

THE CATHOLIC RECORD.

The Catholic Record.

Published Weekly at 494 and 501 Richmond Street, Toronto, Ontario.
Price of Subscription—\$1.00 per annum.

EDITORS:
REV. GEORGE R. NORTHRUP, Editor.
Author of "Mistakes of Modern Infidels."
THOMAS COFFEY, Publisher and Proprietor, Thomas Coffey.

Messrs. Luke King, John Nigh, P. J. Neven and Miss Sarah Hanley are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transmit all other business for THE CATHOLIC RECORD.
Agent for Newfoundland, Mr. James Power of St. John.

Rates of Advertising—Ten cents per line each week, including postage.
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, should be directed to the proprietor and must reach London not later than Monday morning. When subscribers change their residence it is important that the old as well as the new address be sent us.

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, obituary and marriage notices, or by subscribers must be in a condensed form, to insure insertion.

LETTERS OF RECOMMENDATION.

Apocryphal Delegation.
Ottawa, June 13 h, 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 imbued with a strong Catholic spirit. It strenuously defends Catholic principles and rights, and stands firmly by the teaching and authority of the Church, at the same time promoting the best interests of the country.

Following these lines it has done a great deal of good for the welfare of religion and country, and it will do more and more, and its wholesome 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,
DONATUS, Archbishop of Rennes,
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. FALCONER, Arch. Deleg.

LONDON, SATURDAY, JULY 8, 1905.

A LETTER FROM RIGHT REV. BISHOP WILLIAMS.

We have received from the Right Rev. Bishop Williams of this city the following letter which owing to the residence of our editor outside of the city, and the early date in the week when we go to press, was not in time for publication in last week's issue of the CATHOLIC RECORD:

London, Ont., June 24, 1905.

To the editor of THE CATHOLIC RECORD:

Dear Sir—In your issue of June 24 you state with reference to myself: "We know that at synods of his own Church held but a few years ago he has strongly advocated 'voluntary schools,' which have the same meaning as 'separate schools.'"

That statement is without one word of truth. I have never advocated 'voluntary schools' either in or out of synods. Religious instruction in the Public Schools I have always advocated, but never the establishment of Separate or sectional schools either for Anglicans or for any other body. I regret that you will give the same prominence to this correction as you did to the misstatement.

Believe me, yours faithfully,
DAVID WILLIAMS,
Bishop of Huron.

We willingly insert this letter in our columns, and make apology to the Bishop for having, not wilfully, made the mistake of interpreting his words differently from their real meaning, and we admit that they may bear the meaning which the Bishop puts upon them in the above letter, though they might equally well bear the interpretation we put upon them.

The source of our mistake lay in the fact that the system of voluntary schools was being strongly advocated in the Church of England at the time when the Provincial Synod met at which Bishop Williams used the words as we have already quoted them, and we understood him to approve of the movement by saying, as we have already quoted:

"There is no difference of opinion as to the need of religious instruction in the schools. A few years ago there was a great diversity of opinion in regard to it. Now there is a general recognition of the need of the case. That makes practical action all the easier and more effectual. We have passed resolutions and made speeches at the several dioceses, but nothing has been done. Now I propose something practical, and I hope the Synod will carry it."

But is there any substantial difference between the two interpretations? As to the main principle at stake, which is the necessity of religious instruction in the schools, we hold that there is not a difference; but there is this difference, that if the Bishop had advocated the establishment of a voluntary or Separate school system he would have been within his just rights, but when his position is to force upon all the Public Schools of Canada a compromise system of theology which shall be agreed upon between a number of diverging Protestant sects, he pro-

poses to inflict a grave injustice upon Catholics, Jews, Unitarians and others, whose beliefs are not in accordance with the compromise faith which might be agreed upon between the sects taking part in the conference which would necessarily be held in order that a plan of religious teaching should be adopted, even if a common ground may be discovered on which they may stand.

The Catholics of Ontario cannot under any consideration enter into the proposed compromise, as our unalterable faith must be the foundation of all our religious and moral teaching, and we must oppose the introduction of any attempt to impose upon us any new-fangled creed which may be patched up between various sects on the basis of recent resolutions passed by synods, presbyteries, etc.

The Bishop must know that in about 93 per cent. of the School sections of Ontario, there are no Catholic Separate schools, and in those sections, Catholic children are mingled with the Protestant children at school. There are besides Jews, Unitarians, Deists and Atheists at these schools, and there is no possibility of finding a common creed which can be taught to all the children in attendance, whose parents support these schools, by their taxes, equally with those who might agree upon the creed which the Bishop of Huron would force upon them, willy nilly. The enormity would become greater if the pupils now attending the four hundred Catholic schools of the Province were attending the Public Schools, as would necessarily be the case under the compulsory National school plan advocated by his Lordship—a proposition which Catholics will resist to the last extremity.

While mentioning this fact that many of the Public Schools have Catholic children attending, it is proper we should add that the reason of this is not what is asserted by many of the agitators who are ever on the alert to attack the Catholic schools of Ontario. It is not because Catholics prefer the secular or non-religious schools, but because in the great majority of rural Public School sections they are not numerous enough to maintain efficient Catholic schools, so that they are obliged by the necessities of their situation to make use of the Public Schools, and to supply religious instruction to their children by other means.

That what we have said above in reference to the advocacy of voluntary schools by the Church of England, at least in some dioceses of Canada, is correct is evident from the fact that Mr. Lawrence Baldwin had elaborated a plan for such schools so far back as the very date when the Right Rev. Dr. Williams spoke as above in the Quebec Provincial synod, and this plan was in substance adopted by the Synod of Toronto in 1902.

As the same main principle is at stake whether we advocate religious teaching in the public schools or a system of denominational or voluntary schools, our error was not very great in interpreting Dr. Williams' words as approving of the former system, especially as it is the least unjust of the two.

We may add to these considerations that at a conference held by the Church of England in St. James' school House, Toronto, to decide upon the school system to be advocated by that Church, the Rev. Dr. Lagtry attacked the plan now advocated by Bishop Williams as "monstrous and not becoming a churchman." In England, also, the Church of England is at the present moment engaged in fighting most strenuously the whole non-conformist body to sustain the system of Voluntary or Separate schools, as against secular public schools. Is it honest now for a Bishop of that same Church to endeavor to impose on the Catholics of Ontario and the North-west Provinces a system which his colleagues of England denounce as irreligious and unchristian?

THE EUROPEAN WAR CLOUD.

In the trouble which has arisen between France and Germany, and which has not yet been settled, the most serious difficulty with which France finds herself face to face is that the anti-Catholic and anti-Christian policy inaugurated by Premier Waldeck-Rousseau and pushed to an extreme by Premier Combes, has brought both army and navy to a troubled condition unparalleled in French history. The army especially has been demoralized by the espionage and gossip system which was the cause of the overthrow of Premier Combes. The Masonic lodges were shown by the sworn evidence of the Masonic officials to have become the medium whereby Combes and his colleagues in the Government were enabled to spy upon the conduct of all Government officials. The Free Masons throughout the country were directed to report to their lodge officers not the crimes, but the acts of

religion performed by them. Such acts, even if they were done in the privacy of the home, were visited by the anti-Christian Government with dismissal from office. Officers of the army were shut out from promotion, and were even so persecuted that they were forced to resign their positions so that "the army might be rid of them."

One officer had been reported as having knelt on the street while a procession of the Blessed Sacrament was passing. Others were active members of that most well-known charitable organization, the St. Vincent of Paul Society, and visited the poor. Others had Christian wives, or had read anti-Ministerial papers; others had attended Mass, or endeavored to induce their soldiers to receive the sacraments. Others sent their children to Catholic schools, and one was punished because he was married to the daughter of an Opposition member of the Chamber of Deputies. In none of these cases was it charged that they were unfit for their positions, but in every case they were marked down as unworthy of promotion. One Captain Sylvestre of the 12th Infantry Brigade was reported by the spy as being so close a character and so careful that no one should learn from him his religious and political beliefs, that the spy could only conjecture that "most probably he was not of advanced ideas." It was recommended that "he should be excluded from the Paris garrison, as from the circumstances which he was placed, he would thus be forced to resign, and the army would be rid of him."

The spies in these instances were brother officers of the persecuted parties. But the Freemasons were the most energetic, persistent and reliable spies, as it frequently happened that the officers of the army refused to carry out the wishes of the Government by becoming spies upon the private life of their brother officers, and thus the plans of the Government were frustrated, and recourse was had to the Masonic Lodges, which readily furnished the required means of espionage.

One of the meanest and most unprincipled acts of the Combes Government in this respect was the dismissal of a ferryman who had been reported as having ferried over the river a Christian Brother who had been expelled from his school by the Government! This was a criminal act which could not be overlooked, and the guilty party could not be continued longer in the Government service.

We can have but little confidence in the efficiency of the army when such a state of affairs exist, even though the popular indignation which led to M. Combes' resignation may have been modified by some modifications of his policy under the administration of Premier Rouvier. Where one half of the population of the country carries its persecution of the other half to such an extent as this, the country itself, and especially the army and navy, must be in a deplorable condition. It will not surprise us at all should France be obliged to humiliate herself before the demands which Germany is making in regard to the Moroccan question, and unless she is positively backed by England's whole power by land and sea, her humiliation seems to be inevitable.

Nevertheless it seems that England feels the present overbearing attitude of Germany to be directed ultimately towards herself, and it is said that Lord Lansdowne has declared that she will sustain France's attitude towards the Sultan of Morocco with the whole force of the British Empire. This fact being known, the German Emperor will probably not be so ready to dominate over France as he might otherwise do. The question of peace or war thus still hangs in the balance between England, France and Germany. We do not wish to see France humbled as she was thirty four years ago, yet should it be the case that this should happen, we cannot but admit that the suicidal anti-religious policy of the nation has merited that this should be the result.

We hope that the trouble between these three great powers may be amicably settled, and that no war may break out between them. The present prospect is that their difficulties may be peacefully settled; but it is admitted on all hands that they have been for the last two or three weeks perilously near the arbitrament of the sword for the settlement of their difficulties.

Just at the moment when we have witnessed the dreadful character of modern warfare in the terrible struggle between the great modern nations of Russia and Japan, it would be an incalculable disaster if an equally great struggle should break out between these three Christian civilized nations. We hope and pray that such a disaster may be averted. We cannot help coupling with this wish the hope that France may learn that her path to true greatness is not through the darkness of unbelief similar to that into which she plunged

a century ago, but through the way of Christian faith with which her true glory was inseparably connected in past ages.

We have not lost faith entirely in the return of France to her traditional position as the chief protectress of the Church of God on earth for we believe that the spirit of self-sacrifice of her hierarchy and priesthood will be crowned by the triumph of religion, though the days are now dark, and the skies lowering. We believe that the first daughter of the Church will yet become as glorious in her maintenance of religion as she has been in former times.

THE CONTINUITY OF CHRIST'S CHURCH.

While treating of the address of the Right Rev. Bishop Williams of the Church of England Diocese of Huron, as delivered at the Synod recently held in this city, we were obliged to defer any lengthy comments on the claim put forward by his Lordship that "the Church of England holds the truth of the visible Church—that Christ founded an actual outward society which we call the Holy Catholic Church to carry on His work on earth after His ascension, and endowed it with illimitable powers for growth and expansion to meet the needs of all the ages and all the races and all the climes," and that

"When the Church of England reformed herself in the sixteenth century, it did not make itself a new Church. On the contrary, the Church goes back to Apostolic times. No destruction but purification and revision was the work of the Reformation. The English Church after the Reformation was as much the English Church as Newman was Newman after he had entered the Roman. Then, lastly, let us thoroughly understand that the Church of England is Protestant. The name Protestant comes from the early part of the sixteenth century; but the attitude which it represents belongs to the continuous protest of the Church against errors and corruptions, and you find it in prophets of the Old Testament, in the writings of St. Peter and St. Paul, in the pages of the New Testament, and in the utterances of the great Councils of the undivided Church."

And thus we arrive at the distinctive characteristic of the Church of England as at once Catholic and Protestant in the truest sense of those terms, and in fact occupying a mediatorial position between the extremes of reformed and unreformed Christendom. She is Catholic by her doctrine—the maintenance of the liberty of conscience, and the right of every believer to direct and immediate access to God in Christ without the necessary intervention of any human agency."

These are undoubtedly astounding claims, inconsistent with each other, and nullifying each other, and which cannot be substantiated by Holy Scripture, history, whether ecclesiastical or profane, or reason and common sense.

We admit that the Church of England is Protestant—very much so, as it protests against the doctrines and practices of the Holy Catholic Church which have been handed down throughout the ages to the present day—the faith which St. Paul declares to be that faith which once or primarily given to the saints.

But even this title the Right Rev. Dr. Williams has no right to claim for his Church; for at the present moment one half of his mother Church repudiates that title, claiming to be Catholic and not Protestant.

Only two years ago the Rev. C. Fillingham, a recognized clergyman of the Church of England who is still Vicar of Hexton, visited New York, and declared publicly that "the Church of St. Mary the Virgin of New York is a contradiction of the Protestant Episcopal Church and a flagrant defiance of Protestantism"—"openly celebrating High Mass, to get rid of which the Church of England was formed especially." "The elevation and adoration of the elements of bread and wine are there practiced" which a large section of the Church of England's adherents declare to be "gross idolatry, which, as the Prayer-Book declares, should be abhorred by all Christian men." Nay, the probability is that Bishop Williams himself would scarcely hesitate to make the same pronouncement. Yet the local Bishop Potter declared in an open letter that:

"The Rector of the Church of St. Mary, the Virgin possesses my respect and confidence, and though his modes of worship may be as little to my taste as yours, he is not following them without my privacy and knowledge."

Where is the "authority of the Church" when it cannot be decided that the teaching of the Church is one thing or the other?

St. Paul tells us that the "Church of the Living God is the pillar and ground of Truth." Where is the truth when even the Bishops cannot tell its whereabouts? When even in our Canada we

have two colleges in one city, both of which train ministers to teach the Gospel of Christ but from opposite points of view?

Bishop Williams admits that to be Catholic, the Church must put into operation the principle of authority. Where is that principle when the adherents of the High and Low, Broad and Erastian sections or rather factions in the Church are constantly ready to fly at each others throats?

Bishop Williams tells us that "there is no necessary intervention of any human agency between God and man" in the Anglican Church. Well! necessary or unnecessary, we find in one Church of England pulpit this doctrine inculcated, while in another it is repudiated as anti-Scriptural: in one, people are told to confess their sins to a priest that they may obtain forgiveness; in another, they are told that to do this is to destroy the mediatorialship and priesthood of Christ!

Is this agglomeration of inconsistent claims that Church of the primitive Saints which the Apostles of Christ planted over all the known world, and to which, according to the Acts of the Apostles, "the Lord added daily such as should be saved?"

The Church of England under Henry VIII. had a new head proclaimed. Edward VI. and Elizabeth were made successively heads of that Church, contrary to all the discipline of Holy Scripture and tradition which have always recognized the succession of St. Peter as Head of the Church to the present day. Could a Church thus constituted be called one and the same Church with that which had previously acknowledged that the Pope is the true successor of St. Peter? Where did the local civil government of England get the authority to change the headship of the universal Church? And is not this change in the essential constitution of the true Church sufficient to constitute a novelty and a monstrosity in religion?

But the Church of England not only changed the Headship of the Church. It introduced new doctrines, a new list of sacraments, operating in a different manner from the sacraments which had been recognized for fifteen centuries as the sacraments of Christ. The essential liturgy and the daily sacrifice of Christianity was abolished, and the authority of the Church itself which have Dr. Williams acknowledges to have been continuous, was rejected.

How can we confound the true Church of Christ with an organization which has not authority to preserve the unity of the faith from generation to generation, and which at the present moment dares not define what is and what is not the teaching of Christ?

The fact that the modern Church of England is called by this name is no proof that she is entitled to it. It was a name taken by virtue of the physical force which a powerful civil government can exercise, and not by any authority derived from Christ.

There can be only one Church of Christ true and continuous, and that one must be the Church of Christ which goes back with an uninterrupted history and an unchanged faith to the days of the Apostles. The Church of England is fifteen centuries too young to have any title to this name. The modern Church of England is not the Church of Sts. Fagatius, Damian, Augustine, Anselm, Bede, Langton and Thomas a Becket.

SPANISH AMERICA AND THE UNITED STATES.

President Mich. B. Angell of the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor, while addressing one of the University clubs a few days ago, speaking of the concert of European powers and the Monroe doctrine, said that "the development of the European concert suggests the question whether ultimate, perhaps in a future somewhat remote, the larger states south of us and Canada, if she becomes entirely independent, might join us in a kind of friendly American concert to promote general continental interests, and to prevent foreign intrusion. Is it not conceivable," he adds, "that Mexico, Brazil, the Argentine Republic, and Chili might reach a development that would make this possible?"

"I know that we are told that there is no longer any danger of an attempt by European States to come up and gain possession of American territory. How one who sees what has just been going on in China can hold such a view it is difficult to understand. Not in the colonization frenzy of the sixteenth century was there a more voracious greed for the acquisition of foreign territory for the purpose of developing and controlling trade."

"What ground is there to believe that if we withdrew our objections we should not see a similar scramble for the territory south of us from the Rio Grande to Cape Horn; and how easily would excuses be found for conquest in such controversies as have already arisen between European powers and the Spanish-American states?"

The professor further elucidates his views by showing that in 1898 the

European powers which took part in settling the questions which arose out of the war between Turkey and Greece, the only thought of the ambassadors who took part in the conference was simply: "What settlement will be best for Europe?" Questions of indemnity, boundary, administration, etc., were settled with reference to the quiet, order, peace and convenience of Europe generally and no thought was given to the desires of the belligerent nations. His inference is that these powers would deal with America North and South in a similar way.

There is certainly much truth in what the President of Ann Arbor University speaks, but there is likewise very good reason to fear that the big Republic of North America has also aspirations to increase the extent of its possessions at the expense of the Latin American States where it can safely do so. The Mexican and Spanish wars both of which resulted in a considerable accession of territory to the United States were due chiefly to the aggressive policy pursued by the United States. The hasty recognition of the independence of Panama, the backing up of the same by the United States was another instance in which it was proved that this power thought more of promoting its own interests than of acting in the interest of the Spanish Republics. At all events these Republics have had such experience of the friendship of the United States that they as strongly suspect the sincerity of its friendship as they do that of the European powers which may look with longing eyes toward them in the hope of establishing European colonies on their territory.

It is for this reason that many South American statesmen entertain a hope that a union of some kind, a Federal, if not a complete union of the Latin American States may be effected as a barrier against encroachments by the United States, of which they are more in dread than of any encroachments by the European powers.

TO WHERE DOES THE MONEY BELONG?

Bishop Mills of the Anglican Diocese of Kingston has availed himself of the holding of the Synod to speak on the subject of the Autonomy Bills now before the Dominion Parliament.

Bishop Mills takes ground that, looked at from a reasonable and common sense point of view, is entirely fallacious. He complains of an alleged unfair distribution of the proceeds of the Educational tax in the Province of Quebec. His ground of complaint is that in the Province of Quebec there is a "Neutral" panel on which School votes are collected—that is, the votes on Corporations composed of Protestants and Catholics—the former in the great majority—but the proceeds of which, he says, are in a large proportion applied to Catholic school purposes, whereas, according to the Right Rev. Bishop, they should be applied to Protestant schools support, as the great majority of the members of these corporations are Protestants, and therefore the money, so to say, is Protestant money. But surely a prior question should be: whence the origin of this so-called Protestant money?

The corporations in question are in existence by reason of the support given them by the great Catholic majority, hence that majority have some claim on the profits. The same argument applies to those wealthy wholesale firms whom the Bishop includes in his parable of school matters in Quebec province. It is all very well, and at first blush seems reasonable to say that the means invested in these firms is the money of the Protestant owners. But here again comes the question: whence the origin of the money so invested? Is it not the fact that without the custom in trade of the people these firms would never have come into existence? Is it not reasonable that a portion of the wealth so accumulated—and a considerable portion at that—should go back in the indirect manner indicated to those who had originally contributed it—who had kept these wealthy firms in existence? To put the matter in a nutshell, it would be a fair question to ask: how many of these wealthy merchants or their ancestors "whose means are invested in their business" came to Canada as millionaires, or even with a capital sufficient to start business, or how many, on the contrary, landed with the proverbial solitary "one sovereign" in their pockets? The answer would be a conclusive one showing where the "means invested" came from originally. It is most remarkable how forgetful of these facts, as a rule, are those wealthy individuals in their ante-mortem distribution of their wealth. How rarely does it happen that the name of a Catholic orphanage, school or church is to be found in the "last Will and Testament" of those who have stored up their thousands, or their millions, on the custom of trade or on the "sweat of their brows" of the Catholic housekeeper or mechanic or

simple day laborer. How is it that while so opposed to the given Catholics in the given confederates of the Right Rev. Bishop Dr. are silent on the matter, resides in the city of the latter spent the greater life there, and surely well qualified to speak of Kingston.

THE RIGHTS OF

In his speech at the Knights of Columbus recent convention in California, the Right Rev. Bishop of that diocese, in appeal to his which apply with Catholics of Canada, said: "Knights of have a country to be proud of, and we do not care ask no favors because right. We ask even willing to fight for We are willing to have their rights. tolerance—we came is a manhood of Church and Country. Columbus, I know character with not

IN REPLY to an him recently on anniversary of his J. B. McNally, California, gave beautiful sentiment jewels are our charent with the and God till they know that by zealousness of sacrifice accomplished."

THE AVE MARIA

delivered by the the Quebec Legis in 1893 occurs the Tendency of a Latin Christian a word . . .

McGee's mind had little is now a word, and a co one." So also, the by another Irishman, "Ours," by the Thomas Drummond gentleman in dis posed militi org in his opinion "Canada was no or

ANNUAL

TO ST. ANNE DE B 25th—ITINERAR The Ontario P of St. Anne de B (this year) on T will reach the 25th—the Feast the Blessed Vi will prevail a G. T. R. from V borough, Halbu points east thro and at all stati Myrtle and all eluding Peterbor Stittsville, Carl Prescott, Smith Chertseyville, from Lindsay, take regular mo with special a from Mariposa, at Whitby, Ont Toronto, London points in West Toronto on Tue Montreal expre return tickets Myrtle station G. T. R. and C east of Toron tickets at eith cost of \$8.05 fr Myrtle, and which will be seed to St. A shall be reach nesday morning

Exceptional at all station part of the pr be good only c but valid on a ing up to August 1st. can leave Que trains of Tues treat by the 2nd; but if a Montreal be timed as to tious journe morning of V The pilgrims mediate dir Twomee, Bal any further intending pi be attached t which mea journey, and the nominal C. P. R. coaches will the track nea at the dispos There will be the first-cla night.

Pilgrims Trunk must treat Express Special at V