

The Catholic Record

Published Weekly at 24 and 456 Richmond street, London, Ontario.
Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

REV. GEORGE R. NORTHGAVES,
Author of "Miracles of Modern Infidelity."
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.
Agent for Newfoundland, Mr. T. J. Wall, St. John's.
Rates of Advertising—Ten 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. Arrangements must be made 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.

LETTER OF RECOMMENDATION.
UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA,
Ottawa, Canada, March 7th, 1900.
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. FALCONIO, Arch. of Larissa,
Apost. Deleg.

London, Saturday, March 2, 1901.

HIS EXCELLENCY MGR. FALCONIO.

A report has been for some time persistently in circulation to the effect that Mgr. Martineau is to be elevated to the Cardinalate, and that Mgr. Falconio will be transferred to Washington as Apostolic Delegate to the United States.

We should be extremely sorry to lose as Apostolic Delegate for Canada the present eminent holder of the office of representative of the Holy See; but if the rumor prove to be true we must content ourselves with the loss, as we must feel pleased that Mgr. Falconio's services in Canada are so highly appreciated by the Holy See, as to have brought about his promotion to the more important and higher position of Apostolic Delegate to the United States.

REV. FATHER FISHER, O. F. M.

We announce with much regret that Rev. Father Edward Fisher, O. F. M., Secretary to His Excellency, Mgr. Falconio, Apostolic Delegate to Canada, is obliged, through ill health, to return to England. Rev. Father Solanus, O. F. M., of Chatham, Ontario, has been appointed to take his place. During Rev. Father Fisher's stay in Canada he has endeared himself to all those who had the pleasure of making his acquaintance. It can with truth be said he possesses all the traits of the true Franciscan, and in addition his winning personality and kindness of heart made for him friends without number. If it came to pass that at some future time he will return to Canada—and many will, we feel sure, offer up an earnest prayer that such will be the case—his welcome will indeed be a warm one.

MIXED MARRIAGES.

In a recent letter received by his Grace Archbishop Duhamel of Ottawa, from the Secretary of Propaganda, attention is called to a feature of the quinquennial report which has to be sent regularly to the Holy See regarding the state of religion. This feature lies in the fact that the number of mixed marriages, that is of marriages of Catholics with Protestants, has increased—a state of affairs which is not pleasing to the Holy See. The Secretary of the Propaganda writes:

"We have learned with a great deal of regret that marriage between Catholics and non-Catholics are becoming more frequent in your diocese. Your Grace and your clergy well understand that these marriages are allowed only with the regret of the Catholic Church, and constitute a relaxation of that lively faith which should everywhere prevail."

In consequence of this notification, the Archbishop has instructed his clergy to see that the regulations of the Church regarding such marriages are to be read at least once a year in all the churches of the diocese.

The Church has always disapproved of such marriages, and with regret grants permission that they should be contracted; and when they are contracted, always insists upon it that full liberty to practice the Catholic religion be given to the Catholic party, and that the children be brought up in the Catholic faith. The Catholic party should also, by word and good example, endeavor to lead the non-Catholic husband or wife to become a Catholic.

THE CONVERSION OF AMERICA.

In a recent sermon delivered in the Church of St. Paul the Apostle, New York, by the Rev. Walter Elliot of the Paulist Fathers, speaking of the prospect of the conversion of America said:

"Cardinal Gibbons is authority for the statement that 30,000 converts are received into the Catholic Church in this land every year. This estimate of the Cardinal was made before the initiation of the new non-Catholic missionary movement, for since that statement was made, the number of converts has increased 25 per cent."

According to this estimate the annual number of converts must be about 37,500, and unless losses to the faith exceed this number—which we are assured is not the case—the Church is progressing steadily beyond the natural increase of population. Father Elliot is full of hope that the increase will be greater as more energy is thrown into the missionary work, and in regard to the future prospect, he adds:

"It is a vast undertaking to explain to the American people the doctrine of the Catholic Church. But we are equal to it. We have the true faith, we have a splendid clergy, led by noble Bishops and enrolled in many glorious religious orders. The Church of Christ was made to do great things, and above all to save the nations of the world."

THE "CORONATION OATH."

The opening of Parliament by King Edward VII. was a gorgeous ceremonial, and was carried out with great pomp on Feb. 14th, the tableau being exceedingly brilliant, notwithstanding the sombre coloring given by the black evening dresses worn by the peeresses and others who were in mourning in consequence of the Queen's death.

The occasion was marred, however, by the Declaration against Catholic doctrine which His Majesty took in obedience to laws which were passed in an age of persecution when to be a Catholic was an unpardonable offence against the laws of Great Britain.

This oath which the King is required to take was in substance prescribed by an Act of Parliament passed in the reign of Charles II. and modified in that of William III. in 1689, and it was so framed as to make it sure that no possibility should any believer in the Catholic Church, or in the principal doctrines of the Catholic Church, ascend the British throne; but not only was this required, for the new Sovereign must absurdly and falsely swear that any of his subjects who believe in these doctrines is guilty of idolatry and superstition!

The oath is as follows:

"I, by the grace of God, King of Great Britain and Ireland, Defender of the Faith, do solemnly and sincerely, in the presence of God, profess, testify, and declare, that I do believe that in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper there is not any Transubstantiation of the elements of bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ, at or after the consecration thereof by any person whatsoever; and that the Invocation or adoration of the Virgin Mary or any other Saint, and the Sacrifice of the Mass, as they are now used in the Church of Rome, are superstitious and idolatrous."

In addition to this the King must swear that he has not received any dispensation from the Pope or other person authorizing him to take this oath falsely.

This is frequently called the Coronation Oath, though it does not necessarily pertain to the Coronation of the King, as it may be taken, as it was in this instance, on the occasion of the opening of Parliament, or of some other public function. Thus it is taken at the coronation, if it has not been previously taken.

It is needless to say that this is a most senseless requirement, as well as a gross insult to the twelve million Catholic subjects of His Majesty. It is senseless because there is no need for it. It is admitted that the Catholic religion is not inimical to loyalty to the throne; and one of the best proofs that this is the case, is that the Catholics of the Empire remain loyal notwithstanding so gross an insult being put upon them. We do not at all assume or imagine that the fact that such an oath is still taken will shake Catholic loyalty; but we submit to the governing authorities the consideration that the patience of a large body of subjects should not be so sorely tried by the continuance of this detestable and insulting oath.

The British Empire now extends over a territory which includes the followers of Mahomet, the worshippers of Buddha and the Grand Lama, of fire and the hideous fetiches and gods of Africa and China; yet our Sovereign is not required to insult all these.

Why should the insult uttered against Catholics be kept up in an age when the persecuting spirit which led to its adoption is supposed to have passed away?

It is said, and we believe it, that Edward VII. has sound sense, and is endowed with the qualities of thoughtfulness and discretion, and with such qualities he must be convinced of the necessity of repealing the odious law which required him to take such an oath. If he manifest his desire to have this law changed, we have no doubt that it will be; and we therefore anticipate its repeal at the earliest possible moment; but so long as it remains on the Statute books, it is the duty of Catholics, and even of honest Protestants, to agitate for its repeal.

We have had already Catholics in positions of the highest responsibility in the service of the public, not in the colonies only, but in Great Britain itself. There are many Catholic Privy Counsellors: good Catholics have been members of successive British Cabinets, and until recently, a Catholic held the position of Chief Justice of Great Britain, whereby he was the chief guardian of the laws of the British Empire.

So lately as last year, Queen Victoria publicly thanked her Irish Catholic soldiers for their services bravely given in South Africa when it was admitted that the Empire itself was in peril, and her words of gratitude were echoed everywhere so heartily that St. Patrick's day was celebrated with enthusiasm even by Protestants who had never thought of doing the like before.

These Catholics, without exception, fulfilled their duties faithfully and ably, and is it not an act of supreme folly and ingratitude to persist in retaining in the King's oath, a clause gratuitously insulting them and their co-religionists?

We are pleased to notice that the question of repeal of this oath has been raised in Ottawa, and that it is proposed to bring the matter before the Imperial Government.

An expression of opinion from the British colonies would add greatly to the force of the protest which has already been made by the Catholic peers, especially at this moment when the colonies have done, and are doing, so much for the maintenance of British power in South Africa; and as Canada has taken so prominent a part in this work, an expression from our own House of Parliament declaring its desire to see the insulting language of the coronation oath removed therefrom would add great weight to the demand. We hope, therefore, that the Canadian Parliament will make a move in this direction.

A telegram from London states that thirty Catholic peers, including the Duke of Norfolk, have already protested against the iniquity, but the voice of colonial Catholics will have some weight in promoting their case.

Mr. John Redmond also called the attention of the Government to the matter in Parliament, but he was answered by Mr. A. J. Balfour that the form of words of the oath are not to be admired; yet "he hoped the practical question of their retention is disposed of for many years to come."

We hope, indeed, with Mr. Balfour that the King may reign many years; but this does not dispose of the question. Human life is precarious, and the practical question may loom up again at any moment.

If this question had been brought up last year, it is probable Mr. Balfour would have made the same answer, and yet not years, but only a few months elapsed before it became a very practical question. It is, therefore, a matter of importance that the law prescribing the disgraceful oath should be repealed without delay, so that there may be no possibility of its repetition.

EXTREME UNCTION AND MIRACLES.

At a recent meeting of the "Protestant Ministerial Association" of Montreal, after passing a vigorous resolution declaring that the Delpit marriage, the civil validity of which is now being contested before the courts of the Province of Quebec, is a valid one, the meeting listened to the reading of a paper by the Rev. Mr. Webb on "the New Testament doctrine of healing." The reader maintained that the age of Christian miracles is past, yet he added that there is no reason why the sick Christian should not follow the advice of St. James, given in the 5th chapter and 14th verse of his Epistle, and seek for the elders of the Church to pray with him and expect the prayer of faith to save the sick person.

Mr. Webb and the clergy who applauded his views appear to have overlooked the fact that St. James prescribes something more than mere prayer for the sick. The elders, as the Protestant version has it, are also to "anoint the sick with oil in the name of the Lord." A Protestant minister of the present day would be very much perplexed as to the manner in which this injunction should be carried out. What kind of oil should he use, and how is it to be applied? He has never obeyed the command, and would not know how to do so now.

The Catholic priest knows what he ought to do in the circumstance, for he is aware that the apostle here speaks of the sacrament of Extreme Unction, which is administered to the sick, to gain for him the graces necessary to strengthen him in dangerous illness; but Protestantism has abolished this sacrament, and with it the practice of sacramentally anointing the sick as prescribed by the holy apostle.

And how did the Rev. Mr. Webb come to the conclusion that the age of miracles is past? They are not, in deed, so commonly wrought as they were in the apostolic age, when God deemed it proper that Christianity should be propagated by miracles whereby the divinity of the Christian religion should be plainly demonstrated. But Christ did not fix any period to which the working of miracles should be limited. He named no date after which miracles should not be wrought, but gave the commission in general terms to His apostles, and to those who should believe in Him:

"Amen, amen, I say to you: he that believeth in Me, the works that I do, he shall do, and greater than these shall he do, because I go to the Father." (St. John xiv., 12)

Miracles were, therefore, to continue in the Church, and would be wrought whenever God in His infinite wisdom might deem them needful for His work of spreading the gospel. They are still wrought in the Catholic Church, and there are thousands who can testify that at certain shrines of the saints, such as of the Blessed Virgin, St. Anne, etc., just such miracles as were foretold by Christ occur frequently, testifying to the divine mission of the Catholic Church, just as our Lord indicated that His miracles proved that He was the Messiah for whom St. John the Baptist was looking. John's messengers were told:

"Go and relate to John what you have heard and seen: that the blind see, the lame walk, the lepers are made clean, the deaf hear, the dead rise again, to the poor the gospel is preached." (St. Luke vii., 22)

THE ANTI-SALOON CRUSADE.

The raid of Mrs. Carrie Nation upon the saloons of Topeka, which was participated in by a band of women and men who supported her, has resulted, as was to be expected, in bringing this disturber of public order into the meshes of the law. She was several times arrested after smashing slot machines, jars, glasses, and other furniture of saloons or joints with a hatchet, but was released as the judge before whom she was brought at first, would not entertain complaints against her for disorderly conduct and refused to inflict punishment.

In one of these raids, Mrs. Nation was herself struck with her own hatchet which a man defending the saloon against her attempts wrested from her hands, striking her unintentionally on the right temple. She was not seriously injured, but was able to seize another hatchet carried by one of her companions, and to continue the work of demolition. In this saloon a large refrigerator and the bar fixtures were demolished, the contents of the glasses behind the bar were spilled on the floor and Mrs. Carrie Nation herself was taken to the police station, where, with her followers, she started a sort of religious service consisting of hymns and a lecture to the policemen.

She was, strangely enough, let off notwithstanding these pranks, as the judge seemed to be indisposed to inflict a penalty on so extraordinary a female character; but she is in the county prison now for continuing her acts of destructiveness. She is confined in the county jail on a charge of destroying the plant of the Cold Storage Company on Sunday morning Feb. 17th. She acted as her own attorney, and is held by Judge Hazen under bonds for \$2,000. She cannot procure bondsmen, as she expresses her determination to destroy all the saloons she can in spite of police, or any other opposition, and she is therefore detained in jail. Judge Hazen also placed three other women under peace bonds. In their cases, bail was offered and accepted.

We already mentioned in our columns that Mrs. Nation's destructive methods were adopted by the Faith Curists of Dowle's Church in Chicago. An attempt was made at Millwood near Leavenworth, Kansas, to follow Mrs. Nation's methods, for the propagation of the same cause of Temperance, but it ended fatally. The saloon of one John Hudson was attacked. Three men entered the saloon and called for drinks, and when served they gave a signal by pounding on the bar counter, that it was time for the mob of raiders outside to enter. About forty men then rushed into the saloon, and when the purpose of the raiders was thus made known, Hudson grappled with one of the men, and in the fight which followed, a gun carried by one of the raiders went off, the shot entering the wall.

Mrs. Hudson, attracted by the noise, ran screaming into the room, and in the general melee about one hundred shots were fired, one of which struck Mrs. Hudson, tearing off the top of her head. One of the raiders, William Ebb, was also struck in the shoulder by a revolver bullet. It is stated that Mrs. Hudson cannot recover, but the mob, horrified at the mischief they had done, retired without wrecking the saloon.

There were no women in this mob, which was composed of farmers in disguise, four of whom have been arrested.

In Chicago there have been similar disturbances.

These outbreaks of mob violence are inexcusable, as the law ought to be obeyed, and if saloon keepers break the law they may be prosecuted.

We are sorry to notice that some Ontario Prohibitionists have seriously proposed that the same lawless methods which are producing already such ill effects in the West shall be adopted in Ontario. We can scarcely believe that in this law abiding Province there will be found fanatics enough to carry out the proposal; but should it be attempted, the lawful authorities should suppress the attempt at any cost or expense which it may be necessary to incur to suppress such rowdiness and rioting. We are in favor of restricting the sale of intoxicants within the narrowest limits for which the people of the province are prepared; but we are decidedly opposed to illegal and violent methods of making the people temperate. They will result only in misfortune and trouble.

These outbreaks of mob violence are inexcusable, as the law ought to be obeyed, and if saloon keepers break the law they may be prosecuted.

We are sorry to notice that some Ontario Prohibitionists have seriously proposed that the same lawless methods which are producing already such ill effects in the West shall be adopted in Ontario. We can scarcely believe that in this law abiding Province there will be found fanatics enough to carry out the proposal; but should it be attempted, the lawful authorities should suppress the attempt at any cost or expense which it may be necessary to incur to suppress such rowdiness and rioting. We are in favor of restricting the sale of intoxicants within the narrowest limits for which the people of the province are prepared; but we are decidedly opposed to illegal and violent methods of making the people temperate. They will result only in misfortune and trouble.

We are in favor of restricting the sale of intoxicants within the narrowest limits for which the people of the province are prepared; but we are decidedly opposed to illegal and violent methods of making the people temperate. They will result only in misfortune and trouble.

LATITUDINARIANISM IN THE PROTESTANT SECTS.

The pastor of the Jarvis street, Unitarian, Church of Toronto, the Rev. J. T. Sunderland, in a sermon recently delivered in that church, made reference to the retirement of Professor Steen from the Anglican Diocesan Theological College of Montreal.

The professor's views in regard to the fundamental doctrines of the Christian religion were regarded by many as too lax, and tending to Latitudinarianism; but it would appear that his language was so guarded that the ecclesiastical Court which took cognizance of the matter pronounced his views to be orthodox and his theology sound. This decision seems to have been founded rather on the proclivity of recent theological thought to allow great laxity of belief in regard to the most sacred of revealed truths, such as the Divinity of our Lord, and the inspiration of Scripture, and this is really the view taken of the matter by the Rev. Mr. Sunderland.

Our readers are aware that Unitarianism saps the very foundations of Christian truth, and it is not a very satisfactory testimonial to the orthodoxy of our Anglican divine that his views are applauded in a Unitarian pulpit.

In fact, the professor seems to have become convinced, notwithstanding that he is upheld by the ecclesiastical court which took his case into consideration, that he belongs to too advanced a school of thought to be an acceptable theological teacher in an Anglican institution.

It is of course well known that there is in Anglicanism a Broad Church or Latitudinarian party, but this is not a strong party in Canada, so we have no doubt that the Rev. Mr. Sunderland is correct in stating that Professor Steen intends to go to the United States, where he will join with some sect, perhaps even the Protestant Episcopal, where he will find more tolerance for his mode of thought.

Rev. Mr. Sunderland is evidently well pleased with this evidence that Latitudinarianism is spreading in the Church of England, and he does not conceal his delight, as he considers the fact an evidence of the spread of Unitarian views among the apparently orthodox sects. It is not that Unitarianism is professedly adopted; but the sects are taking up the Unitarian creed while remaining in name what they were before, whether Anglican, Presbyterian, Methodist, Congregationalist or Baptist.

Thus Protestantism, professedly founded upon an undoubted belief in the divine inspiration of the Bible, is fast drifting towards unbelief in this important doctrine, and as a matter of course to pure Deism, which is all that will remain when belief in the Bible disappears.

The Catholic Church alone, which Protestants have hitherto regarded as an enemy of the Bible, will soon be the only Christian Church which will hold firmly to the doctrine of Biblical inspiration, and the Divinity of the Son of God.

THE DELPIT MARRIAGE CASE.

The Delpit marriage case is still attracting a considerable amount of attention, and is being discussed with a good deal of vigor in certain papers, much indignation being freely expressed by some papers and their correspondents, because the validity or invalidity of the marriage has been made to depend upon the pronouncement of the Roman ecclesiastical Court whose duty it is to pronounce upon such cases.

We have already stated in our columns the point at issue on which the decision of the courts so far has been made to rest, and it is this:

The Catholic Church maintains that marriage being a Sacrament of the New Law is a sacred institution and contract, and not a merely civil agreement between the contracting parties.

This being so it belongs to the domain of the Church to lay down the conditions under which the marriage contract is valid.

The civil law of the Province of Quebec recognized this claim before the cession of Canada by France to England, and as by the terms of that cession the religious privileges of Catholics were still guaranteed to them, Mr. Justice Jette decided in reference to the Delpit marriage that its validity depends upon the ecclesiastical law on the matter, as regards Catholics only.

It follows from this that the question at issue is not one of Catholic encroachment on the rights of Protestants, as several of the Protestant religious papers represent it to be. Thus the Presbyterian Review of the 7th inst. is completely astray when it says:

"We think over this unhappy Delpit business, and we give valuable space to it as it presents for solution the question whether the Pope's decree or the King's writ is supreme in one of the Provinces of Canada. There must be no doubt upon this point. If the Province of Quebec, in which the other Provinces of the Dominion have a very special interest, stands isolated from the sister Provinces in its relationship to the authorities of the land, it is well that this should be known. . . . We have no fault to find here with the Roman Catholic because he is loyal to another than the Protestant faith. But the circumstances connected with this miserable Delpit business justify the proclamation anew that Protestants have rights in the Province of Quebec, and that Rome rule in Canada is intolerable."

The fact is that there is no question of Rome rule in civil matters in the Province of Quebec or any other Province, but so long as the civil law governing marriage follows the law of the Catholic Church, the judges must follow it independently of any special action of Rome; and if there is any hardship thereby inflicted on any person or class of persons, the proper remedy should be found, not in abusing Rome or the French-Canadians, but by endeavoring to have the law changed in a constitutional manner to suit the circumstances of the case, if the hardship be real, and not merely a phantom of the imagination. But here we must remark that the civil law can not legislate in conscience upon any more than the civil effects of marriage. The Church alone, inasmuch as marriage is a sacred contract, can regulate the substantial conditions under which that contract can be validly entered upon.

But here a difficulty arises which is not to be overcome by brow-beating the French-Canadians, as the Review seems inclined to do. It was, as we have already remarked, a condition of the cession of the Province that the religious privileges of the Catholic people should remain intact, and thus the Catholics of the Province cannot be forced to change the law in regard to marriage, so far as Catholics are concerned, and it is an act of folly to

browbeat possible reasons of the civil much if the present law is not done to be ent in little, no further the principles. Notwithstanding have been seems to be the marriage when the Sacred R the evidence, and so far under the contract that law have been. The la that if tw Quebec, Council of ity is in marriage parish p him, and nullity. the con was, of it have been consequence. We no clares b her pres ate an a But i rights of thus ren Catholic. To th great ha Quebec, regarde olics. ant mlti garded ics Ca tario on celebrat ants, wh isters w Catholic perform mony a blamab as he whom h to be b ly and from h ministr reader Catholic istratio. The never l the wor ism by riage to the Cath unlawv riage v valid a Cathol to the

that R no cl downf fury th King a few destroy temple ers ov likewise Cesar, face of Chr the t man: counse human of its ceptan feel th edge; able p These taste asse Lord's refuse of the jure l work They not reinga, convic regard ecap tolefa for permitt amid time, injure take their would est th gathe life, t