norton says that the principle on which the prevalent treatment of such cases as he speaks of is founded in the doctrine that human life is sacred; but he is of opinion that the principle and practice have been carried too far. In such cases as we have mentioned above, and when the continued life of a patient who cannot recover is a cause of suffering both to the patient and to other people, an end should be put to that life and suffering by giving the sick person a dose of laudanum! As an example, he says "no reasonable man should hesitate to hasten death in the case of a mortal disease such as cancer when it has reached the stage of incessant severe pain and when the patient desires to die. The prolongation of life in such a case, by whatever means, is mere criminal cruelty." The doctor concludes thus:

"It is not to be hoped that a superstition so deeply rooted in tradition as that of the duty of prolonging life at any cost will readily yield to the arguments of reason or the pleadings of compassion, but the discussion of the subject in its various aspects may lead gradually to a more enlightened public opinion, and to the consequent relief of much misery."

In answer to all this we have to say that the law of God, which tells us "thou shalt not kill," must prevail over all human fads and fancies. This law is deeply fixed in man's nature, and no man can be justified in taking upon himself to deprive of life God's rational

creatures who are innocent of all crime. That life was given by God for His own wise purposes, and He has not given to man the right to take away that life which comes from Him and not from man. The only exception to the law "Thou shalt kill," is when society, which is also of divine institution, deems it necessary to punish a criminal by capital punishment in order to prevent the repetition of such crime; or when an innocent individual is attacked by an unjust aggressor, and the attack cannot be repelled otherwise than by killing the aggressor in self-defence. The case of waging a just warfare is included in these cases.

We are greatly surprised to see the name of Mrs. Ballington Booth associated with those of Dr. Norton and Miss Hall in this advocacy of murder. We had always associated Mrs. Booth's name with works of philanthropy and charity, and we regret to learn that she has adopted this new fad, which is opposed alike to charity and religion.

FREEMASONRY IN MONTREAL.

We regret to notice by recent Montreal papers that among the lodges which figured at a general Masonic celebration in that city a few days after the great festival of Christmas was one which is claimed to be the only lodge in America which makes use of the French language in its proceedings, and that it was presided over by a French Canadian master, who is, as we presume by his name, a descendant or at least a relative of the famous St. Paul de Chomedey de Maisonneuve, who landed in Quebec on August 20th, 1641, from France, and was installed a short time afterward as Governor of the French colony of Canada.

Paul de Maisonneuve was an undoubted Catholic, brave and pious, and contributed greatly by his piety and zeal toward making French Canada the thoroughly Catholic country which it is still.

Our regrets are modified by the fact that among the four million of French Canadian Catholics who have spread themselves over many parts of the United States as well as Canada, and have a permanent domain on this vast continent, there are not more Masonic lodges than one which can lay undisputed claim to the fact that it follows in the footsteps of the Combes and Gambettas of their mother country, but even one such lodge is one too many.

Freemasonry, has a diabolical hatred of the ancient religious traditions of France, which date back even to the Apostolic age, and it is chiefly to Freemasonry that it is due that at the present moment a merciless war is being waged against the Christian religion in France. We regret that there should be a distinctively French lodge of that order in Canada at all, and especially that the respected name of the able Governor St. Paul de Maisonneuve should have descended to one who at the present day is Master of the only French lodge in America. We are glad, however, to record the fact that French Canadians are not to be induced by such an example to abrogate the glorious traditions of their race by following the footsteps of the French Freemasons in declaring war upon the religion of their ancestors.

There is no doubt that the final cession of Canada to Great Britain by the Treaty of Paris in 1763 was regretted by the French population of that period, and for this natural feeling they deserve honor and not blame; but they and their descendants loyally accepted British rule, and since then they have several times sealed their loyalty with their blood. The French Canadians of to day are quite as loyal to the British throne as are those of British origin, and it is not desirable nor laudable that after every little interval of time noisy gatherings of over zealous Britons should sling at their fellow citizens of French origin the reproach that they are French, and the insinuation that they are not truly loyal to the flag under which we live.

In fact, the feeling is now general among French Canadians that it was a benign Providence which brought about the separation of Canada from France before the Atheistic principles of the French Revolution of 1792 were transplanted to this country. Thus Canada was preserved in loyalty to its faith, while still they rejoiced and gloried in the Catholic traditions of their mother country which was well named "the oldest daughter of the Church."

Freemasonry is by no means a part of France's glory. It is a modern innovation which has brought reproach to France's fair name, and we should be much grieved to believe that it has gained any headway among the French Canadian people.

We still retain the hope that the modern Atheists will not retain the predominance in France which recent events there seem to indicate; but at all events we hope that none of the

fruits of the Atheistic regime in France may be transplanted to this country.

Freemasonry has been for the past century the principal motive power of every anti Catholic movement in Europe, and the proofs of this are too numerous to be refuted. On this account, it has been strongly and justly condemned by many successive Popes. We hope, therefore, that all Catholics in the Dominion, whatever may be their nationality, will hold themselves aloof from that dangerous organization.

Loyalty to God is our first duty as God's creatures, and the duty of loyalty to the church of God which is doing Christ's work on earth is a necessary consequence of this. Now since so many Popes have condemned Freemasonry, if there were no other reason than this the avoidance of that organization by Catholics of every nationality, loyalty to the head of the church should be a sufficient reason to keep them out of an association which has brought upon itself the condemnation of the church.

It has been said that American Freemasonry is not tainted with the Atheism of the European organization, but it is certainly afflicted therewith, and is governed by the same principles, which are inherently Atheistic, and it should, therefore, be avoided by all Catholics as essentially evil, the more especially as the condemnation by the Popes referred to above extends to the society as a whole. No one who clings to it can be a Catholic, either in Europe or America.

MARQUIS VALENTINE PATRICK McSWEENEY.

It will be a matter of interest to our readers to learn that there is in Rome a Marquis, who, though not born in Ireland, is the son of an Irishman, and who occupies a high position in the Roman Court owing to his very great knowledge of languages. This gentleman is the Marquis Valentine Patrick McSweeney, the son of Valentine Patrick McSweeney of Macroom in Cork county, where the family residence still exists though in a somewhat ruined condition.

The Marquis was born in Paris in 1871, his mother being a Polish lady, Emma Countess Konarska, and as the Poles are noted for linguistic ability, it is said that the Marquis's great skill in languages is due chiefly to his Polish descent. He speaks eight modern languages with great ease and accuracy. He is especially skilful in English, French and Italian, which languages he speaks with the fluency of a native of the countries to which they belong respectively.

The Marquis was appointed Honorary Chamberlain to the Pope in 1893 and Private Chamberlain in 1895, and in 1896 received the title of Marquis. His diplomatic services to the Holy Father are very great owing to his proficiency in these languages, as well as those of the Balkan States, and in the diplomatic negotiations of the Pope with these States he has rendered great service, especially with Montenegro, during recent years. He is much interested in the movement which was so dear to the heart of Pope Leo XIII., the return of the Oriental Church to the Catholic faith, and his negotiations in a great measure had reference to this question.

The Marquis is partly editor of the Cosmos Catholicus, with which he is to a great degree identified, and which is issued periodically in Rome and treats of Catholic matters in general in the three languages, French, English and Italian, in which the Marquis is especially skilful. His residence is in the palace of the Falconieri on the Julian Road, where he frequently entertains eminent visitors to Rome, and where he makes particularly welcome the hierarchy of Ireland, and other Irish visitors who are connected with the movement for Irish Home Rule, in which he takes deep interest.

A CONTRAST.

A very remarkable feature of the electoral contest now going on in Great Britain is the violent action of disorderly mobs in various parts of England. To such an extent has this been carried that it is difficult for speakers to be heard at the public meetings; and, in order that some semblance of order might be secured, in many places resort has been taken to the expedient of issuing tickets of admission. It has been the custom, when even only slight outbreaks of violence at public meetings occurred in Ireland, for the English press to point to those disorders as a reason why the Irish people had not advanced to that state which would entitle them to the privilege of governing themselves in a local Parliament. Truly the spectacle presented to our view to-day is a remarkable one—the people of the English constituencies in a fever of excitement, of turmoil, of disorder; whilst every constituency in Ireland seems like a Puritan Sabbath.

Furthermore, in the English constituencies the voters are those who are opposed to freedom of speech. In the Irish constituencies the Government officials, acting under orders from Dublin Castle, assume this role. And while the London papers have little to say in regard to mob violence in England, it would form the chief feature of their papers had these outbreaks of passion taken place in the sister Isle.

officials, acting under orders from Dublin Castle, assume this role. And while the London papers have little to say in regard to mob violence in England, it would form the chief feature of their papers had these outbreaks of passion taken place in the sister Isle.

A RELIGIOUS DESPOTISM.

Mrs. Mary Baker G. Eddy, the founder of the Christian Scientist or Eddyite church, claims that she has a million followers who have adopted her belief, and who attend nine hundred churches of that sect throughout the world. It appears that about Christmas from year to year that lady has been the recipient of hundreds of telegrams, gifts and letters of thanks accompanied by presents, some of which have been of considerable value. Nevertheless the number of such messages has given her annoyance, as she is already very wealthy; so she this year determined to put an end to the practice, and issued a church law which was read in all her churches throughout the world on Sunday, Dec. 31, forbidding her followers peremptorily from sending her any messages of greeting or Christmas gifts. Not only does she forbid such greetings to be sent to herself, but she declares in an accompanying message that all such exchange of presents on Christmas day or other festivals mentioned is to be deemed a breach of the law of the Christian Scientist church.

The following rule has been laid down as article xi. of the laws of the church to be observed in future, under the title "Duty to God."

Members of this church who turn their attention from the Divine principle of Being to personality, sending gifts, congratulatory despatches, or letters to the Pastor Emeritus (who is Mrs. Eddy herself) on Thanksgiving, Christmas, New Year, or Easter, break a rule of this church, and are amenable therefor."

It will be noticed that three other holidays besides Christmas Day are mentioned in the message, but the order was issued especially on account of the frequency of such gifts on Christmas day.

It has created much surprise among Mrs. Eddy's own followers that such a law has been made, as so many years have passed without any condemnation of the world-wide practice, and her act has been already spoken of by many as an exercise of absolute authority which if enforced will show Christian Scientist to be a more despotic church than any which has hitherto existed among professing Christians.

The practice is certainly most harmless from a moral point of view, and is indeed a means of strengthening friendship; and even many of Mrs. Eddy's most staunch followers express themselves as displeased that such an attempt should be made to make a sin of so harmless and laudable a custom.

It may be remarked that although Mrs. Eddy's so-called church has made great progress during the life of its founder it is still far behind the churches which are really Christian, both in the number of its followers and of its adherents. The Christian Scientist churches of the world are announced to number only nine hundred, with about one million adherents, whereas the Catholic church has about thirteen million of adherents and at least fourteen thousand churches in the United States alone. There does not appear to be any very bright prospect that Christian Scientist is going to become the great church of America, and its fads will not tend to make its prospect of becoming so any brighter.

The despotism of Mrs. Eddy is all the more glaring as the Christian Scientist religion is admittedly a mere human invention.

THE PROPOSED CHURCH UNION.

So vigorously are the advocates of union of the three churches in Canada, Presbyterian, Methodist, and Congregational, pushing their views forward that we have little doubt the proposed union will take place in the course of time, and we believe the time required will not be very long. A few years—perhaps ten, and perhaps less—will be needed to accomplish the fact. At all events, hundreds of thousands of Canadians who belong to the three bodies named are looking forward earnestly to the day when the union will be an accomplished fact.

A representative of the Toronto Globe has been making enquiries in regard to their views among members of the three churches concerned in the negotiations for unity, and is astonished at the unanimity with which ministers and laymen alike declare that the union ought to succeed and must succeed.

The Rev. Dr. Lyle, of a Hamilton Presbyterian church, who is a very enthusiastic advocate of union, said:

"We ought to have church union, and we are going to have it. It may take eight or ten years from now to accomplish it. It is desirable from every standpoint, so far as I see. There may be exceptions. There is no one thing without some drawbacks, but taking the broad and fair view of

it, I have no hesitation in saying it is most desirable. Taking it on the lowest ground, it will effect a financial saving in the mission fields and in the smaller towns and villages. On the higher ground, it will remove much jealousy and friction that is not desirable nor in accord with the prayer of our Lord that they might be made one. Further, the impression of the church on the world as an aggressive organization will be improved, as the less division there is the better. Moreover, by the union more men will be released for work, and the church will be in a better position to carry out the end of Christ, to evangelize the world. As to a divided church being more active, there is much of its life that is not desirable nor healthy. Those who argue that it would return to the deadness of the uniform church of the Middle Ages forget that the whole spirit of the twentieth century is one of aggressiveness and great activity in contrast to the deadness of life generally in that period.

"As to the doctrine, if the United church is broad enough to embrace all the vital truths of Christianity, what is going to suffer? It is only the forcing of truths of secondary importance into the position of truths of primary importance that is going to suffer. That would be a decided gain, etc."

We have said already in our columns that here is precisely a point on which the proposition of union is likely to end in the shipwreck of faith in God's revelation: "The forcing of truths of secondary importance into the position of truths of primary importance is going to suffer by the proposal." What does this mean? It can mean nothing else than that some of the truths actually revealed by God are to be judged by men to be of secondary importance, and are to be put into the background in the negotiations for unity. We have pointed out that the proposition for unity, if brought to a successful issue, must be effected precisely in this manner. But on what authority can man sit in judgment on the amount of importance or prominence which ought to be given to God's truth, so as to decide what is of primary, and what of secondary importance?

Our Lord and Saviour, in sending forth His Apostles to preach His Gospel to every creature made no such distinction as this. They were commanded to teach the nations "all things whatsoever I have commanded you," and it was only on the condition of their complying with this order that they were told: "And behold, I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world." (St. Matt. xxviii., 20.) Christ is not with them if they teach not His whole doctrine.

But now we are assured by this representative of Presbyterianism that there is a distinction between the various truths of religion as taught by God. Some are of "secondary importance," and it will be a "decided gain" to "put these into the background."

In fact, in the agreement which was made recently in Toronto, it has been practically agreed that certain doctrines shall be hidden in the darkest corner available. Nothing is to appear of them in the new creed which it is proposed to adopt. This is indeed what has been already proposed to be done at numerous other meetings which have been held with the same object in view, to effect a union of creeds; and the tendency is in every case not merely to put into the background the "secondary truths" as proposed by Dr. Lyle, but also "those which are now held to be of primary importance," so that though these are now admitted in a perfunctory way to be of primary importance, they will soon be relegated to the limbo of exploded beliefs.

This sentiment was, indeed, given full expression to by the Rev. J. K. Unsworth of the First Congregational church of Hamilton. This gentleman was President of the Congregational Union in 1905, and we doubt not that he expressed the views prevalent in his own denomination. He said: "Give us plenty of elbow room, and the union will suit the Congregationalists." He is enthusiastic for the Union, but only on these terms. He was in favor of it from the time when the matter was first mooted; but he laid it down as an essential that the fullest liberty possible be conceded in regard to creed to those entering the union. He said:

"Our object in supporting the union is that the essential unity of the Christian church should be expressed in organization, and made efficient by co-operation."

Being asked: "Do you think the doctrine laid down will meet with general acceptance among your people?" His answer was: "We would desire to have some liberty in regard to the terms of subscription, as we have always had toward the creeds. We would accept it in general, I believe, without being held to every detail of it. I would have preferred myself, a briefer, more modern statement embodying the essentials, which could be used as an affirmation of faith in connection with the Christian worship service."

An Ingersoll Presbyterian clergyman, the Rev. Mr. Hutt, is not so enthusiastic in the cause of union on such terms. He declares that he is a firm believer

in the Presbyterian doctrine as laid down in the Confession of Faith. He announces that he is a thoroughgoing Calvinist, and will teach, as long as he lives, the Calvinistic doctrines of predestination, election and reprobation, as he has always taught them since he was ordained to the ministry. There are for him, as we would infer from what he has said on this subject, no secondary truths which are for the present to be kept in the dark background, to be hereafter consigned to oblivion.

But we are told that the laymen are even more anxious for union than the clergy.

Mr. J. J. Green of the W. E. Sandford Company, a member of the Centenary Methodist church of Hamilton, said to his interviewer:

"Having been divided, they (the denominations) ought to come together. I go to Dr. Lyle's church, and I hear a sermon that, if I did not know, I would say was Methodist. I presume it is the same with a Presbyterian coming to hear Dr. Rose. The same applies to the Congregational minister here. I would not know any difference, so far as doctrine is concerned. The saving by union will be enormous. Leave the question to the laity, and I think it will be settled in short order. Among the laymen, I think, there is an overwhelming majority in favor of union. There are difficulties with this as with every amalgamation; but I do not think they are insuperable."

Mr. W. A. Robinson, of the D. Moore Company, said he was entirely in favor of the union. He appears to have set little account upon the question of doctrine, as his statement of the difficulties which lie in the way is confined to the itinerancy policy prevailing in the distribution of the Methodist ministers—a matter of mere convenience which does not rest upon any divine injunction.

Alderman J. M. Eastwood, of one of the Presbyterian churches of Hamilton, said:

"The essential question is agreed upon a creed to which all can give hearty assent without reserve. The doctrines should not be accepted merely as a matter of compromise, but they should be such as would rally the intelligent Christian public, and all who seek better things. Compromises in religion are fatal to zeal and honesty. Better honest and friendly work on separate and almost parallel lines than any union that must be kept free from discussion by make-believe or by shunning discussion of matters that its formularies hold to be most important."

It will be seen that the general talk among both the laity and clergy is favorable to unity, and that it is understood that there must be a sacrifice of doctrine to some extent in order to attain it. The most naive proposition in the whole case is perhaps that of Mr. Green, that the settlement of the matter should be left in the hands of the laity, who would soon bring about an arrangement.

As Christ sent His Apostles to teach His doctrine, and commanded that they should be received and heard with the greatest respect and reverence, Mr. Green's proposition would rather reverse the order of primitive Christianity, as it would lead to the clergy teaching not what Christ commanded, but what the people wish to hear. Indeed this is the view of the case which seems to be the prevalent idea among the laity throughout, as they express themselves generally to the effect that the doctrine to be taught should be such as is acceptable to them.

We must say we have but little faith in the good results of a union which will be brought about on such lines.

Nearly all who have spoken on this subject seem to be satisfied that the church of Christ should be one, and that this was intended by its Divine Founder. Why, then, should they not seek unity by returning to the one fold which has duly appointed pastors who will teach the doctrine which was in the first place given to the saints by Christ Himself to be taught to all nations, and not left to the nations that they might botch up a doctrine which they will agree to hold in common for the sake of saving the expense of having different churches, overlapping each other in territory and giving out contrary instructions as to what they should believe and practice in order to be saved?

It is still to be remarked that if this union be brought about fully, there will still be left 140 out of the 142 or more sects which exist in Canada according to the last Dominion census. The principle of private judgment in religion will continue to be what it has always been—the source of dissensions and errors in the most important matters of religion.

The aspiration for unity in the Christian church is undoubtedly most laudable, for it was Christ's intention in establishing the church that it should be one. In fact He established but one church which He called "My church," "One fold," "My flock," etc.; and in the Acts of the Apostles we are told that "the Lord added to the church daily such as should be saved." (Il. 47.) This fact alone shows that, in the past, Protestantism departed in an