The Catholic Record. Price of Subscription-\$1 00 par annum.

EEV. GEORGE R. NORTHGRAVES. Author of " Mistakes of Modern Infidels."

THOMAS COFFEY. Publisher and Proprietor, Thomas Coffey.

Mesers Luke King John Nigh, P. J. Neven and Miss Sarah Hanley are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transact all other summers for THE CATHOLIC RECORD. Ageni for Newfoundland, Mr. James Power at S. John. Rates of Advertising – Ten cents per line each usertion, agate measurement.

ef Sa John. Rates of Advertising—Tencents per line each usertion, agate measurement. Approved and recommended by the Arch-histops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa and St. Boniface, the Bichors of London, Hamilton, Peterborough, and Oxdensburg, N. Y., and the citery throughout the Dominion. Torreepondence intended for publication, as well as that having reference to business should be directed to the proprietor and must teach London not ister than Monday morning When subscribers change their residence it is important that the old as well as the new address be sent us. Buberibers when changing their address should notify this office as soon as possible in order to insure the regular delivery of their taper. Agents or collectors have no subority t top your paper unless the amount due is paid. Matter intended for publication should be mailed in time to reach London not ister than Monday morning. Please do not sent us poery. Oblivary and marriage notices sent by subscribers must be in a condensed form, to insure theories.

LONDON, SATURDAY, JUNE 3, 1905.

'As we go to Press the very sad in telligence reaches us that Right Rev. Dr. McDonell, Bishop of Alexandria, died in Montreal on Tuesday morning. We will refer more fully in our next issue to this sad event. He was a good and holy Bishop. May Heaven be his zeward !

THE COMING ELECTION IN LONDON.

A few weeks ago we explained that it was the duty of citizens to put country before party ; and, applying this principle to the city of London, we con cluded that in the event of the Hop. Mr. Hyman or the Hon. Mr. Beck being given portfolios, it was in the best interests of this city that both should be elected by acclamation. Since then the Hon. Mr. Hyman has been appointed to the important position of Minister of Public Works ; and if the citizers had not been coerced by interested party politicians from Toronto and Ottawa. we believe the good sense of the London people would have elected him by acclamation.

Even Mr. Hyman's opponents do not Jeny his fitness for the honorable and responsible position. During the illness of the late Hon. Mr. Sutherland the duties of Minister of Public Works were performed by the Hon. Mr. Hyman, who has shown special capacity for the work. This was expected by his political friends and opponents, as his career as a successful business man is well known, and has been marked with integrity and capacity of the highest order. As a resident of London no man has done more towards the progress of the city, and as a member of the Government he always had that progress at heart. As Minister of Public Works he will be in a better position than ever to help the interests of his native place. Why, therefore, should the London citizens try to defeat him and allow themselves to be stampeded by outsiders who have not the welfare of the city at heart ?

The only reason is that he voted with the Government he was elected to support, and, with one hundred and forty members of the Federal Parliament. to continue freedom of conscience to the Protestant and Catholic minorities in the new North-West Provinces.

of the city of London will not be noodwinked by Toronto and Ottawa agitators who are ready to create religious discord and to injure the fair name of our beautiful and peaceful city. The elections were recently held. Both narties in power have large majorities. London has a worthy and respectable member in each Cabinet. All citizens should unite in placing country and city before party, and show their appreciation of their representatives by keeping them in power and position in the councils of the country.

OPPOSITION TO SEPARATE SCHOOLS THE GUIDING MOTIVE.

When the amendment of the Opposition to the Autonomy Bill was introduced into the House of Commons we were given to understand that there was no intention to pronounce upon the advisability of having Separate schools in the new Northwestern Provinces. but that the purpose was to leave to the people of those provinces the decision of this question.

Of course it is possible to maintain that under the Dominion Constitution, which is the British North America Act, the status of the new Territories when admitted into the Confederation of Canada as Provinces would be differ ent from that of Provinces already formed coming into the Confederation. On this point there appears to be a diversity of opinion among constitutional lawyers, and we do not presume at present to offer an opinion upon it. But it was evidently the spirit of the framers of our constitution to preserve carefully whatever educational rights any Catholic or Protestant minority possessed before becoming a Province of the Dominion.

Now, on the admission of the Territories as Provinces, the minorities in any locality already possessed rights to establish Separate schools, and it would be an injustice to take away those rights, or to leave them in doubt for the future.

We maintain that school legislation should in every case respect the natura! rights of parents, and among those rights there is undoubtedly the pre eminent right of parents to give a religious education to their children. That right, therefore, should not be taken away or left uncertain by any act of the Dominion Parliament.

In the matter of education, the Dominion Government, being composed of varied interests, all of which are im portant in some parts of its area, is in the position of a supreme authority which has at heart the interests of all its subjects, and it is more likely to deal justly with all than the more limited and local authority of a Province. It is therefore far better that in a case where controverted interests are at stake, which are not of merely local importance, the ultimate authority should be the Dominion Government The matter of Education is just such an interest, and it is for this reason unweek. doubtedly that the Imperial Government gave to the Dominion Government the duty of protecting minorities in the matter of education. It is, therefore, quite in accordance with the spirit of the Dominion Constitution to protect the local minorities of the North - West against any possible annoyances which domineering majorities might wish to impose upon them. We do not speak thus to cast any aspersions upon the fairness of the people of the North-West. It was not, we presume, the intention of the Protestant minority in Quebec to cast any aspersion on the Catholic majority by demanding as they did that their rights should be guaranteed as a condition of their acceptance of Confederation in the first place. They wanted security, and security for the Catholics and Pro testants of the North-West is what the Catholics of the Dominion now ask, and have the right to ask. It is claimed that the amendment was not intended to destroy the Separate schools of the North West : but it was certainly intended to make them insecure at least. More than that, every member of Parliament could see that the ultimate object was the destruction of the existing Separate schools, and thus the whole discussion as led by Dr. Sproule, Mr. Samuel Hughes, Mr. William Maclean and others turned upon the rights or wrongs of a Separate school system. The sophistry of some of the Opposition speakers will not hoodwink the Catholics of Canada in regard to their real intention, which was plainly seen by the Protestant Conservatives of Quebec, who, with the exception of one man, voted for the protection of the Northwestern minorities, because they themselves felt that this protection was due as a return to the Catholics of Quebec for the fair treatment they had enjoyed and still enjoy.

THE CATHOLIC RECORD.

NO OBJECTION.

Under the above heading the St. Thomas Times of May 18 pays some attention to our claim that Catholics should have "schools which teach what we wish to be taught " just as we have said that we " offer no objection to Protestants teaching their own children in their own schools." in their own way.

The Times answers us thus :

" No one is objecting to the Roman Catholics having and exercising that privilege. They have the same right this free country to establish school of their own as have any other denomin ation. But they have no right to expect Protestants to help bear the cost of maintaining Separate schools for the promulgation of Roman Catholic be-liefs."

Our contemporary has evidently been sleeping the sleep of Rip Van Winkle, as he is not aware that the Separate schools are maintained solely by the taxes or voluntary contributions of Catholics themselves-Protestants not being even permitted under the school laws to become legal Separate school supporters, if they wished it.

in addition to these school rates by means of which the schools, Public and Separate, are chiefly maintained, there s a small Government grant given, in which the Separate schools share in proportion to the secular work done out it must be remembered that Catho lics equally with Protestants make up the fund from which this Government grant is drawn.

In the previous issue of the Times, it s stated on the authority of the Huntingdon Gleaner, a discontented Protest ant paper of Quebec, that many Protest ants in Ouebec are driven from their farms because there are none but Cathclic Public schools for their children to attend, or they must grow up uneducated : and of this state of affairs the Times complains as a coercion (or

persecution) of Protestants. There are indeed in Quebec whole counties where there are not a score of Protestants, men, women and children together. The schools are open even in such eases to the children, and none are compelled in any case to be taught the Catholic religion. But surely that is not a reason why the Catholic children should be deprived of Catholic instruction. The Protestants of Quebec have every facility to establish Protestant schools where they want them, and every Quebec Protestant speaker during the debate on the Autonomy Bill admitted not only this fact, but also that they have absolutely nothing to complain of in regard to the treatment of the Quebes Protestant minority by the Catholic majority. The testimony of these representatives of the people, coming for the most part from largely Protestant constituencies, is of more value than that of the Huntingdon Gleaner, which has for years been nothing more than a

numbling grumbler. We might quote some of these testimonies here were it not that there is a

heavy pressure on our columns this

THE PROMOTERS OF DISSENSION. The Toronto politicians who have been endeavoring to create dissension

ants had been compelled to send their children to schools which ran counter to their religious convictions, or from which the teaching of religion was to be excluded.

The proposed Autonomy Bill does nothing more than continue to the people of the new Provinces the same rights which were conferred upon them when that tract of country was made into organized Territories.

The educational clauses of the Bill of 1875 were introduced at the suggestion of Sir John Macdonald, were supported by Hon. Edward Blake, and accepted by Hon. Alex Mackenzie as a most desirable provision. As such they passed in Parliament by a unanimous vote. Why should these provisions be erased now ?

No reason can be assigned, except that it is for the purpose of making party political capital out of the race and religion cry which has been raised by Orangemen and some denominational congregations, hatred to Catholics being the ultimate motive.

These people forget that Catholics are an important section of the popula tion of the Dominion, and are entitled to full religious equality with their Protestant fellow-citizens. Whether we are right or wrong in our convictions that religious teaching should be should be given in the schools, these convictions should be respected. The cry of coercion of the North-West is altogether delusive. What we want is that neither Catholics nor Protestants shall be coerced into a system of education which they cannot and do not approve.

The cry that Hon. Mr. Hyman is in favor of the coercion of the North-West has been raised by politicians and newspapers of the baser kind. His vote was given in favor of the same policy to which both parties committed themselves fully in 1875-the policy of Sir John Macdonald, Hon. Alex. Mackenzie and Hon. Edward Blake, the policy of freedom of educatior.

THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE DELUSION.

The case of the four Christian Scientists who were charged at first with manslaughter, which charge was changed by the Grand Jury to "unlawful conspiracy to deprive Wallace Goodfellow with the necessaries of life. to wit, medicines and nursing," was terminated on 17th inst, all the parties charged being found guilty by the jury. Mr. E. A. DuVermet had the conduct of the case for the Crown, but in his absence at the close of the trial his place was occupied by Mr. B. A. Ardagh, who at once moved for the sentence of the court. On behalf of the defendants, however, Mr. Cassels, K. C., asked for an arrest of judgment, as a reserved case for the Court of Appeal has been asked for and granted. Judgment was accordingly postponed by Justice Magee until June 30th, and the defendants' own recognizance were accepted for \$500 each to appear on that date.

The maximum sentence on the charge is seven years' imprisonment ; but of course this sentence will not be imposed should the Court of Appeal remen the readiet

but my opinion is that if he had proper nursing and medical care at the time saw him (Dec. 27) he would have been alive. This is my opinion, especially after seeing the post mortem.'

Mrs. Goodfellow, the young widow of the deceased, also gave testimony as to the absence of medical treatment so far as she was aware, but Mrs. Grant, one of those attending him, and the other Christian Scientists present, read in turn from Mrs. Eddy's book. She protested against this treatment of her husband, but was told that the Lord's disciples had suffered before and were not afraid to suffer again. Then she was ordered away because she "disturbed the thought." They did not explain what " the thought " was.

Mrs. Isabella Stewart, the " demonstrator " of Christian Science, was examined. She is the leader of the sect in Toronto on a salary of \$2,000 a year. She testified that she had instructed Mrs. Lee in the Christian Science and that the latter is competent in Christian Science treatment. These scientists do not believe in doctors or medicines. Those who have smallpox she said are not ill. They are only con-

vinced that they are ill, and when the conviction is cured the disease disappears. She had treated about thirty cases of typhoid fever. and she had treated a case of small pox by absent treatment. The Scientist treatment she asserted to be based on Scripture.

Justice Mages remarked "You had no danger then.'

We give these details, not for the purpose of influencing in any way the final verdict on the case of the four individuals who are still on trial, but to put our readers on guard against the wiles of Christian Science, so-called, but which is more appropriately styled "Eddyisp," a system which is neither Christianity nor Science.

We may remark that it is not true as Mrs. Stewart stated, that the Eddyite system is found in Scripture, for in Scripture we find both that the sick have need of a physician, and that God has furnished man with medicines, the leaves of trees being specially mentioned. This we have in the words of Christ :

" They that are in health need not a physician, but they that are sick." (St Matt. ix. 2) (See also St Mark ii. 17. St. Luke v. 31. ')

From these passages it is also to be seen that sickness is not a mere illusion, as Mrs. Stewart and Mrs. Eddy would have us believe, but a reality from which the need of physicians arises. Hence also St. Luke the Evangelist is described by St. Paul as "the physician most dearly beloved."

Joseph employs the physicians of Egypt to embalm his dead father. (Gen. 1. 2-25.)

In the prophecy of Ezechiel God says The fruits (of trees) shall be for food and the leaves thereof for medicine." xlvii. 12.)

Reason and common sense agree with Holy Scripture in the condemnation of Eddyistic frivolities.

THE END JUSTIFYING THE MEANS.

intation of the old calur

JUNE 3, 1905.

theological experts. The Court declared that if in any book of Jesuit authorship it could be found en unciated as a general principle that an action morally bad becomes lawful when used to attain a good end, the plantiff should be held to have gained his case. As the plaintiff maintained that he had proved this in his book, and as the accuracy of the quotations was admitted on both sides, the Court decided that it was sufficient to deal with the Count Hoans. broech's pamphlet without examination of the Jesuit books from which the citations were made. The passages quoted were then examined one by one, being taken from Sanchez, Vasquez, Toletus, Mariana, Costropalao, Lay. mann, Delrio, Becanus, Escobar, Tamburini, Gury, Voit and Palmieri. The conclusion reached by the Court, after full examination, was that not one of the passages quoted affirms the principle that the end justifies the means, and that the plaintiff had therefore failed to prove his point, and was not

entitled to the reward. Now it is only fair that we should ask, have the leaders and authors of Protestantism ever sanctioned this doc. trine which has been falsely attributed to Jesuits, and thus implicitly to the Catholic Church ?

It is well known that Philip, Landgrave of Hesse, was in 1531 one of the leaders of the Smalcald league, the object of which was the maintenance of Protestantism in Germany, and in return for his support, and to obtain its continuance, Luther, Melancthon, Bucer and others of the leaders of Protestantism formally permitted Philip to contract a second marriage with Margaret de Saal while his first wife was living, and shamelessly gave two reasons on account of which this permission was given, to obtain the continuance of his protection to the Protestant cause and for his restoration to health. Surely this was a case of the end justifying the means !

Again, Lord Stafford, who was accused of high treason by the notorious Titus Oates, was protected for some time by King Charles II. until owing to the persistent persecution of the Puritanical Parliament, the king, though knowing Stafford's innocence, at last consented to his death and signed his death-warrant upon being assured by the Council of Bishops of the Church of England that it was lawful for him

to do this to save his throne. It is therefore in truth the drawing of a red herring across the track of the fox, to baille the hounds, for Protestants to accuse the Jesuits of teaching that the end justifies the means when we find that both in England and Ger-

many this doctrine was put into practical operation by the leaders of Protestantism. This doctrine was never taught by Jesuits or by the Catholic Church, who

have always held that doctrine of St. Paul that evil cannot be done even though good may come from it.

THE DIVORCE QUESTION IN ENG-LAND.

The question of the marriage of divorced persons has been keenly discussed in Church of England circles in We had occasion recently to give a England itself as well as in Canada and

In the Diocese of London, England,

at the annual conference, the question

was brought up for discussion on

May 17th, and after a keen debate it

was resolved that no clergyman of the

Church should marry any divorced per-

son during the life of the other party

This resolution is to be adhered to

whether the party desiring re-marriage

be the innocent or guilty party. This

brings the Church of England in Lon-

don diocese precisely to the position

of the Catholic Church ; but it is a

position in conflict with the British

law. The law, however, does not com-

pel a clergyman to marry the person

who has been adjudged guilty in a

divorce suit, but it provides that he

cannot refuse the use of his Church if

another clergyman is willing to per-

form the ceremony. Also, he must

perform the ceremony in the case when

the so-called innocent divorced party

presents himself or herself to be mar-

to the marriage already contracted.

JUNE 3, 1905.

It is said that should the

upon the resolution as pass fusing to marry the so called party to the divorcee, they severe penalties under th cluding criminal prosecution ing the law. This will follow from the absolute depende Church of England upon the State. It will be somewhat see the Church as by law in this position. On on will be endeavoring the law of God as the Catho teaches it, but on the othe clergy will be harassed by men which obliges them God. " It is better to obe; man ;" but will they choose under this principle of mor are strongly of opinion that men will prevail upon m clergy in this case, especi ecclesiastical resolution whi passed appears to have force, and will not be ba any strong ecclesiastical How can a single diocese of lay down a stringent rule, v other dioceses will follow already acted upon, which what the State commands the clergymen who voted ority will not feel themselve an unauthorized decision of ity. For a while it will pr pen that the minority cle have a large increase in the marriages they will be asl hrate : but soon, when t perceive that they are losing as well as incurring severe p resolution so boldly pass quietly set aside, and matt mence to go on pretty muc the marriages being celek out any disagreeable que asked regarding the divorc It is chiefly among the

party that the strict law o observed, and we may the from the vote how wide the principles of the H party become in London. ciples must have spread widely than the vote wor for they are favored to a g among the clergy than t therefore, the lay vote b the figures given, the p High to Low Church cl diocese of London will considerably greater than 169 to 71.

May we expect that which must ensue on the divine law will precipitate on the part of the High toward the Catholic Chur always maintained the sa riage ? This is surely among

probable possibilities. THE CHURCH AND TH ITALY.

Despatches from Be

London Standard state

ferences have been he

between the Emperor

the Archbishop of Bre

ogne, the purpose of wh

about a change for the be

Is this really such a crime that the non, gentleman deserves to be banished from public life on account of it ? We hear about the coercion of the new Provinces, but the fact is that in general the people of the new Provinces are well satisfied, and recently gave London a good example by electing the new Minister of the Interior, Hon. Mr. Oliver, by acclamation. Supposing it is admitted that the Hon. Mr. Hyman's wote was a mistake, then the question comes: Did he not vote honestly? He woted in the honest conviction that it is right and proper to give both Protestant and Catholic parents the liberty to educate their children in the great truths of Christianity. As a Christian ruler in a Christian country had he not a right to give such a vote? Even those who do not agree with this conviction should not force their personal opinions upon either the Protestant or Catholic minority in the North-West. The parents who do not want religion taught in the schools to their children are protected and can withdraw them from such instruction. Why not be fair and protect the parents desire religious teaching at odw certain times? Some people imagine that Catholics alone desire such religious teaching in the schools, but many prominent Protestant educators insist on the same thing ; and the Hon. Mr. Hyman was clearly within his rights and duties in voting as he did on the Autonomy Bill,

It is not the first time in this province that the race and creed cry has been raised by a certain class of politicians, but we hope the sensible people

Souls are never lost because their beginnings break down, but because they won't make new beginnings.

by raising a race and religion agitation have succeeded in bringing out an opponent to the Hon.C.S. Hyman, member for London and Minister of Public Works, in the person of Mr. Wm. Gray, and already we have it from the best authority that appeals to religious hate have been made to electors in the

canvass for Mr. Gray. The pretence on which this method of carrying on the canvass has been adopted is, of course, the vote which Mr. Hyman gave for the educational clauses of the Autonomy Bills. Such newspapers as the Free Press of London, the Mail and Empire and the News and the Telegram of Toronto, have kept up the cry that the Autonomy Bill imposes a tyranny on the Protestants of the North-West, and prejudice is appealed

to to resent this. The truth is that these clauses merely secure to minorities the privileges they have always enjoyed to educate their children after the manner which is agreeable to their own conscientious convictions.

Before there was a Public School vstem in the North-West at all, any locality could have schools suited to the needs and wishes of the people. Minorities, whether Catholic or Protestant, could have their own schools wherever they were willing to support them. This was true freedom.

But, with the Constitution given to these territories in 1875, the Canadian Parliament, under Hon. Alexander Mackenzie's administration, introduced clauses which would continue these rights to the people, and would aid the schools thus established, whether they were Protestant or Catholic, or nominally undenominational, in proportion to the amount of work done. In all this, there was an avoidance of have recovered if he or some other

coercion, whereas there would have been coercion if Catholics or Protest- swered : " Nobody could say that,

There was a large audience in the court room during the trial, and it was evident that a great interest was taken in the proceedings. It was remarked that many of those in attendance were persons interested in the Christian Science belief.

The parties tried and found guilty were Mrs. Sarah Goodfellow, mother of the deceased, Mrs. Isabella Grant, Mrs. Elizabeth See and William Brundette.

Harvey Goodfellow, a brother of the deceased, gave evidence, but threv little light upon the method adopted by the Christian Scientist attendants who were treating the case. He thought the deceased did not wish for the attendance of a doctor, and he believed that the deceased had all the nourishment he wanted.

The sick man's mother-in-law. Mrs. Hannah Taylor, had visited the deceased on Dec. 24, and found him in a very sick condition. She then scored Mr. Brundette severely for not permitting the attendance of a doctor.

Dr. Carveth also visited the patient on the day before his death, and blamed the two women he met there for not having had a doctor.

Chief Coroner Johnson gave very pointed evidence to the effect that deceased had died, in his opinion, from want of proper nursing and nourishment. He believed he needed a nurse even more than a physician. As to whether the young man himself wanted a doctor, his state of sickness was such

matter for himself. Dr. Riordan's testimony was similar to that of the other doctors. Questioned as to whether the young man would doctor had charge of the case, he an-

in the Protestant Episcopal Church of the Jesuits that they teach that " the the United States.

end justifies the means." This has We have more than once shown in been repeated ad nauseam by certain our columns that the only correct pos-Protestant writers, and was reproduced ition for Christians to take on this matin an editorial in a recent issue of the ter is that laid down by our Lord, that Jewish Times of Montreal. marriage once completed is indissoluble To what we said already on this sub except by the death of the husband or

ject we may add the following in relawife ; for Christ lays it down as the tion to the same subject. Christian law that what God hath About two years ago this calumny joined together no man may put asunwas repeated in Germany in the form der. It is not within the authority of that it is a Jesuit teaching that "a any legislators, civil or ecclesiastical,

good end justifies the use of bad therefore, to change this law, though, means." Thereupon a well known indeed, Parliaments and Legislative Catholic priest of the Rhine Province, bodies under various names in different the Rev. G. Daschback, offered a countries have presumed to make laws reward of 2.000 florins to any one who differing from the law of God on this should prove that any Jesuit teaches point. this unchristian doctrine. The deci-

sion was to be given by a jury consisting of Catholic and Protestant university professors in equal numbers.

An apostate Catholic, Count Hoensbroech, an ex Jesuit, then published a pamphlet in which he claimed to prove the teaching. The jury to which Father Daschback appealed could not be constituted, as the Protestant professors refused to take part in deciding the matter,

The Count, however, sued for the sum designated in the civil court of Trier. The court dismissed the case with costs on the plea that the matter was in the nature of a wager, and was therefore not actionable under German law.

The plaintiff, not satisfied with this decision, appealed from this inferior court to the Supreme Court of the that he was not able to decide such a Rhine province, and a decision was rendered on March 30th last, whereby the sentence of the Lower Court was set aside. The Supreme Court decided that the matter at issue is a Prize

ried to a third person. Problem and not a wager, and that the The resolution as passed was very Court was competent to deal with it as keenly debated, but was finally carried such without the intervention of by the large majority of 169 to 71.

veen the Ho lations hots the Kingdom of Italy. himself desired these con held, and called the A telegraph to meet him cellor of the Empire, H so it may be reasonably matters of great import consideration.

The Emperor's relat Holy Father are most o he holds most friendly in with the King and (Italy, it is not altogeth that through his inte may be brought about a between the Pope and Italy. The present sit serve approaching to ho lasted for more than a g the king of Italy fully fact that it is to the i State and the well bein that there should be a attitude of Church and each other. In fact th incidents which have g belief that such a c affected under the though nothing has tra on what basis an amic can be brought about.

It has been known fro of the reign of Pope F previous relations with family of Italy were several times while he Venice he took part in S when King Humbert guerite were present. occasions was that of th man of war at Venice. relaxed the rigid rule IX. forbade Catholics the Italian elections, not be said that the any form, even indirect right of the Italian