

The Catholic Record.

Published Weekly at 44 and 45 Richmond Street, London, Ontario.

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

EDITORS: REV. GEORGE R. NORTGRAVES, Author of "Mistakes of Modern Infidels."

THOMAS COFFEY, Publisher and Proprietor.

MISSISSAUGA: LEEY KING, JOHN NICH, P. J. NEVIN and WM. A. NEVIN, are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transact all other business for the CATHOLIC RECORD.

Rates of Advertising—Ten cents per line each insertion, square measurement.

Approved and recommended by the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa and St. Boniface, and the Bishops of Hamilton and Peterboro, 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 Tuesday morning.

Articles must be paid in full before the paper can be stopped.

London, Saturday, May 8, 1897.

THE CASE OF GALILEO.

A correspondent, J. G., of Montreal, takes exception to an article which appeared recently in our columns in which the celebrated case of the imprisonment of Galileo by order of the Holy Office at Rome was dealt with. The article in question stated that Galileo was not condemned on account of his entertaining certain scientific dogmas, but because he made a religious dogma of them, which our correspondent puts as because "he quoted Scripture in their support."

The article in question was not our own but expressed the views of an able writer and thinker, with whom however a journal publishing them is not necessarily in complete accord. We cannot be always held strictly responsible for all the divergencies of thought which may appear in articles in our columns which have been selected from various sources. As long as the general tenor of an article is good, and that the views held therein are morally and dogmatically sound, we deem it our right, and sometimes it will be highly useful to our readers, to publish such an article, even though we might differ from the writer in some details. There are certain limits of defined doctrine and morals within which unity of belief and teaching is necessary, but outside these limits we must not be so dictatorial as to insist that every one must be of the same mind with ourselves. Beyond those limits we must allow to every one the same liberty of opinion which we would wish to enjoy ourselves.

With these preliminary observations our position in regard to the Galileo question may be understood. It may be looked at from various standpoints, inasmuch as after the lapse of over two and a half centuries there are necessarily some circumstances of the case which are doubtful and debatable. Our correspondent says he thinks it would be "far more straightforward on the part of the Church we defend to admit frankly having erred in its treatment of Galileo instead of eternally trying to explain, one day stating that he was condemned for contumacy, and another day that it was for quoting Scripture." He adds to this expression of opinion that Josh Billings remarked on just such matters that "a fence is not strengthened with whitewash."

We admit that it would be a wondrous spectacle if the whole world were of one opinion on every subject, but this is a condition of affairs which we cannot expect to exist before the millennium at least, so our correspondent must be tolerant of differences of view on non-essential matters. In regard to the case of Galileo we admit that the theory of the earth's motion around the sun has been proved by modern science, but it was a very debatable question in the time of Galileo, and it was really only a more or less probable or a possible theory, and not a demonstrated truth until after the discoveries of Sir Isaac Newton more than a century later. We say, then, that it was premature for Galileo to maintain that it must be believed as a revealed truth, founded upon Scripture teaching, as he certainly did maintain in his celebrated "Dialogues" which brought upon him the condemnation of the Holy Office.

Our correspondent insinuates that this condemnation is proof decisive against the infallibility of the Church and of the Pope. We must dissent entirely from his view. The infallibility of the Church and of the Pope has nothing to do with matters of science, whether demonstrated or theoretical, and it was not in question in regard to Galileo. The prerogative of the Church's infallibility has reference only to doctrines, and not to a question of the advisability of teaching a certain scientific theory. But Galileo taught the Copernican theory of the earth's motion as if it were the certain teaching of Scripture, and this the Holy Office declared

to be rash, without condemning the theory itself. It is therefore true to say that Galileo was condemned for teaching rashly as a truth revealed in Scripture, a theory for which there was at the time no sure foundation. But the Holy Office had members who believed the Copernican theory themselves. It was not likely they would condemn Galileo for maintaining what they themselves held and believed.

J. G. appears to think that there is a contradiction in asserting that Galileo was condemned for contumacy, and that it was for supporting his theories by Scripture. There is no contradiction, for as a matter of fact Galileo was censurable not only for his rashness in prematurely making an unproved theory a religious dogma, but also for actually holding up his sovereign, or at least his suzerain, to public ridicule, because he did not altogether believe just as himself did. It happened that his suzerain was the Pope, and this act of disrespect was punished as a civil fault, and not as a matter of religion at all. We say, therefore, that it is perfectly correct to claim that there was no connection between this civil act of condemnation of Galileo and the doctrine of the Church's infallibility, whether we regard the question of contumacy or of his rash quotation of Holy Scripture.

We have spoken of the imprisonment as if it were a serious affair, but in reality it could scarcely be called an imprisonment at all. His prison was at first in the most comfortable rooms of the Holy Office, and afterward in a palace, where every effort was made to make his situation comfortable. This was the more especially taken care of because Galileo was a special friend of Pope Urban VIII., but he certainly was restrained from teaching his theory as a religious dogma. It is not true to say, however, that the theory was condemned by the Church, for even such condemnation as was issued was issued only by an ecclesiastical tribunal which dealt with matters of administration and discipline and not at all with doctrinal decisions. Besides, there is no infallible doctrinal decree of Church or Pope except such as contains teaching, confirmed by the Pope, and addressed to the whole Church as doctrine which all Christians must believe. Now this was not the case with the decree against Galileo, which was solely the act of a tribunal of law, by which civil matters were settled, and it was no more a decision of the Church than is any ordinary law suit in this country, though it happened under the Pope's rule.

It is well known that the sovereign does not examine the ordinary decrees of the courts, and the decree condemnatory of Galileo was certainly not signed by the Pope, so that it cannot in any sense be maintained that it was a doctrinal decree which affects the question of the Church's infallibility.

BAD ADVICE. The advice given by the African Methodist Bishop, Henry M. Turner, a few weeks ago, to the negroes of the whole United States, has created quite a sensation throughout the country, the more so because it has become known that many of the negroes are acting upon it, and are providing themselves with repeating rifles and revolvers to protect themselves against the assaults of white men for the purpose of lynching negro evil doers.

Bishop Turner complained in an Atlanta religious paper of the treatment to which negroes are subjected, and there was good ground for his complaint, for the use of lynch-law, the victims to which are mostly negroes, is one of the abominable results of the godless education under which the present generation of the people of the South have been brought up, and it has become alarmingly frequent, and there is no prospect of its being given up. Nevertheless such advice as the Bishop gives to the colored people is very strange coming from the mouth of one who calls himself a Christian Bishop. He says:

"The fiendish lynching of John Johnson and Archibald Joiner upon mere suspicion in Louisiana while the African Methodist Episcopal Bishops were meeting in the city of New Orleans, only a few miles from the scene of blood, was most damnable. Let every negro in this country who has a spark of manhood in him supply his house with one, two or three guns, or with a seven or sixteen shooter. We advise him to keep them loaded and ready for immediate use and when his domicile is invaded by bloody lynchers, or any mob day or night, Sabbath or week day, turn loose your missiles of death and blow the fiendish invaders into a thousand jiblets. We

have had it in our mind to say this for over seven years, but on account of our episcopal status we have hesitated to express ourselves thus, fearing it might meet with the disapproval of the House of Bishops. But their approval or disapproval has done nothing to stay the fiendish murderers, who stalk abroad and are exterminating our race. So we have said it and hereafter we shall preach it, speak it, talk it and write it. Again we say, get guns, negroes, get guns, and may God give you good aim when you shoot."

The lynching is to be severely condemned, and the natural law of self-preservation justifies measures of defence, so that the life of an unjust aggressor on one's life may be lawfully taken, if necessary for self-defence. But Bishop Turner does not discriminate between the cases of guilty and innocent negroes, and this is an important point. Mistakes are sometimes made by the lynchers, and sometimes they inflict punishment with all accompaniments of extreme cruelty, on mere suspicion, but usually they are pretty sure of the guilt of those who are lynched for crimes which have been committed. The Bishop would do better to make an effort to humanize and improve the morality of his fellow-negroes, who have been the cause of the lynching practice by the commission of many fearful atrocities which have been committed by negroes in the South, and if the crimes would cease, then, we believe, there would be an end of the lynchings.

News which reached us on the 30th, from Houston, Texas, adds another notable feature to the matter of lynching. The despatch states that six negroes were lynched on the previous night by persons of their own race and color, for the murder of another negro and two girls, and the burning of the home of their victims. The mob took them from the room at Sunnyside where they were being guarded, and hanged them to a tree. Would it not be well were Bishop Henry M. Turner, and his associates, to devote their energies towards making the negroes good citizens? There appears to be a very large amount of that sort of work left undone, particularly in the southern States.

SUNDAY STREET CARS.

Toronto is at present convulsed over the question of Sunday street cars, and a popular vote will be taken on Saturday to decide whether or not they shall be run in the city.

On two former occasions a similar vote was taken with the result that the advocates of Sunday cars were defeated, the second time with a reduced majority against them. This was in 1893, when the majority was a little over 1000 on a total vote of 27,311.

The question has been made a religious as well as a social one by the opponents of the street cars. A few years ago all who advocated the running of the cars on Sunday were set down as being practically infidels, but during the present campaign a change seems to have come over the religious citizens in this respect, and they are now considering the matter on its real merits as a social problem. The fact that such a change has occurred in the views of many seems to indicate a probable change in the result of the vote which will be taken on Saturday, and that this time the Sunday car advocates may win. Thus in the Bloor Street Baptist church at a meeting held on Tuesday of last week, both clergy and laity present agreed in expressing the opinion that "the running of Sunday cars is not a violation of the Fourth (Third) Commandment, and that the question now before the people of the city is not a religious one at all." It is said that the congregations of the other fifteen Baptist churches of the city entertain similar views.

There have been many meetings held by the contestants on both sides, and the question has been ably debated whether or not a Sunday car service should be established. Its opponents for the most part rest their case on the biblical prohibition against work on the Sabbath day. They appear to forget that the Sabbath day spoken of in the Bible is not the Sunday, but Saturday, which was the day of rest appointed to be observed under the Old Law, and as there has been under Christianity a change so important as the substitution of one day for another, it must be clear to reflecting minds that we are to look to the laws and practice of the Christian, and not of the Jewish Church, for the manner in which the Sunday is to be kept holy. Under the Christian dispensation the manner in which the Sunday is to be observed is to be deduced from the laws of the Church,

which are disciplinary, and dependent upon the peculiar circumstances of cases. On the other hand, Christ Himself has said that the Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath. Hence we may reasonably infer from all these considerations that existing social conditions must be taken into account in deciding whether or not a Sunday car service is lawful, or desirable.

We certainly do not mean to assert that Sunday cars will make the general-ity of the people any more religious, neither do we believe it would make them less so.

It has been said that a Sunday car service will be an inducement to the people to bring them away from church, and to spend a day in the public parks, which will be brought thereby within easy reach of them. On the other hand it is said that the facility afforded by a car service which will bring all the churches of the city within easy reach of the public will cause a better attendance at the churches.

We presume the car service would to some extent operate in both ways, but we believe it would operate more extensively in favor of church attendance.

It is not to be expected that the car service in itself will have the effect of making the public either more or less religious, but it will operate in enabling the public to act more easily upon their own inclinations, whether these tend toward religion or mere pleasure. It will increase their freedom of action in either way, and as we have said already we are convinced that the preponderance of gain will be on the side of a better church attendance. But in any case, it is the spirit of the age to favor whatever tends to give greater liberty of action, and we may reasonably infer that the greater liberty afforded by a street car service will be, on the whole, a general benefit, though we must not be too sanguine in hoping that devotedness to religious worship will increase to the same degree to which facilities for going from one part of the city to another will be increased.

A Sunday car service will certainly increase the opportunities for social and family intercourse, but the strongest argument in its favor is probably the fact that the street railways place within reach of the poorer classes, the opportunity of going whither they will. Those who have more means may use bicycles, and the wealthy have carriages which they use freely on all days of the week, as well as Sundays. The workmen and the poorer classes who cannot afford either of the two last mentioned modes of locomotion have no opportunity to go freely from place to place except by means of the street cars, and it does not appear fair to them that while the rich have carriages at their disposal for use on any day, those who are not so well supplied with this world's comfort should be shut out from the use of their carriages—the street cars—on the only day when they have the opportunity of using them at all. In fact, if we sum up the amount of convenience and comfort which will be afforded to the public by a street car service, we may safely say that it will not entail proportionately so much extra labor on the conductors and motor-men as is at present entailed upon cabmen, coachmen and grooms who are employed in rigging and driving carriages. If the work done at present in this respect is to be regarded as a work of necessity to be done or permitted on Sundays, the work of running the street cars seems to be equally so. At all events it cannot be considered fair that a bare majority of the people should impose such a burden upon the minority, who form nearly if not quite one half of the population, as to deprive the latter of their freedom of intercourse and even of recreation, if they see fit, merely because that majority has its own peculiar views regarding what ought to be permitted to others.

It is to be remarked that if this question be decided in favor of the advocates of Sunday cars their opponents will not be restricted in their liberties at all, as they will be perfectly free to use the cars or not, as they see fit; whereas if the car service be not allowed, the liberty of those who wish to use it will be taken away.

In nearly all the large cities of the continent there is now a Sunday car service, and even in many of the minor cities. It appears to leave Toronto in the background, as far as the public convenience is concerned, that it is without such a service.

It is true that under our constitutional regime the majority must rule, but it should not use its power arbitrarily to the great inconvenience of

the minority. Might does not always give right, and, besides, the majority of to-day may be the minority of to-morrow, and if they desire to be justly treated themselves in future, they should to-day deal justly and considerately with those who for the time constitute the minority.

REV. MR. COBURN.

The citizens of London were, last week, favored with a visit from Rev. John Coburn, who, we are told, is a young Methodist minister of Toronto. His "mission" was to deliver a lecture to the True Blues, which, he said, was a religious order, founded upon Christian principles, and its object the maintenance of Protestantism. Its prime object, however, he admitted, was to enlist the services of the brethren in the work of caring for neglected Protestant children. The rev. gentleman also stated that, according to a report of the Ontario Inspector or there were ninety-three Protestant children in Roman Catholic orphanages. The True Blues, he thought, should take care of these children. He also informed his hearers that a scheme was now on foot to enable the True Blues to build an Orphan's Home. Would it not be a wise move to establish an institution wherein the True Blues themselves could be taken care of and educated up to a higher standard of citizenship? The speaker appeared to be altogether oblivious of the fact that on every occasion during the summer months when a picnic or excursion had been organized and carried out by this association the municipality to which the members went to disport themselves expressed itself as more than anxious that such a visit should never be repeated. Rioting, drunkenness and blasphemy has, on such occasions, been the order of the day. One instance we now call to mind was the excursion of the Toronto contingent to Hamilton.

A perusal of the papers of that city, on the day after the picnic, should convince Mr. Coburn that his constituency is sadly in need of proper training. It is a great pity to see a person calling himself a Christian minister, going about the country sowing the seeds of rancor and ill-will between neighbors. Mr. Coburn appears to be a mischievous busybody, fond of notoriety; but the notoriety he will achieve by his connection with these gosling Orangemen is such that few will envy. Could not the warm-hearted and liberal-minded Rev. Dr. Burns, of Hamilton, give this young man a curtain lecture?

A FOSSIL.

The Church Evangelist is very much troubled because the penal laws against Catholics which were in force in England for three centuries, but were repealed in 1829, are a thing of the past, and it is anxious they should be applied even now in Canada, notwithstanding that the free exercise of the Catholic religion was one of the stipulations under which Canada was ceded to Great Britain.

The Evangelist tells us in its last issue that appeals to Rome were forbidden by British law in 1532, "and finally it was decreed that no foreign prince, person, prelate, state, or potentate hath or ought to have any jurisdiction, power, superiority, pre-eminence, or authority, ecclesiastical or spiritual, within His Majesty's realms, dominions, or countries."

This absurdity was indeed enacted as law, in spite of the evident falsehood contained in it, but the Evangelist should know that Catholics are not now even asked to swear to any such nonsense. It is only the clergy, and in some cases the laity among the Evangelist's own co-religionists, who gulp it down.

Knowing that the Pope actually has and exercises spiritual and ecclesiastical authority in every part of her Majesty's dominions it is a puzzle to us how the Evangelist's co-religionists can reconcile it with their consciences to swear that he has not, and as to the clause that a foreign prelate ought not have such authority we have only to say that it would exclude St. Paul, whom some credulous Anglicans claim as the founder of the Anglican Church, and St. Augustine, who is claimed by the Archbishop of Canterbury to have been his great predecessor.

The purpose of all this nonsensical stuff on the part of the Evangelist is to give it a chance to proclaim that the Papal Delegate now in Canada "ought to be prohibited and stopped at once, and he be sent respectfully back to his master."

The Evangelist forgets that the

British Government was very glad to have a Delegate from the Pope in London itself even when the penal laws were in full operations, to assist in the readjustment of Europe after the fall of Napoleon I., and the Pope's Delegate at that time is admitted to have had the wisest head among all the great counsellors then assembled. The Evangelist is at least a century behind the age in wishing for the restoration of laws which the British Government itself found it necessary to break even while they were in full force.

THE APOSTOLIC DELEGATE.

We have been informed that His Excellency Mgr. Merry del Val, the Apostolic Delegate, is expected to visit Toronto this week, where he will be the guest of the Most Reverend Archbishop of Toronto.

It will be a source of great pleasure to his Grace and to the clergy and laity of Toronto that they are honored thus with a visit from the learned, pious, and venerated prelate whom the Holy Father has sent to Canada to represent him.

The mission of his Excellency to Canada is a most important one, as it is understood that he is expected to decide whether or not the school system established by the Government of Manitoba can be used at all by Catholics, and some hope is entertained that he may, by conciliatory methods, succeed in obtaining a more favorable settlement than that which has been agreed upon between Messrs. Laurier and Greenway. We understand, however, that his visit to Toronto has no official purpose, but is intended to be complimentary to his Grace the Archbishop, whose able administration and eminent personal qualities are well known in Rome by the Holy Father, and doubtless also by his delegate.

The delegate will be welcomed to the West by all Catholics, and it is probable that the Catholics of Toronto and of other localities who may wish to visit him will be given an opportunity to pay their respects to him at a special reception.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

AS WILL be seen in another column, Most Rev. Archbishop Cleary has returned to Kingston. For some time past his Grace's health had been very precarious, but a season spent at that delightful resort, Cape May, has been the means of benefiting him very materially. We sincerely trust his recovery to health will be permanent; and in this wish we are joined, not only by the people of Kingston, but by the faithful throughout the Dominion. Distinguished, warm-hearted, a great prelate and an able administrator, truly zealous for the furtherance of the interests of Holy Church—brilliant and able in its defence—a kind and loving father to his flock, his Grace of Kingston could ill be spared, and we trust a kind Providence will give him many more years of usefulness.

"THE art exhibition in the window at 236 Main street is Miss Angelica McNulty's contribution to the Centennial exhibit. There are arctic and water colors, pastels and crayons, all of wonderfully clever execution. Miss McNulty is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. John McNulty, and displays great talent for one so young."—Memphis, Tenn., Commercial Appeal.

The young lady above referred to is a niece of Sister Martha (Miss Quarry), so long and favorably-known in London. Her father and mother were also residents of Ontario for many years. We are more than pleased to note the marked success of Miss McNulty as an artist, and we trust her future will be a brilliant one.

THE Anglican Bishops of England have been long coquetting with every sect which they imagined might have some inclination to form a sort of union with Anglicanism, but their efforts have been chiefly directed toward those churches which have preserved some semblance of valid Catholic orders, notwithstanding that they have cut themselves loose, or have been cut off from the Rock Peter on which Christ built His Church. The Greek Churches and the Jansenists of Holland have had many overtures from England for intercommunion, but the Jansenist Archbishop of Utrecht has recently made a pronouncement which shows that even that little sect regards Anglican orders as spurious. The Archbishop says:

"The Established Church of England knows nothing of a sacrificing priest in the Catholic sense, as her Thirty-nine Articles and other declarations prove. Consequently, if it is indispensable that the power of offering the sacrifice of the Mass be expressed in the rite of ordination, whether by word of sign, then it be-

comes impossible can orders. To suspend my whole Church point. But un- their Thirty ne be no question."

THE Greco-T as might have complete colla- the Turks are Larissa and V Greek strongh same name. A ported from V Volo, and the be en route for port from the the Greek fleet is not season- may be expe if the two these success Greece from l Turkish land the way open The Turks are troops in Crete Col. Vassos, t there. Turke M Hanataux, the latter pow Turks to occ if an attem direction Fra the rescue of Turks, however easy victories whether they outside advice, ally believed th agreed upon that Turkey w lenly moderat it is still diffi cult will be.

ARCHDIOCE

Return of the Welcomed

From the K that the disti Archbishop of home from Cap spent a good search of heal he was met Farrelly, Vica Gauthier, Dear Hogan, T. O'Neill, Ke McDonough, K man, Walsh, O'Rourke, an being altogether men.

The laity wa W. Hartly, ex-Swift, P. Brow ley, Z. Prevost Ryan, and othe After tender hearty greetin returned to the train, the Arch Johnston stre number of St was in waiting a warm welcom the clergy and carriages drov When Notre D the pupils, in came out and presenting his a beautiful bou greetings wher Archbishop wh There was present in the cathedral to ta thanksgiving the safe arriv ation to health Cleary. All th were in atten sided on the Vicar General and Vicar-Ge Right Rev. M officiated at the Sacrament, as deacon, and R deacon, Fr. N of ceremonies.

His Grace touching addr joy at being i again, and rel strength while in felt that the priests and pe had been a membered him the Mass and i and Jesus had cations. Pray by which heav Thy should se answer them. sometimes not they had not or because wh be for their should seek Je a thoroughly said, he felt strength to co he had been ap been years ag to do in the at this city. Ple to do this next pressed his o With his peopl pupils of th teachers for th come and the during his ab expressing hi being able to