

**The Catholic Record.**

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

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

EDITORS: REV. GEORGE R. NORTHRAYER, Author of "Mistakes of Modern Infidels," THOMAS COFFEY.

PUBLISHERS: LUCAS E. SOLO, JOHN NIGLI, P. J. NEVIN and W. 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, single 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.

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

London, Saturday, March 28, 1906.

**A GARBLED QUOTATION.**

An expression of opinion which has been attributed to the Most Reverend Archbishop Croke, on the subject of purely secular versus Catholic teaching in the schools, has been several times quoted in connection with the Manitoba school question. Those who have been opposing the restoration of Catholic rights have seized with avidity the supposed utterance of the Archbishop as adverse to Catholic education, but it might have been suspected that the quotation was a misrepresentation, and it is now made certain by the Archbishop himself that this is the true state of the case.

The garbled words attributed to Dr. Croke appeared in the American edition of the *Review of Reviews* of last September, in an article written by Mr. W. T. Stead; but it now appears that the words, or something resembling them, were sent to America in an uncorrected proof, which Mr. Stead corrected by next mail, but the American editor, Dr. Shaw, preferred to publish the incorrect report originally sent him, or perhaps garbled in the American office, and which conveys sentiments quite opposed to those of the Archbishop.

The same article was published in the English edition with almost, though not exactly, Dr. Croke's actual words, which differ very much from what was attributed to him by the American edition. According to the English edition, the Archbishop said: "I think that the New Zealand system is fairly satisfactory. The State provides an education solely secular, and ministers of all denominations are authorized to impart religious instruction to their pupils one day in the week. The Catholic priests in New Zealand attend regularly for some hours in the week to catechize the Catholic scholars in the Public schools. The system seems to work admirably."

Even this was not in all respects an accurate report; but it was much worse as it appeared in the American issue, being made to read as follows: "'I think,' replied Doctor Croke, 'that the New Zealand system is the best in the world. The State provides an education solely secular, and ministers of all denominations are authorized to impart religious instruction to their pupils one day in the week. The Catholic priests in New Zealand attend regularly for one hour in the week to catechize the Catholic scholars in the Public schools. The system works admirably—and why should it not? It is a mistake to be always thrusting dogmatic teaching into every kind of instruction. Religion can be all the better taught if it is not made too stale by a monotonous repetition.'"

To this garbled quotation the editor appended the remark: "A notable sentiment, indeed, from a Catholic Archbishop, and one which were he other than what he is would bring down on him the anathemas of no small section of his own Church."

The matter, being thus published only in America, might have escaped the notice of the Archbishop; but the Rev. Father Drummond, S. J., of Montreal, suspecting that there was a fraud in the matter, sent an inquiry to His Grace concerning the accuracy of the statement, and a copy of the *Review* containing it. He received a reply from Dr. Croke repudiating the quotation entirely, and correcting the errors in the English version of his words. Dr. Croke says in his letter to Father Drummond: "I had no idea that there was a second and enlarged edition of the *Review of Reviews* published in the United States. So far as I am concerned I entirely repudiate it. My views about educational matters in New Zealand have been misrepresented, or, at all events, misunderstood. In a conversation with Mr. Stead, which was quite an informal one and in no sense what is known as an 'interview,' I referred to the diocese of Auckland alone, and not to New Zealand at large; and after having given it as my opinion that the educational system there (Auckland) was 'fairly satisfactory,' I added that it 'seemed' (not seems) to work admirably. I only spoke of Auckland as it was twenty years ago, and did not mean to offer any opinion as to the actual state of things as regards State schools or systems. For the rest, it is needless to say that I ever have been and still am

a staunch and uncompromising supporter of the denominational system, at home and abroad, and that I hold it to be a shameful tyranny and injustice to tax Catholics, or any other religious body, for the maintenance of schools which they cannot conscientiously avail themselves of, and deny them, at the same time, all participation in the public funds to which, as citizens, they have contributed their proportionate share."

It certainly seems that the American editor of the *Review of Reviews* published deliberately and knowingly an incorrect account of the Archbishop's words, and that those who have been using the falsified version for the purpose of perpetuating the Manitoba injustice have been leaning on a broken reed.

**RELIGION IN THE NEW ENGLAND STATES.**

A recent issue of the New York *Sun* mentions that at a conference of Baptist ministers held a few days ago in that city, one of the speakers complained bitterly of the progress of Catholicity in the New England states, and urged that "an organized stand is necessary against the aggressive missionary work of the Roman Catholic Church, and if the Baptists are satisfied to stand still, the Roman Catholics will make a new France of the New England States."

The *Sun* then gives some interesting statistics to show that the Baptist minister's fears of the predominance of Catholics are well founded, notwithstanding the fact that New England was once the "very citadel of Protestantism," but the inference drawn by the *Sun* is very widely different from that of the preacher.

The *Sun* reminds the ministers that while the preponderance of Catholics is owing in part to the great immigration of recent years, it is due more to the falling off of religious faith and conviction among the Protestant population, and it therefore advises the Protestant New-Englanders rather to revive the faith of their own people, than to attempt any crusade to resist the progress of Roman Catholics. By following the course recommended, it imagines the Protestants would secure more successful results than by combatting Catholicism.

The influence of infidelity has extended while Protestantism has been failing, and the *Sun* considers that time and other resources should not be spent in fighting a Christian faith differing in form from their own, while there is so much need of combatting the increasing influence of infidelity among their own people.

Among the facts which are noted in regard to the progress of Catholicism, it is proved by the last census of the United States that out of a total of 1,769,202 church members in the six New England States, there were in 1890, 1,004,605 Catholic communicants, showing that Catholics have nearly 58 per cent. of the church membership.

In Massachusetts and Rhode Island they form about two thirds of the whole; in Connecticut, nearly one-half, and in Vermont, which was formerly almost exclusively Protestant, they are now about two fifths of the entire church membership.

Though this is the case, the Catholics do not constitute a majority of the population, so that the conclusion is that Catholics have held their faith much better than the Protestants have done, and they have a majority of church members because so many Protestants have renounced their faith for infidelity or indifference.

We may judge from these indubitable facts what value is to be placed upon the boasts which are from time to time made by the French evangelization societies to the effect that they have made phenomenal headway among the French-Canadians of New England, and that they have French congregations amounting in the aggregate to fifty thousand souls. These figures are gross exaggerations. We know, indeed, that there are always some sheep who will stray from the fold, but we also know that it is a rare thing to find a French Presbyterian in New England. We name the Presbyterians here as it is the Presbyterian evangelization societies which are most accustomed to make this boast. At all events, the revelations made by the New York *Sun* show that even if the pretence were true, they would rather have secured a large batch of new recruits for infidelity than any increase thereby to the number of their own adherents. They would be better occupied in resisting the encroachments of infidelity than in destroying the faith of Catholic French-Canadians. Certainly the complaint of the Baptist brother at the

New York Conference does not tally well with the boast of the French evangelization societies.

**A CURIOUS EMBROGLIO.**

An amusing ecclesiastical quarrel has occurred at Ludington, Mich. A Methodist minister, the Rev. W. I. Laufman, has taken a determined stand against school teachers who dance, and Ludington society has been dreadfully stirred up by his denunciations of dancing in general. But it has come out in the discussion which arose out of the minister's position, that recently he had an exhibition in his own church at which a troupe of itinerant violinists visiting in the town played dancing tunes so that all the young people in the church are said to have been led thereby into patting their feet and moving their bodies in harmony with the music.

But this was not the worst. Even the pulpit was rigged with wings, and what is known among theatrical people as a grand spectacular display was made with flowers and drapery, giving the church the appearance of a regular theatre.

The deacons of the Church state that this occasion, which was all the work of the minister, was the cause of the dancing mania against which the latter is now waging war. They say that the tunes played in the church were "devilish and quite unsuited to Methodist belief and practice."

The other ministers of the city were asked by Rev. Mr. Laufman to join in his crusade, but after holding two meetings to consider the matter, they resolved to have nothing to do with it, and the originator is left to "go it alone." He announced a lecture against dancing for a recent Sunday evening, and it may be presumed that it was delivered according to programme, but there is a general feeling of disgust at the inconsistency of his course.

Mr. Laufman has embroiled himself especially with the Episcopal minister of the city, whose church he has denounced as being favorable to dancing, and he added that it is the "Roman Catholic Church with the tail cut off." An Episcopalian retorted in one of the local papers that the Methodist church is "the Episcopal church with its whole body cut off from the head."

**THE POPE'S APPEALS FOR CHRISTIAN REUNION.**

While the Archbishop of Canterbury, the London *Times* and the extreme Protestant press generally assert that the attitude of the Holy Father, Leo XIII., in regard to the immutable character of Catholic doctrine, constitutes an insuperable obstacle to any movement on the part of English Protestants toward a reunion of Christendom under the supreme authority of the Pope, it is interesting to observe how the obstacle indicated is being, slowly perhaps, but surely, removed; and at all events the Holy Father is not at all discouraged from the prosecution of his work of conciliation, in the hope that it will bear good fruit.

Advices from Rome continue to give the information that the Pope is soon to issue another appeal which will be addressed, not to the clergy or the press primarily, but to the English people, as it is among the people that the desire for a return to the one fold must be nurtured that adequate results may be expected. Nevertheless it is certain that a large body of the English and American clergy of the Anglican and Protestant Episcopal Churches have made great strides toward the adoption of distinctively Catholic doctrines, which were rejected by the first reformers, and which have been since a point of attack by all Protestant controversialists until recent years.

Dean Farrar, now of Canterbury, may be regarded as one of the leaders of the anti-Catholic party in the Church of England, and we may reasonably accept his estimate of the number of Ritualistic clergy, which he puts at seven thousand in England alone. The significance of this estimate lies in the fact that these clergymen have adopted entirely the very doctrines which are stated by the *Times* to be the insuperable obstacle to reunion; and it is further conceded that as a body this number consists of the most indefatigable workers in the Church.

We are far from asserting or imagining that these clergymen are all or nearly all prepared to return to the fold of the Catholic Church. The union of Church and State makes their adherence to the Anglican Church a necessity, if they desire to retain their livings and revenues; and they have, besides, persuaded themselves that they can transform the Anglican

Church into a truly Catholic Church by engraving upon its dead trunk the Catholic doctrines they have adopted, without submitting themselves to the one supreme authority without which the Church could not be Catholic.

The notion is delusive, but it is at present an obstacle to the return of many Anglican clergymen to Catholic unity; and even in Canada and the United States, though there is no State Church, the example of the English Ritualists has been contagious, and there is not that tendency to become Catholics which we would expect from their assimilation to Catholics on points of doctrine. Yet it must be evident to all that this assimilation will have a great effect in ultimately determining the return of a large section of the Anglicans to Catholic unity. Probably that return may begin on the part of the laity, but when it dawns upon the clergy that there remains but one serious obstacle to be overcome, many will feel it to be their duty to take the final and decisive step, for they cannot but become aware that the sin of schism at least must exist where they persist in separation from the supreme authority in the Church while they have not even the excuse of thereby maintaining some Christian truth.

Among Catholic doctrines none have been assailed in the past with more bitterness than the Sacrifice of the Mass, Prayers for the Dead, the Veneration and Invocation of Saints and especially of the Blessed Virgin Mary, yet all these doctrines and practices are now held by Ritualists as firmly as if they had always been taught by the Church of England.

An example of this is to be found in a church recently erected in New York city at a cost of \$500,000 and solemnly dedicated to St. Mary the Virgin in December last. Masses, so-called, are celebrated therein every day for the living and the dead. These Masses consist in the Communion service of the Book of Common Prayer, recited by the clergy with extra ceremonies extracted from missals formerly used in England, or invented by the ministers themselves, and with vestments of the Byzantine form, which are more or less elaborate according to the feast.

This church is also decorated with a statue of the Blessed Virgin which occupies the most prominent position in the sanctuary. The church itself was dedicated by Bishop Grafton of Fond du Lac, Wisconsin, who is said to be the most Ritualistic of all the Bishops in the United States, and the ceremony of dedication was performed with a High Mass, with deacon and subdeacon clad in the vestments appropriate to these offices.

The Church of St. Ignatius, in the same city, has also a highly Ritualistic service, and the very name of the saint to whom it is dedicated, the founder of the Jesuit order, is an indication of the great approach made to the Catholic Church within a few years.

In Canada, too, there are many churches in which Ritualistic services are held, and in which the clergy imitate Catholic practices very closely, even to the hearing of confessions, though Ritualism is almost unheard of in this diocese of Huron, as the former Bishops of the diocese took great pains to crush it out of existence; but in other dioceses it flourishes with the approbation, or at least the toleration, of the Bishops. Surely, then, there is reason to hope that the efforts of the Pope to recall the lost sheep to their fold have a good prospect for a successful issue in the not very distant future.

**THE CALENDAR.**

It is announced that the Russian Government has at length determined to adopt the Gregorian calendar, after the example of the rest of the civilized world. The change will be made at the beginning of the twentieth century; but it has not yet been decided whether it will be effected by advancing the date at once by twelve days, and thenceforward following the Gregorian method, or by the abolition of leap years until the dates of the Russian and Gregorian calendars agree. The former method would be much simpler, and will probably be adopted as remedying at once the inconvenience felt in using a different calendar from that of all Christian nations, whereas the second method would prolong the confusion for forty-eight years.

As some of our readers may be sometimes perplexed to understand the real difference between the two calendars, it will be interesting to them to have a correct account of the matter, and the explanation which we shall here give briefly will also make clear another

point which is sometimes found equally perplexing, the difference between the old and the new styles of computing dates.

The Gregorian calendar, which we use in common with other Christian nations, was introduced by Pope Gregory XIII., who made the change from the Julian calendar in the year 1582, by ordering that October 5 of that year should be accounted as October 15, and that thenceforth only those centennial years which are divisible by four hundred should be reckoned as leap years. Thus, though it is the general rule that every fourth year, namely every year which is divisible by four, is a leap year, there is an exception in the case of the centennial years which end each century, as 1800, 1900, 2000, etc. In the case of these centennial years, only those which are divisible by 400 are counted as leap years, so that the years 1600, 2000, etc., are leap years, whereas 1700, 1800, 1900, 2100, are common years of 365 days each.

Before this change was effected the Julian calendar was in use, whereby every fourth year, including all the centennial years, was reckoned as a leap year, and this method is still followed in Russia. As a consequence, there is now a difference of twelve days between the date given to any day, as reckoned in Russia, and that given to it in other Christian countries. Thus our Christmas day is reckoned by the Russians as Dec. 13, and they do not celebrate Christmas day until we are celebrating the feast of the Epiphany, on January 6. It is for this reason also that the Epiphany is sometimes called "old Christmas day," because if the Julian calendar had continued in use, Christmas day would be then celebrated.

The Pope's decree was adopted in Catholic countries very soon after its promulgation, but in the Protestant States its adoption was long delayed, because they did not wish to accept even an improvement from the Pope, or as a consequence of a Papal decree. Some of the Protestant German States adopted the Gregorian calendar in 1700, but it was not wholly used in Germany till 1774. Great Britain adopted it by an Act of Parliament in 1752.

It is not to be supposed that this change of calendar was made without good reason. Its purpose was to make the calendar year correspond with the actual solar year, which is the period of the earth's revolution around the sun. This revolution of the earth is one of the causes which produce the succession of the seasons, in connection with which there are four special dates on which occur the two equinoxes and the two solstices. On March 21, the vernal, and on September 22, the autumnal equinox, occur, on which days the sun is vertical at the equator, and the days and nights are everywhere equal, as exactly twelve hours elapse between sunrise and sunset on those days, except at the poles of the earth where the year consists of only one day and one night, each six months in length.

The solstices occur on December 22 and June 21. The first is called the winter, the second the summer solstice, signifying that whereas it may be remarked that after June 21 the sun is lower down in the heavens at noon on each successive day, till on December 22 it is at the lowest point, when it seems for a short time to remain at that height and then rises higher every day till it reaches the highest point on June 21, after which date it begins again to descend. The solstices are named from this apparent standing still of the sun on these dates, the Latin word *solstitium* having this meaning.

It is clear that if the calendar year does not correspond with the solar year, the dates of the solstices and equinoxes will change, so that after the lapse of years, June 21 and December 22 will no longer be midsummer and midwinter days, and after a sufficiently long period June would come round to midwinter and December to midsummer, in which case also the dates of the equinoxes would be similarly changed, the vernal equinox coming to September, and the autumnal to March. This is, in fact, what occurs in regard to any date in the Mahometan year. The months of the Mahometan calendar are lunar months, and the feasts of Mahometanism being kept on certain fixed days, pass through all the seasons of the year during a cycle of thirty-three years, until they return to the season, and within a few days to the same solar date on which they began.

The period of the solar year during which the earth revolves around the sun is very nearly eleven minutes, even and a half seconds less than

365½ days. The Julian Calendar, with its leap year every fourth year, supposeth the length of the year to be just 365½ days; there is, therefore, an error of a few minutes each year; but when it comes to reckoning centuries, that error becomes noticeable. It amounts almost exactly to three days in 400 years, and by the rule promulgated by Gregory XIII., the error is prevented from occurring. So near the truth is Pope Gregory's correction that it would take 3,600 years of the Gregorian calendar to make an error of one day between the calendar and solar years.

It was partly to preserve the occurrence of Easter within fixed dates that Pope Gregory took so much interest in this matter. The Ecumenical Council of Nice, which met in the year 325, ordained that Easter should be celebrated on the Sunday following the full moon which occurs on the day of the vernal equinox, or the nearest day thereafter. It was remarked in the sixteenth century that the date of the equinox had changed ten days during the time which had elapsed since that council, and this had changed the date on which Easter should have been celebrated; and it was this fact which induced the Pope to consult with the best astronomers as to the mode of preventing such an error from occurring again, and the Gregorian calendar was the result of their deliberations. The name of the astronomer whose calendar was adopted was Luigi Lilio Ghiraldi, sometimes called Aloysius Lilius.

The terms "old style" is applied to a date given according to the Julian calendar, and "new style" to a date of the new or Gregorian calendar. By remembering this, readers will be able to understand why it is that in histories and narratives relating to the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, two dates are frequently given in the form of a fraction. In such case the upper date is understood to mean old, and the lower date new style. So also for a few days at the beginning or ending of the year, a day will belong to the previous year if it is reckoned in old style, or to the following year, if in new style. This is also indicated by writing the dates in the manner of a fraction.

**THE REMEDIAL BILL.**

After all the delays to the passage of the Remedial Bill, caused by the efforts of politicians of both parties to make political capital out of the grievances of the Catholic minority in Manitoba, it has at length passed its second reading by a majority of 15.

The vote was taken at 6 o'clock a. m., on Friday, the 20th inst., at the end of a continuous sitting of thirty-nine hours, and stood 112 for, to 94 against the second reading. Of those who voted for the Bill, 105 were Conservatives and 7 Liberals; against it there were 76 Liberals and 18 Conservatives — if we count as Conservatives Mr. Dalton McCarthy and his two followers.

Against Mr. Laurier's amendment for the six months' hoist, the majority was 24, 3 Conservatives voting against it who voted also against the passage of the Bill. These were Messrs. McGillivray, Hughes and Ross (Dundas). The votes of these three gentlemen on both sides of the question are explained on their behalf by an endeavor to show that they are opposed both to remedial legislation and to Mr. Laurier's policy, but the real cause of their curious course was undoubtedly that they wished to please their constituents by their vote against the Bill when they found that the Government was safe.

The vote by Provinces on the second reading was as follows:

	For	Against
Ontario.....	32	22
Quebec.....	15	5
Nov. Scotia.....	13	3
New Brunswick.....	4	1
Manitoba.....	2	4
P. E. Island.....	6	0
B. Columbia.....	4	0
N. W. Territories.....	4	0

The fact is, the Bill was made a party question instead of being dealt with as a question of justice to the Catholic minority.

Most of the Conservatives who were really opposed to it waived their opposition in order to maintain the Government, while the Quebec Liberals voted against it in order to overthrow the Government. It may be supposed that the intention of the latter was to give Mr. Laurier an opportunity to pass a better measure.

It is now understood that the Manitoba Government is willing to make such concessions as will remove the grievances complained of. We shall be glad if such be the case, and within a few days it will be seen whether or not it be so. We would prefer, both for the sake of the Catholic minority, and of peace, that