

# ARREST OF CHRISTIAN SCIENTIST.

James H. Lewis, a Christian Scientist of Toronto, has been arrested charged with criminal negligence in failing to provide medical aid, medicine, and proper comforts for his little son, Roy Lewis, while he was in a dying condition from diphtheria. Physicians assert that there was a likelihood of the cure of the child if he had had proper medical aid and care during his illness. The arrest was by Detective Verney of the Toronto detective force. This is but one of many instances of deaths arising from similar neglect, in consequence of the Christian Science belief, but it appears that very properly the Toronto police have been instructed to arrest those whose duty it is to provide proper medical treatment for those under their charge, when their sickness is so severe that such treatment should be provided.

# TO PURIFY LONDON.

This is surely an age of gigantic and bold undertakings; but a movement which is being begun in London, and of which a recent cable despatch gives information, is undoubtedly the boldest in the social order which has ever been attempted. This is nothing less than a crusade which has just been announced for the suppression of vice in that city. More than a thousand prominent persons representing every borough in the great metropolis have associated themselves together to suppress disorderly houses, obscene language, pernicious pictures, publications and plays.

Among the supporters of the movement are Lords Roberts and Wolsey, Cardinal Archbishop Vaughan, the (Anglican) Bishop of London, Lord Kinnaird, Archdeacon Wilberforce, Sir W. H. Broadbent, M. D., Sir Douglas Fox, Canon Gore, Rev. Hugh Price Hughes, and others.

Six hundred and forty two out of one thousand three hundred and forty nine borough councillors have pledged themselves to support the movement, and no doubt many others will give their adhesion to it later on.

The police have been instructed to be more vigilant in their investigations into the manner in which suspected houses are conducted, and the magistrates generally have entered heartily into the movement, promising to enforce the law on the subject with inflexible vigor and severity.

The vice-chairman of the association, Bishop Alfred Barry, said a few nights ago at a meeting to further the object of the Association:

"The social sins and miseries of London have a firm hold on the community. Unabashed and aggressive immorality has assumed the dimensions of a vested interest and an international trade. We do not profess to be able to compass the total suppression of immorality, but we hope, with the help of God, to redeem London from the reproach of being an open market for body and soul."

The Association will provide homes for unfortunate women willing to reform, and the measures generally proposed to be adopted in the carrying on of the crusade, being of an eminently practical character, there is more hope of success than in any movement of the kind which has ever been begun.

John Kenst, the seller of obscene literature, who is at the head of the aggressive Evangelical party, is in

danger of having his establishment broken up by this crusade—not indeed by Mrs. Carrie Nation's methods, but by the regular course of law.

# ADVANCING TOWARDS ROME.

There is a feature in the agitation of the question of Revision of the Westminster Confession to which much attention has not been called, and that is the testimony which the movement affords to the constancy of truth as it has been and is still taught in the Catholic Church.

The 25th chapter of the Westminster Confession admits that the Church of Christ must exist always "to worship God according to His will," and in support of this statement quotes "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." (St. Matt. xvi, 18;) and several other passages of Scripture, among which we need point out only this one: "He (Christ) gave some Apostles, and some prophets, and some evangelists, and some pastors and teachers, for the perfecting of the Saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ. Till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God." This text continues in the part not quoted in the Confession: that we may not now be children, tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, in the wickedness of men in craftiness by which they lie in wait to deceive."

These passages teach us more than they are quoted in the Confession to prove, namely that the Church of Christ must always continue to exist. They show that the Church is built upon a rock against which all the efforts of the enemy of our salvation to overthrow it, will not prevail to have it teach any other doctrine than that which in St. Matt. xviii, 19, Christ commanded His Apostles to teach to all nations; and it is to save us from becoming the dupes and victims of false doctrines that we are told the hierarchy of the Church of Christ was instituted by Christ Himself. In fact the Church of Christ must be what St. Paul describes it to be in 1 Tim. iii, 15: "the Church of the living God, the pillar and the ground of truth."

Now it must be remembered that besides the Greek Churches, which in nearly all their teachings are identical with the Catholic Church, there was for the West only the Catholic Church in existence when Luther, Calvin and Zwingli raised the standard of revolt in their respective countries, and started Protestantism on three widely different fundamental principles. Thus, even according to the plain teaching of the Westminster Confession, the Catholic Church must have been the only one which had authority to teach, and actually taught Christ's doctrine, and the only one of which Christ had said: "If he (the erring brother) will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as the heathen and the publican." (St. Matt. xviii, 17.)

The 25th chapter of the Westminster Confession, already quoted says: "The purest Churches under heaven are subject both to mixture and error, and some have so degenerated as to become no Churches of Christ, but synagogues of Satan."

Then follows the declaration: "Nevertheless there shall be always a Church on earth to worship God according to His will."

Of course, the Catholic Church is the one chiefly aimed at in this denunciation of the "synagogues of Satan," but it must include also all the Greek Churches, which teach substantially the same doctrines. Thus all Christianity is denounced as having repudiated Christ, in the same breath in which we are told that the Church of Christ must exist always in virtue of the promise of Christ to His Apostles: "Lo, I am with you all days even to the consummation of the world." A greater contradiction than this cannot be conceived, that Christ's Church must exist always, and yet that it has since long ago, ceased to exist, having become "a synagogue of Satan."

The absurdity of all this is felt by Protestants themselves, and the revision movement aims at eliminating this reference to the Catholic Church as well as the fling at the Pope found in the same chapter as follows:

"There is no other head of the Church but the Lord Jesus Christ: nor can the Pope of Rome in any sense be head thereof, but is that Antichrist, that man of sin and Son of Perdition, that exalteth himself in the Church against Christ and all that is called God."

One of the passages of Scripture appealed to in support of this teaching is found in 2 Thess II, 8, and is as follows:

"Let no man deceive you by any means; for that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the Son of Perdition, who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God."

Many years ago, the Rev. Philip Schaff, one of the most prominent of the Presbyterian clergy of the United States, and a member of the American section of the Committee on the Revision of the Bible, declared that the teaching of the Confession on this point is founded upon a false interpretation of the Scriptural texts referred to, and this is borne out by the fact that all this abuse of the Pope, at least, is to be left out of the Confession upon revision.

It is true, the present proposal is to leave the Confession untouched, whereas a new and short Creed is to be prepared which, it is said, will be an "explanation" of the Confession, though every one is perfectly aware that it will supersede the old creed, and that this is the purpose for which it will be prepared. The proposal is evidently, so far as it goes, an advance toward the old Catholic faith, and the giving up of one of the new-fangled favorite doctrines of Presbyterianism, and an admission that after all the hurly-burly of three centuries of abuse against the "Man of Sin," and the "Synagogue of Satan," the Catholic Church was right, and Presbyterianism wrong.

The same thing is to be said on the subject of foreordination, and the reprobation of angels and men, and especially of infants. The subjection of the so called reprobate of these three classes to an inevitable fatality which leads them on to eternal destruction, is to be among the things which revision will put out of the Confession. We are told that hereafter God must be regarded by all American Calvinists as a Father to be loved, and that we must all put confidence in His mercy, and believe in His teachings.

Here again there is an approach to the teaching of the Catholic Church, and an acknowledgment that she has preserved unchanged "the faith once delivered to the Saints." This is sure, even if it be a slow advance towards Rome, and it is certainly an improvement on the stern despotism which John Knox and John Calvin represented as existing in the judgments of Almighty God.

# STILL ROMEWARD BOUND.

In regard to another matter, the celebration of Christmas and Easter, the actual Presbyterian attitude is somewhat difficult to understand. The General Assembly of Virginia last year made a pronouncement on the case to the effect that "there is no warrant for the observance of these days as holy days; but on the contrary, such observance is contrary to the principles of the reformed faith, and not in harmony with the simplicity of the Gospel of Jesus Christ." This is in accord with that chapter of the Westminster Confession which prohibits any manner of worship of God which is not commanded in Scripture. In the Twenty fifth General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of Canada, the Moderator announced that "No encroachment should be made upon God's Word either in spirit or in letter by the introduction of times and seasons and ordinances He has not appointed."

This was evidently intended as a special condemnation of those Presbyterians who, of late years have kept the festivals of Christmas and Easter. But these two assemblies of Virginia and Canada evidently overlooked the fact that they themselves insist most strongly on the strict observance of Sunday, an observance which is certainly not appointed in Scripture, but is derived from the institution of the Lord's Day by the Catholic Church, as the weekly holy day to be observed by all Christians in honor of Christ's Resurrection from the dead. The Confession itself says (chap. 1.):

"There are some circumstances concerning the worship of God, and government of the Church, common to human actions and societies, which are to be ordered by the light of nature and Christian prudence according to the general rules of the word, which are always to be observed."

It is, therefore, the office of the Church of God to ordain such matters, and as Scripture certainly does not prohibit either by the spirit or the letter, the observance of such festivals as the Nativity and Resurrection, it is within the jurisdiction of God's Church as an organized, divinely instituted, and self-governing body, to appoint such festivals as it deems advisable to increase devotion; and such ordinances

are of obligation, inasmuch as whosoever will not hear the Church is to be regarded as the Heathen and the Publican.

But though the General Assemblies, condemn these great Christian festivals, the common sense of the people and the spirit of devotion have created a proclivity among the people to keep these great feasts, and the General Assemblies will certainly be obliged before long to go with the torrent. We therefore look for another approach to Catholic practices, before long, in this matter of observing the great festivals which Presbyterians have sternly refused to observe during the last three centuries.

# THE LAW TIMES AND THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

The Canadian Law Times is a journal published in Toronto with the purpose of furnishing lawyers and judges with reliable and succinct digests of legal decisions of the courts for their guidance in ascertaining the laws which apply to the cases which may come under their consideration. It is a journal from which professional men derive much useful knowledge regarding current decisions. But to put the matter mildly, an article in the June issue of the Law Times to which our attention has been directed by one of the Catholic judges, shows that the editor is apt to be carried into occasional indiscretions by his excessive zeal to propagate his own religious views, or at least that he rejoices to have an opportunity to fling his handful of mud at the Church of nineteen centuries, even at the expense of truth.

In the issue of the date mentioned we find an article in the form of a letter for which the editor is fully responsible, the more especially as it is anonymous, and the responsibility cannot be placed on other shoulders.

This letter gives an extract from Lord Bacon in which there is an insinuating and false reference to the teaching and practices of the Catholic Church, the publication of which is inexcusable in an article which has for its purpose to advise judges how they ought to fulfil the duties of their office. Surely this advice could be given without quoting Bacon's false and insinuating statement.

Except for this reference, the article is unexceptionable. It says: "It was possible for Bacon four hundred years ago to use this language in his essay 'Of Judicature':

"Judges ought to remember that their office is *ius dicere* and not *ius dare*; to interpret law, and not to make law or give law, else it will be like the authority claimed by the Church of Rome which under pretext of exposition of Scripture, doth not stick to add and alter, and to pronounce that which they do not find, and by show of antiquity to introduce novelty."

In the first place, by giving a false date to Bacon's writing, an authority is given to the writer to which he is not entitled. If he had lived four hundred years ago, it would have been in Catholic times, and he would be naturally supposed to have been a Catholic thoroughly conversant with the "iniquitous practices" of the Catholic Church. Such however, is not the case. He was born in 1561, and his legal works were published in and after 1599, during the reign of Queen Elizabeth, and they contain intrinsic evidence of Bacon's sycophancy to the Queen. During the troubles of Lord Essex with Queen Elizabeth, Bacon wrote to the favorite an imploring though eloquent letter advising him to make all efforts to secure the favor of the Queen alone, as thereby lay his prospects of promotion and success in life, and though Essex had been Bacon's bosom friend, after the former had been executed, Bacon was the tool chosen by the Queen to malign his quondam friend by the preparation and publication of his "Declaration of the practices and Treasons Attempted and Committed by Robert, late Earl of Essex;" and the work itself was altered and corrected by the Queen and her Council before being given to the public. Bacon was, therefore, a suitable man to malign the Catholic Church at any opportunity in order to gratify Elizabeth, and to justify before the English people the penal laws passed against Catholics, and the establishment of a new "Reformed Church."

The Catholic Church does not "under pretext of exposition," or under pretext of any kind, "add and alter and pronounce that which she does not find, and by show of antiquity introduce novelty."

The Catholic Church has no need of false pretences in propounding doctrines or recommending devotional practices. She adheres strictly to revealed truth.

Doctrines are revealed by Christ and are unchangeable; and from the beginning the doctrines of the Church have been handed down without change, for as St. Paul testifies in Eph. iv, 3, 14, for this purpose Christ instituted a hierarchy of "Prophets, Apostles, Evangelists, pastors, teachers, etc.," "to keep the unity of the Spirit, in the bond of peace, one Lord, one faith, one baptism. . . till we all meet in the unity of faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God . . . that we may not now be children, tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, in the wickedness of men, in craftiness by which they lie in wait to deceive."

The Catholic Church has real authority from Christ to interpret Scripture, for in His commission given to the Apostles and to His seventy-two disciples He said:

"Teach all nations to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and behold, I am with you all days even to the consummation of the world;" and, "He that heareth you heareth Me, and he that despiseth Me despiseth Him that sent Me." (Matt. xxviii., 20.) (St. Luke x, 16.)

Elsewhere our Lord says to His Apostles:

"Peace be to you. As the Father hath sent Me, I also send you. Then breathing upon them He said: Receive ye the Holy Ghost: Whose sins you shall forgive they are forgiven them, and whose sins you shall retain they are retained." (St. John. xx, 21, 23.)

From these passages it is evident that the doctrine of Christ is not to be changed by any authority on earth, but must be taught as it was revealed by Him. It is not the Catholic Church which changes, or alters these teachings, but this was done, and is being constantly done by the Elizabethan Church of England to which Bacon belonged, and by other Protestant churches as well. It is well known that Edward and Elizabeth, as well as succeeding sovereigns made such changes, but the doctrines of the Catholic Church are proverbially unchangeable, so that Protestants are constantly reproaching it for not changing with every wind to suit the times and the varying fancies of men.

But the Church has within itself an authority to lay down rules of conduct, and regulations which will facilitate the attainment of the end which Christ had in view in instituting the hierarchy, the salvation of mankind. This is evident from the passages we have quoted which require obedience to the Apostles as they were obliged to obey Christ, and whosoever despises the laws laid down by these Apostles and their lawful successors, despises Christ Himself, and becomes no better than the heathen and the Publican. (St. Matt. xviii; 17.)

The case stands just on a parallel with that of the judges to whom Lord Bacon's advice is directed, for the judges do not "make the law," but interpret it, just as the Catholic Church does according to Christ's institution. But the judges make rules to carry out the statutory enactments, and in the spiritual order the Church makes rules or laws to carry out the commands of Christ. Thus Christ enjoins fasting and penance, and the Church fixes the times and manner in which these obligations are to be fulfilled. Christ has instituted sacraments, and the Church determines the times and places and rites in which and wherewith the sacraments are to be administered.

If the Canadian Law Times had omitted the slanderous and insulting accusation of Bacon the force of the advice to judges would not have been in the least degree weakened, and this is what journal should have done.

The extract to which we object asserts that the Catholic Church "makes a show of antiquity to introduce novelty."

This assertion is the climax of impudence made by one of the promoters of an entirely novel Church. It is easy to show by historical evidence that as to doctrine, the Catholic Church has taught throughout the ages the same "faith which was once delivered to the Saints." Even her disciplinary laws are substantially ancient; though the details are varied according to the circumstances of time and place. We need not repeat what we have already said regarding the reasonableness of this.

# He Loved the Poor.

The love of St. Ambrose for the poor was so great that he even melted down the consecrated vessels in a time of great necessity. "If," said the saint, "the blood of Christ redeemed their souls, shall not the vessels which hold that blood be used to redeem their bodies?"

# THE CORONATION OATH.

Liverpool Catholic Times.

With the third reading of the amended form of the Royal Declaration, as tinkered by Lord Salisbury and the Report Commission, the fate of the bill is transferred to another place. The peers have done their work; the Commons are now to decide whether that work shall remain done or be undone. It is not, of course, to be expected that such a highly contentious measure can be piloted through the House of Commons in the crowded days of an expiring session. Nor is it probable, even when Parliament comes together after the holidays, that the bill, as it now stands, will have a calm passage through the rocks and shoals of debate. It will meet with attack from the angry Protestants on the one hand and from the discontented Catholics on the other.

Between Scylla and Charybdis its fate will most likely be determined. No steersman will be able to get it through the stormy straits; and we should not be surprised if, rather than tempt fortune on those seething waters, Mr. Balfour let the bill drop altogether, and called off to quieter seas. He has a well-earned reputation for dropping bills now. If he keeps his promise to introduce next session a sweeping measure of educational reform, he will arouse the fiercest wrath of all militant non-Conformists, and it is not in human nature to expect him to make that fight fiercer still by arousing the allied bigotry of Protestants against him on this royal declaration. And so we do not look with much hopefulness on the prospects of the amended accession oath when it comes, if it ever does come, for debate by the Lower House.

But, even though we never hear of further legislation against this disgraceful attack upon Catholic doctrines, we may take satisfaction from the discussion which the terms of the Accession Oath have provoked among all decent minded people. On every side it has been condemned: Anglicans and Catholics have united in reproaching the outrages on Christian dogmas. And, better than all, the course of the debate in the Upper House has proved that, though doctrine forms the warp and woof of the Declaration, its purpose and intent are, as Lord Tweedmouth said, not ecclesiastical, but political. This, we think, is in itself a distinct gain, and gives reasonable ground to hope that whenever the country hears of the bill again it will be found to have abandoned all references to theological doctrines, and confined itself to stating merely that the monarch, on his accession to the throne, shall profess himself a member of the Established Church. With such a profession Catholics, so long as England has an Established Church, would find little cause of quarrel.

The majority of the nation has an undoubted right to decide what sort of a king it wants, and so long as it does not outrage the religious sentiments of the minority by insisting upon declarations that are uncalculated for, useless and insulting, we do not see why the majority should not be allowed to have its way. It will have its way, whatever we do, for as the Chorus told Creon, it has the power. But its way should not shock the religious susceptibilities of Christians. There is no need for singling out the religious tenets of any creed for denial by the monarch. Let him profess his own religion, or the religion that is legally connected with inheritance of the throne. But let him do it in positive, not in negative terms. Let him say he is a Protestant; we shall all understand what he means. And if he wishes, or if England wishes him, to specify any or some doctrines peculiar to the Established Church, no one will object. But it is intolerable that, in order to declare himself a Protestant, he should have to deny certain Catholic dogmas. Why cannot he assert Protestant doctrines? But, as Lord Tweedmouth said, the whole question is political, not ecclesiastical, and its aim is to keep the throne free from interference by the Pope.

On the possible or probable influence of the Papacy upon any present or future wearer of the English Crown, we said our mind a couple of weeks ago, and need add nothing further today. But we would take the opportunity of reminding Catholics that if the obnoxious Declaration against Transubstantiation and Intercession of Saints is to be removed, it will not be removed by sitting down and doing nothing but deprecate further public remonstrance. If Catholics cease to protest, the Government will cease to act. Why should Mr. Balfour burden his shoulders with a bill that is sure to prove troublesome, unless he finds that Catholics are determined on the necessity of having their grievance redressed? He would be a fool to face the disagreeable task of carrying a contested measure that nobody wanted. And if Catholics are to convince Mr. Balfour that we want the Royal Declaration mentioned or ended, we must make our voice heard. And we must insist on it being heard and needed.

Our religious views are not so popular with his Majesty's Government that it will go out of its way to champion them and satisfy us. It will give us only what we demand; never more, and generally less. What we have hitherto won in the way of religious emancipation, we have won by popular clamor, determined, aggressive, and threatening. Had we waited, and deprecate discussion, in the hope that favors would have been graciously and graciously showered down upon us by the Government, we should not have had one single griev-

# MOTHER OF MANY HEROES.

A story going the rounds of the press describes the unhesitating response of a Catholic priest in a small New York town, to a call to the bedside of a smallpox patient in a pest house, says the Monitor. The heroism of the priest in fearlessly exposing himself to the danger of contagion is extolled. The doctors and attendants of the hospital, "heavily garbed in rubber, stood aside and looked on in wonder," as the priest, unprotected by any scientific armor, ministered to the spiritual needs of the unfortunate. The tribute paid to the priest's courage and devotion is deserved, but because such conduct is a new thing among men of his calling. There is not a Catholic priest in the world who would not discharge his duty in the premises with equal readiness. Scarcely a priest of middle age but has been called upon many times as a rule, to prove his fidelity to a sacred trust, in a manner similar to that recorded. One of the greatest glories of the priesthood is unquestionably devotion in the service of God and humanity, not the less great because unheralded to the world.

# THE PHYSICIAN OF SOULS.

Jesus did not only enrapture multitudes by this miraculous power manifested in love and in an impulse of the most tender, most merciful, most delicate and most intense love, joined to the most marvellous forgetfulness of self. His lofty intellect also revealed itself. He did not content himself with healing—He went beyond body to the soul. To say the truth, He never occupied Himself but with souls. It is evident that Jesus the diseases of the soul through diseases of the body. He beheld some point in the soul, which had reduced the like in the body, and that He applied His great and beneficent power. His miracles were merely extraordinary acts which elicit wonder, but convey no instruction; nor were they merely acts of compassion and kindness; they were something deeper—acts in which His saving power was displayed. Saviour of souls, the Redeemer, living and visible through these ages. Thus, before He performed any miracle, He desired that the energies of the soul should be awakened and united to Him. "Dost believe?" He said; or, "Wilt be saved?" And again, "If you but believe?" He would only when the infirm soul had at least endeavored to turn the Physician.—E. Bongaud, translated by C. L. rie.—New World.

# DECADENT NEW ENGLAND.

A few days ago a remarkably spoken letter on the lack of children New England families appeared in public press of Ottawa, Canada, was written by the Hon. David minister of justice, and, although production of a non-Catholic, strong indictment of an alarming. Said Mr. Mills:

"The New England people upon the soil, but not of it. Obviously dislike farming as men their women do having children were it not for the forefathers who have taken up their residence among them, there would be no children born nor fields cultivated."

"If left to themselves, the ex of a descendant of the Pilgrim would be as rare as the great and the race is sure to share the fate of the dodo."

"This must be a very serious blam for the United States state Stop the foreign immigration. United States would not incur population, and after a time there would begin to diminish. There is obviously something with a people who, under conditions favorable, have such small families."

"The United States woman realize her duties to God and country, and she does of the pleasures than she does of the duties which the Creator has upon her."

# THE DRIFT OF THOUGHT.

A striking lecture on the outlook was that delivered a few ago by Father Morgan M. St. The Catholic Summer School, millar with the works of Father know him to be one of the deers of the country, far-seeing