The Catholic Record.

Published Weekly at 484 and 486 Richmond street, London, Ontario.

Price of subscription—$2.00 per annum.

EDITORS:

REV. GEORGE R. NORTHGRAVES, Author of "Mistakes of Modern Infidels."

THOMAS COFFEY.

Publisher and Proprietor, Thomas Coffey.

Messrs. Luke King, John Nigh, P. J. Neven and Joseph S. King, are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transact all other business for the CATHOLIC RECORD.

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

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

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

When subscribers change their residence it is important that the old as well as the new address be sent us.

London, Saturday, December 17, 1898

WILLIAM'S FAILURE.

It is now admitted that the effort of the Kaiser William to unite Protestantism, or at least Lutheranism, under one head, on the occasion of his visit to Palestine, was a failure. A good many sects, including all which are in Palestine, and the Lutheran Churches of Germany itself, sent representatives to add to the *eclat* of the opening and dedication of the new German Lutheran Church in Jerusalem, but the sectaries do not want a Protestant Pope. Protestantism is based upon the principle of individuality as opposed to the centralization of authority, and therefore it was, and is still, opposed specially to the claim of the Pope to be the head of the universal Church. But if a Pope is to be recognized at all, most reasoning Protestants would prefer the real Pope to a sham one whose claim would rest solely on his own pretentiousness.

FULTON.

The Boston minister who is to represent the New England Sabbath Protective League at next week's congress at Washington announces that he will speak thereat upon "Shall America Offer the Spanish Islands Anything Better than the Spanish Bull Fight on Sunday?" We wonder what his reply would be if some of his auditors should ask him whether he considered Fulton's performance in Havana on a recent Sunday preferable to a bull fight.—Sacred Heart Review.

Press despatches inform us that this notorious mountebank was recently mobbed in the mining districts of Nova Scotia, where he had been lecturing on "Romanism." We are surprised that the good, honest miners of that Province would so far forget themselves as to throw even pieces of coal at the dirty fellow. This is what the Boston Pilot says of him:

Justin D. Fulton, who lately advertised himself as conducting "evangelical" services in Cuba, now reports from Cape Breton, Nova Scotia, that he has been "stoned" with lumps of coal by indignant miners whom he had insulted there. Mr. Fulton should try to accustom himself to coal, and red hot coal at that, unless he repents and amends his ways before he dies.

CONVERTS BUT NOT CHRISTIANS.

The Protestant Bishop of Calcutta has written an expression of opinion that the Christians of India, so-called, are not Christians at all. He is speaking of the converts to Protestantism, who, he says, are but little if any better than agnostics and pagans, being both indifferent and apathetic in their Christianity. Yet every one of these converts has been obtained through the outlay of large sums of money collected from zealous propagandists of Protestantism in England.

If this is the result of years of missionary labor in India, it may well be asked, will there be any satisfactory result from sending missionaries to Cuba, Porto Rico and the Philippines, as the Protestant missionary societies of the United States proclaim their intention of doing? These missionaries may perhaps succeed in destroying the faith of some who are already Christians, but their inability to make Christians of those who are Pagans or Mussulmans has been frequently demonstrated from the small results they can show in the countries to which they have already directed their efforts, for the professed purpose of establishing Christianity and civilization there.

PRESBYTERIANS AND ANGLICANS.

The Presbyterians of Ireland have long had a standing grievance against the members of the Anglican Episcopal Church, that notwithstanding that they are Tories as staunch as the Episcopalians, they are quietly set aside when the party candidates for parliamentary seats are selected. In several constituencies in the North the Presbyterians have a majority of votes, nevertheless they have been generally unable to agree upon a party candidate from among themselves, and when public offices are filled the Episcopalians monopolize them through having the member of Parliament's influence, who is nearly always one of that denomination. A Presbyterian committee has been organized, and will meet as soon as practicable in Belfast to adopt measures to secure the parliamentary representation to which they deem themselves entitled in proportion to their numbers. The Home Rulers have acted more generously toward Protestants of the same political faith with themselves, Catholic constituencies having no hesitation in sending Protestants to Parliament if they are sound as regards the Home-Rule issue. Hence Protestant Home Rulers are more numerous in Parliament than is called for by their proportion to the Catholic Home Rule population. If the Presbyterians want fair representation they should become Home Rulers.

A BOGUS DECREE.

The daily papers within the last two weeks have been commenting on a decree said to have been received from Rome having reference to Freemasonry and other secret societies. The despatches in which this decree was stated to have been issued asserted that the Holy See has given permission to priests to officiate at the burial of Catholic Freemasons, Knights of Pythias, Odd-Fellows, and some other secret societies, and allows also the members of these societies to be interred in consecrated ground.

The despatch which announced this decree stated that it had been sent from Rome to the Apostolic Delegate at Washington, Mgr. Martinelli, and that it provided that the concession thus made to members of secret societies should be extended to them in the case that they are not openly hostile to the Church, or that at some time they have, even indirectly, expressed a willingness to become reconciled to their former faith.

The news of such a decree having been issued gave an opportunity to some of the papers publishing the supposed fact to explain at some length the consequences of this decree, some of them asserting that now these societies must be tolerated by the Church, and that their members must be admitted to receive the sacraments of the Church, as they are no longer to be regarded as excommunicated.

The whole story of this decree had the appearance of a fabrication, and we deferred noticing it till we should have authentic information on the subject. It is now certain that the story is a fraud, as from the beginning we suspected it to be, and the attitude of the Church toward the secret societies will be exactly what it has hitherto been. Their members still remain under the ban of excommunication, and cannot be admitted to the sacraments nor given Christian burial, nor interred in consecrated ground, unless they renounce their membership in the forbidden societies.

To ascertain the truth of the matter, the Catholic Universe of Cleveland, Ohio, telegraphed to Mgr. Martinelli, the Apostolic Delegate to the United States, receiving for answer that "Nothing is known at delegation of such a decree."

As a general rule, little or no credit is to be given to pretended decrees asserted in press despatches to have been issued from Rome, until they are fully authenticated by receipt of the decrees themselves.

THE MORMON PROBLEM.

Mormonism is once more asserting itself so strongly in Utah that the people and press of the United States are coming to the opinion which was before prevalent, that it will have to be dealt with vigorously by repressive Federal Legislation.

Brigham H. Roberts has been elected to Congress from the new State of Utah, in defiance of existing Federal laws which subject polygamists to heavy penalties, and exclude them from positions under the Government of the United States.

Mr. Roberts is said to have three wives, and he has been a Mormon missionary. He is regarded as the ablest of Mormon controversial writers, and in Congress, if he be permitted to take his seat, he will, no doubt, be found to be a vigorous defender of the "peculiar institution" which has made Mormonism so odious to the entire population of the country. It will be a new departure in Congress when the Polygamists are thus enabled to have their principles advocated in the Legislative halls.

It is not against polygamy alone that the people are so strongly set, but it is known that the authorities of the Mormon church make every effort to dominate the politics of the State. They claim to control all appointments to office, and to dictate all legislation, which must be in accordance with their peculiar theology and the revelations made to the Mormon prophets. Naturally, the Gentile or non-Mormon population object to all this as destructive of their rights as American citizens, and the problem arises how to restrain the Mormon Church from interference in politics, as well as to suppress polygamy.

Mr. Roberts, who ran as a Democrat, had two opponents, one a Populist, the other a Republican. His Republican opponent, being a pious Mormon, accepts the election, because the Church sides with Mr. Roberts, but the defeated Populist candidate has entered a protest, and has thereby incurred the ire of the Church authorities, who imagine that their decrees should over-ride all opposition.

When Utah was only a territory, the laws of Congress were paramount there, but now that it has become a State, the Constitution recognizes its right to manage its own internal affairs, and of this fact the Mormon authorities take advantage to reassert their right to rule the Gentile population as they see fit, and even to begin anew openly the practice of polygamy, which they pretended to have abandoned when they were subject to Federal law.

The Presbytery of Utah, which is the Presbyterian High Court in the State, has declared that polygamous practices are being restored under the new order of things, and though there have been some non Mormons who have, for the sake of popularity with the Mormons, whose patronage they desire, declared that the Presbytery misstates the case, there is sufficient testimony of disinterested persons well qualified to judge, to the effect that the Presbytery of Utah has stated the truth. This has been confirmed also by resolutions of the Presbyteries of New York and Brooklyn. There is, in consequence, a strong impression prevailing throughout the country that the Mormon problem will have to be faced by Congress again, once for all, and settled to the satisfaction of the American people.

There is some danger that we may have also in Canada a Mormon problem to be solved. Within the last few years the Mormons have been making great efforts to gain proselytes from the Protestant sects, and have succeeded beyond expectation. The Mormon settlers in the North West pretend that they obey the laws of Canada, and do not practice polygamy, but there is trustworthy testimony to the effect that this is only a pretence. Care should be taken by our Government not to allow such breaches of the law, lest we should have on hand just such a difficulty as produced so much trouble between the Mormons and the United States Government.

It may be said that Mormonism is a religion, like any other form of Protestantism, and that it arises out of the same principle of private judgment from which other forms of Protestantism have sprung, and that the same measure of liberty should be accorded to it as to other sects; but the doctrines and practices of Mormonism are so gross, and so destructive to the moral principles on which society rests, that a civilized Christian community cannot allow them to be put into practical operation.

ANTI-CATHOLIC READING MATTER.

We have had before now occasion to call attention to the anti-Catholic spirit which animates the Toronto Mail and Empire.

For a time, its anti-Catholic editor appeared to have somewhat improved in tone, and we had no strong reason to rebuke his insolence and bigotry, but for the last few months he has broken out afresh as badly as ever. We can but express our surprise that the many Catholic readers of that journal endure with patience the constant sneers with which he speaks of the Catholic faith and the practices of the Catholic Church.

A recent issue of the Mail and Empire will serve to illustrate the style adopted by this anti Catholic scribe. In the issue of the 4th inst. he takes the opportunity to have a fling at the Ritualistic party in the Church of England in the following gross manner:

"I was baptized and reared a member of the Church of England, and it is the Church of my preference; but I always had the greatest possible contempt for what I consider the monkeying of the High Church party. If some hysterical women, and weak-minded men want to revert to the mummeries and superstitions of the fourteenth century, it is simply their affair; but they should not be allowed to act as members of the Established Church. I shall be sorry to see it done, but the inevitable result must be the disestablishment and disendowment of the Church of England. The present Papist pranks played by certain members of the Church are intolerable, and disestablishment is the only remedy."

Is it the Mail and Empire's aim to become a second edition of the Evangelical Churchman, with the express purpose in view to put down Ritualism and Popery? If this is the case, it is not a suitable journal for circulation among Catholics, or for Catholic family reading.

The Ritualists, we presume, are able to take care of, and to defend their own cause, but we must object to the use of distasteful nicknames as applied to Catholics. The term "Papist" thus used is begotten of bigotry, and is used only by bigots. But beside this exhibition of hate against Catholics, the editor speaks of the sacred rites of the Catholic Church as "the mummeries and superstitions of the fourteenth century." These rites are not either mummeries or superstitions. They are symbolical and illustrative of the sublime doctrine of the Real Presence of Christ in the Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist, and that Real Presence is provable by the plainest words of Holy Scripture, and by the tradition of the nineteen centuries of Christianity's existence.

Of the use of these ceremonies by the Ritualists we shall only say here that it gives no excuse to the Mail and Empire to insult Catholics. If the Ritualists ape the Catholic ceremonial, without having the substance of the thing symbolized, it is a matter for Church of England adherents to settle among themselves, but there is no sense in making it the occasion for a misrepresentation of Catholic doctrine and for calling Catholics by offensive names.

So far, we have spoken of the Toronto Mail and Empire. The Globe is not free from being guilty of a somewhat similar offence. The Globe's editorials have been indeed as fair as could be expected, for a long period, but we are sorry to notice that it is now publishing a coarsely anti-Catholic serial story entitled "The Black Douglas" by S. R. Crockett. That is also totally unfit for publication in a journal which is to be read in Catholic families.

WHERE ARE THE MISSIONARIES MOST NEEDED?

The terms of peace having been now definitely accepted by Spain, as they were dictated by the United States, there no longer remains any doubt that our American neighbors will at once assume sovereignty over not only Porto Rico, but also the Philippine and Sulu islands, and the island of Guam in the Ladrones.

These new acquisitions of territory will add at once to the United States a population of ten million souls of divers races, and when it is remembered that there are already three race problems in the country which have caused, and are still causing much trouble and vexation, it may well be supposed that there will be new troubles coming from the additional race problems which will arise out of the annexation of the new territories.

We have already an inkling of what some of these additional troubles will be. The Protestant missionary societies have loudly proclaimed their intention to invade the newly acquired possessions to propagate Protestantism there. But as the Catholic Church has already forestalled them, and numbers nearly the entire population in her fold, there does not appear to be much hope that the invading missionaries have any great prospect of success, though it must be admitted that the freedom accorded by the constitution of the United States to all sects to propagate their beliefs as they think proper, affords them an opportunity which they have not had hitherto to establish a propagandism. On the other hand, the Catholic Church will not be idle in regard to strengthening her position under the new order of things; and as she has proved herself in the past to be able to adapt herself to the working of American institutions, there can be little doubt that she will be able to hold her own in the new territories as well as she has done in the past both in them and in the States of the Union as they exist at present. In fact since the future of these late Spanish colonies has been finally settled by the Peace Commission at Paris, the missionaries themselves appear to have become somewhat conscious of the difficulties which lie before them, and their ardor seems to have been cooled, though there are still some zealots who seem as determined as ever to proselytize the Catholic populations who are on the way to become their fellow-citizens.

A meeting was held a few days ago in Detroit by the Methodist ministers of that city, which, according to the Detroit Free Press, for a wonder, set aside the consideration of evangelizing the islands of "Luzon, Sibuyan, Billran and Bohol" and others with unpronounceable Malaysian names, in order to give attention to the moral condition of the populous American cities.

The workers in the slums of these cities report not only that bad government and political corruption are rampant, but that there is an amount of iniquity and moral degradation which is appalling, and which calls for a thorough cleansing. They believe that the true mission which they are called upon to fulfil is rather to ameliorate the condition of the people at their own doors, than to carry the gospel to distant lands, especially to those in which the gospel has already been preached, even though not preached in the precise form under which they would desire to see it propagated.

The Detroit Free Press agrees with this view, and calls attention to the fact dwelt upon at the convention, that this work of evangelization is needed for Detroit itself, in which these ministers have found as much rampant immorality as exists anywhere, and as a consequence it dissents strongly from the views of those expansionists whose only thought is to convert the Filipinos, Cubans and Porto-Ricans in order to develop among them "a purer faith, a truer liberty, and a finer civilization."

It remains to be seen what course will be followed by the missionary societies who have already, in theory, portioned out to the various sects in what islands each one is to labor, so that they may not come into collision with each other, and expose themselves to the derision of the islanders to be converted, by preaching contradictory doctrines in the same locality, as would be the case if two or more different sects were operating in the same field of labor.

NON-CATHOLIC CATHOLICITY.

The Episcopalians of the United States are heartily sick and tired of the official name of their Church, which is "The Protestant Episcopal Church of America."

The name was originally of their own choice. It was adopted after the Declaration of Independence by the thirteen colonies which formed at first the United States of America. The Church of England in these States soon discovered that this name, implying English domination, would not be acceptable to Americans, and therefore decided that a new name should be adopted suited to the new conditions, and after due deliberation called itself the Protestant Episcopal Church.

At this period, the new-fangled notion that Anglicanism is a branch of the great universal or Catholic Church was not thought of, and Anglicans gloried in the name Protestant, by which name the Church of England is designated in the English laws to which that Church owes its existence.

Recent studies and researches of the English and American clergy have convinced them that the name Protestant is sufficient to condemn as spurious any Church which is so designated.

Why should a Church claiming to be the Church of Christ call itself Protestant? This term implies, and implied from the first, that there was a more ancient form of Christianity against which it protested. It, therefore, indicates innovation and novelty as against antiquity and adherence to the truth as revealed by Christ, and preserved by His Church from generation to generation. It was in this sense that the name "Protestants" was applied to the followers of Luther, and this is now felt by modern Anglicans and American Episcopalians to be the real sense of the term, so that they have become disgusted with it. Thus Bishop Nicholson, of Milwaukee, speaking in his cathedral a couple of Sundays ago, in reference to the recent conference of the Episcopal Church at Washington, expressed his regret at the failure to change "that dreadful name." He said:

"We did not get rid of that dreadful name, Protestant Episcopal, but in the whole Conference not one voice was raised in support of it. It is doomed. That is conceded on all sides, and the only question upon which there is needed an agreement is what the name shall be: whether 'the American Church,' or 'the American Catholic Church.'"

By this repudiation of the name by which they have hitherto called themselves, the American Episcopalians show the absurd position which they have occupied to the present time. They have hitherto been protesters against the only true Christianity. But the leopard does not so easily change its spots or the Ethiopian his skin, and even if leopard and Ethiopian were to adopt new names, their essential characteristics would still adhere to them. So with Protestant Episcopalianism. It will not be able to conceal its true character of being a modern Church by the subterfuge of adopting a new name.

The Bishop gives us to understand that in changing the name of the Protestant Episcopal Church, it will probably assume one of the two titles "the American Church," or "the American Catholic Church." We need scarcely say that the assumption of either of these two names will be a piece of arrogance which will make the Church ridiculous in the eyes of all thinking persons.

The Protestant Episcopal Church cannot claim to be the American Church in any sense of the expression. It is of English origin, and in this respect there are several Churches which are better entitled to be designated American. The Baptists, Congregationalists and Unitarians have a superior claim to that of the Episcopalians, if we have regard to the question of origin, and the Mormons a superior claim above them all to be called the American Church. If we consider the time when Episcopalianism or Anglicanism was introduced into the country we find that it was antedated by the Catholic colonization of Florida and Louisiana respectively eighty and fifty-two years before Raleigh established the first English settlement in 1592 at Roanoke, Virginia, and if we regard the population of the various Churches we find that the Methodists more than double the Episcopalians, while the Catholics number almost if not quite as many as all the Protestant denominations together. We can scarcely believe that if the Episcopal Church should arrogate to itself the name American, the other Church organizations of the country will quietly acquiesce in the misnomer. The Bishops of that Church would do well to reflect, before adopting a new name, that a manifestation of arrogance in selecting it will make it almost certain that the general public will be likely to resent it by giving some uncomplimentary, though perhaps fairly appropriate nickname to the Church which would exhibit so much presumption.

It is evident from what we have already said that the second title proposed would be as much out of place as the first. It is objectionable, not only because of its qualification of American, but also because of its assumption of the name "Catholic," which already belongs to the Church which is pre-eminently and alone Catholic.

There can be only one Catholic Church, the Church of all nations and of all times, and it is incongruous to modify Catholicity by means of a local epithet like "American," as if a local Church could be Catholic or universal. These two epithets are irreconcilable.

Here it may be objected: "Is not the same reasoning applicable to the name 'Roman Catholic' as to 'American' or 'Anglo-Catholic'?"

We answer in the first place that the correct name of the Catholic Church is simply Catholic, not Roman Catholic. The latter designation has been given to the Catholic Church in England by British law, which has no authority to dictate a name to the Church of all nations. Nevertheless, there is a sense in which it is applicable. The epithet Roman may be used to express, not merely the local Church which is comprised in the diocese of Rome, but the headship of the Church universal, which is derived from St. Peter, first Bishop of Rome. In this sense the term Roman is applicable to the Church without localizing it, or destroying its universality, and in this sense there is no incongruity in the expression "the Roman Catholic Church." But it cannot be said that Christ gave either to any American or English Bishop the supreme headship of the Church, and therefore such combinations as American Catholic and Anglo-Catholic are incongruous.

PROTESTANT MISSIONS AND THE BIBLE.

The New York Bible Society had recently quite a surprise while preparing for one of their gatherings for the promotion of their object, which is chiefly to spread the gospel in heathen lands.

Any Protestant minister might be expected to assist the society in this work, for is not Protestantism boasted of as the religion of the Bible, and is it not boomed as being founded on the Bible and the Bible alone?

The Rev. Minot Savage, a well-known and popular preacher of New York city, was selected to give an address on the importance of spreading the Word of God broadcast over the world. To the astonishment of the members of the Society, Mr. Savage gave his opinion about the Bible in the following terms:

An examination of the bible itself will show that the authors who composed it did not dream of making the claim that what they were writing was written by God or spoken by God. It is not right for the Bible Society to publish and issue this book and call it publishing and distributing the word of God. The bible is, in reality, a large library of books; no one knows who wrote them, when they were written, and they are contradictory. The writers contradict themselves and each other. But if we find a book full of errors concerning all the things we can discover, is it necessary that we should trust it in things that are beyond the reach of investigation? It would be impeaching the character of God to call the bible the word of God.

The Rev. Mr. Savage is one out of a multitude of Protestant clergymen who entertain similar views in regard to the Bible at the present moment, both in America and Europe, especially in Germany. It is undeniable that such Latitudinarian views are one of the inevitable results of Protestantism and private judgment, which are fast tending to utter infidelity.

We may well ask what the Protestant missionaries are going to bring to the Cubans and Philippines in place of the religion which the natives of these islands now believe and practice. When the Bible is thrown overboard, what will there be left in Protestantism to teach to those whom missionaries propose to convert?

The Protestant preachers have been accustomed to assert that Catholics have no respect for the Bible; but if they look at home they will surely find room to increase respect for the Bible among their own colleagues. In bringing this about, the missionaries will find plenty to do without carrying a knowledge of the gospel to those who have that knowledge already.

RITUALISM.

The following communication, which appeared in the St. John, N. B., Globe of Nov. 26, will be read with interest while so much attention is being given to the Ritualistic movement in England, and, to a somewhat less degree, in Canada and the United States. The communication describes very clearly what extent Ritualism has imitated while mutilating the Catholic ceremonies used in offering up the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass:—

RITUALISM'S JUDGMENT ON "ANGLICANISM VERSUS THE WHOLE CHURCH."

To the Editor of the Globe:

Sir—This account of the practice services and in prayers may interest any who found an interest in the present theory of Ritualism as given in Mr. Percival's "Digest of Theology." But "A Layman" writing to you fails to understand this present theory, or will not take the authors at their word. He says they ignore the Anglican Church. They reply, that is just so; we have nothing to do with the Anglican Church, except in so far as it is "Catholic."

A. As to their services, take a book "Catholic Prayers for Church of England People;" second edition revised and enlarged; London, W. Knott, 1893. It is bound up with the Book of Common Prayer.

I. "Holy Mass and Communion begins with the Asperges, "sometimes sung before High Mass on Sundays. [This in the Roman Missal, the short introductory service, while the priest sprinkles the congregation with holy water, and the words are used, "Thou shalt purge me with hyssop," etc., and the prayer, "may it please thee to send Thy holy angel from heaven to keep, cheer, guard, visit and defend all who are gathered in this place.]"

Then the service proper begins with the "Priest" and the "server" at the foot of the altar, confessing to Almighty God, to Blessed Mary Ever Virgin, to the Saints, and mutually to each other. This with the psalm, "Judge me, O God:" "I will go unto the altar of God," is from the Missal. Of course the same service, if not exactly the same words, was in use in England before the Reformation. The "Hail Mary," however, was said in the old English Mass and is not said in the Latin Mass now generally used; [it is not said here in this book].

The rubrical directions are given as in the Roman Missal for the blessing of the incense, etc. It is not necessary to allude to them all.

Then is said the "Kyrie Eleison" from the Missal; and within brackets it is directed: "At the chief Mass of the day he may say" the Lord's Prayer and the Collect and the Ten Commandments, as given in the Anglican Prayer Book.

That is how the service is made throughout—the Mass is inserted, with the disjointed fragments of the Mass preserved in the Prayer Book as, of course, kept; for, as they say: "The Prayer Book . . . is the old Church book cut and sliced and tampered with."

The first principal part of the Mass, the Offertory, is wholly omitted in the Prayer Book. Ordinary Anglican churchmen no longer knew the meaning of the word: the Offertory to them means the collection of the alms.

The whole service of the Mass is restored in tots—the Offertory, the bread and wine, the mixing of the wine and water, the preparation