

The Catholic Record.

Published Weekly at 464 and 466 Richmond street, London, Ontario.
Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

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 re-
ceive subscriptions and transact all other busi-
ness for the CATHOLIC RECORD.

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

Approved and recommended by the Arch-
bishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa, and St.
Boniface, the Bishops of Hamilton, Peter-
borough, 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.
Returns 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 ad-
dress be sent us.

London, Saturday, June 17, 1899.

LOOSE PRINCIPLES.

The Rev. Dr. Spencer, at the Baptist Convention held in Toronto a few days ago, complained of a practice which he said prevails in many churches, to announce dances and theatrical performances from the pulpit. He also complained that in the social gatherings of the churches, ale and stout are often provided for the guests. It is quite true that social gatherings are to be preferred where total abstinence prevails, but it appears to us that the announcement of profane amusements, which are frequently hurtful to public morals, in the most commendable of all these practices. These dangerous amusements ought not, on any consideration, to be officially sanctioned by an announcement in the Church, which would surely be desecrated by so doing. This is a natural result of the recent tendency to substitute talks about worldly matters for the preaching of the word of God, in many Protestant churches. But how is such a procedure to be prevented where each congregation, or even each individual is the supreme judge of what is becoming in the House of God, as is the case under the Baptist discipline?

A DELEGATE FOR CANADA.

A telegram from Rome declares that the Holy Father is about to issue a Bull appointing an Apostolic Delegate for Canada, having duties similar to those which have been exercised in the United States, at first by Cardinal Satolli, and now by Mgr. Martinelli. The appointment of a Delegate to the United States has proved to be a great boon to the entire Catholic population there, and no doubt it will be of similar benefit to Canada. From private sources we are given to understand that the appointment of an Apostolic Delegate to Canada has been determined upon owing to the recommendation of Mgr. Mery del Val that the Holy Father should have an immediate representative here. It is expected that Mgr. del Val will be the first Apostolic Delegate, and should the rumor prove to be correct, the appointment will give great satisfaction to the hierarchy, the clergy and the laity, to all of whom His Excellency gave great satisfaction by his affability and conciliatory methods. It fact, he won golden opinions from all with whom he had intercourse during his brief stay here in 1897.

THE ANTICOSTI SETTLERS.

The Montreal Methodist Conference has expressed in strong terms its condemnation of the Hon. J. L. Tarte, for having stated in the House of Commons that Fox Bay settlers on the Island of Anticosti are wreckers of whom Mr. Menier, the proprietor of the island, is anxious to be rid. These people are Methodists, and the Conference for this reason takes their part, declaring that they are honest settlers, and that Mr. Tarte insults Methodism by stigmatizing them as wreckers who lure ships to destruction in order to plunder them. Several other Conferences have followed the lead of the Montreal Conference, and demand an apology from Mr. Tarte. The Patrie declares that Mr. Tarte will prove his statement, and that the Methodist Conferences have injudiciously taken the side of the settlers, and will be sorry for having done so when the facts are disclosed.

As we understand that Mr. Menier has very properly brought the matter before the Courts of Law we do not wish to prejudice the case. Mr. Menier is proprietor by honest purchase, and has done much good for the island and for the province by spending millions for improvements, but whatever rights may belong to the settlers should be respected, if they have any. As far as we are aware, Mr. Menier proposes to respect those rights, and if

so this should be satisfactory. We have no doubt that a just decision will be reached in the matter by the Courts, and Mr. Menier will be guided by it.

THE WINNIPEG CONTROVERSY.

We already made some remarks on a reply made by Archdeacon Fortin, of the Anglican Church, Winnipeg, to a sermon delivered by the Rev. Father Drummond of the same city.

Our comments on the Archdeacon's lengthy epistle were confined chiefly to a consideration of his attack upon the doctrine of Papal Infallibility, based upon the negligence of Pope Honorius in the seventh century, who, though himself orthodox in his teaching, did not suppress a heresy with that vigilance which should be exercised by the Apostolic See.

We have here to remark that the Archdeacon was the aggressor in the controversy which has been going on for some time in the columns of the Winnipeg Tribune between himself and Rev. Father Drummond, as he began the attack by a sermon directed primarily against Ritualists, in which he took the opportunity to abuse also the Catholic Church, in order to divert attention from the dissensions which are raging in the Anglican Church just now, and are threatening to break up the Establishment.

It will become the clergy of a Church which is torn into factions to the extent to which Anglicanism is now divided, to accuse the Catholic Church of teaching error, even if the accusation were true. The Church of England, in fact, is at the present moment teaching every possible doctrine in its pulpits, from extreme Latitudinarianism to what the Low Churchmen, like Archdeacon Fortin, call "extreme Sacerdotalism."

Rev. Father Drummond made an excellent reply to the Archdeacon, to which we need only add that, in attacking the confessional so bitterly, the Archdeacon condemns an institution of his own Church, for the Anglican Book of Common Prayer most clearly teaches that before receiving the Communion, and also on the bed of sickness, it is advisable for those whose consciences are seriously burdened with sin to make their confession to a "priest" and to receive absolution in the very form in which absolution is given by the priests of the Catholic Church.

In the face of such a fact, how can the Archdeacon make the assertion that "Auricular confession is not a primitive nor even a moderately early practice of the Christian Church."

He then asserts that it was introduced by the Popes in the thirteenth century. If this be so, the Archdeacon's Church, and all Anglican clergy, whether High or Low, Broad or Erasmian, swear that they have from Christ the power of absolving, a power to which they have no claim whatsoever.

Archdeacon Fortin's letter is the most damaging to his own Church's claims which could possibly be written.

ANOTHER HERESY TRIAL.

The Rev. Dr. B. F. Austin, formerly Principal of Alma Methodist College for the education of young ladies, at St. Thomas, Ont., and now of Toronto, was deposed from the ministry of the Methodist Church for preaching heresy. This action was taken by the London Conference at its recent meeting in Windsor.

On the doctor's return to Toronto he was interviewed in regard to the reasons for his deposition, and he declared that if he had been allowed to maintain the orthodoxy of his views as expressed in the sermon for which he was condemned, he would have been sustained by nineteen-twentieths of the members of the Conference.

The principal charge against the doctor was that he maintained the theories of clairvoyance and spiritualism, and even engrafted them upon the gospel. So far from denying the facts of the case, the doctor appeared to glory in them when interviewed. He states that, after careful study of the phenomena of clairvoyance and spiritualism, he has come to the conclusion that they are caused by actual manifestations made by spirits of the dead, or of "those who are called dead."

While we certainly cannot by any means approve of supplementing the teaching of the gospel by the so called spiritual manifestations of clairvoyance and spiritualism, which are to a great extent fraudulent, and to some extent probably diabolical, we cannot understand on what ground the Methodist Conference can condemn the exercise of private judgment in one of their clergymen, whereas it has always been

proclaimed as the fundamental principle of Protestantism that each individual has the right and duty to frame his creed for himself without subjecting himself to the judgment of any Church tribunal. It was upon this theory that Methodism was founded, cutting itself loose from Anglicanism, and forming a new and independent sect, just as Anglicanism itself had previously done, putting aside the authority of the Catholic Church. Why then does the Methodist Conference now set itself up to be a supreme arbiter of faith, thus belying all its previous pretensions that it gives the fullest latitude of belief to its adherents?

The pretence is made, indeed, that this is necessary in order to ensure discipline, but the inconsistency of holding heresy trials in a Church which proclaims complete individual liberty is too evident to need to be expatiated upon.

Other charges against the Rev. Doctor, which the Conference declared to be proven, were an implied denial of the Divinity of Christ, and of the value of the atonement, and that he taught that the Revelations already made to man by Almighty God are not final. The additional charge, that he denied the eternity of punishment in hell, was declared to be not sustained.

EVIDENTLY A FICTION.

A very improbable story, originating with a correspondent of the Montreal Witness at Kinross's Mills, Megantic Co., P. Q., appears in that paper and some of the Toronto dailies to the effect that the Catholic priest of the locality had shown an extraordinary anxiety to proselytize an old resident named William Harvey who died last week at the age of seventy-five years.

It is stated that the deceased had been visited almost daily by the Rev. Mr. Whitelaw, Presbyterian minister, and had given instructions regarding his funeral, having even named the Protestant cemetery where he was to be buried. After this he became unconscious, and his wife who had hitherto passed herself as a Protestant, but now declared herself to be a Catholic, called in the priest who, as the story runs, "in his anxiety to administer the last rites and send Mr. Harvey out of the world a full-fledged Roman Catholic, rushed the ceremony through before any of Harvey's Protestant friends were aware of it."

Our readers will see at once that this sensational story bears on its face the evidence that it is a fable. Catholic priests never make conversions after this fashion, and in the case in question, the priest would not have administered the last rites of the Church to the sick man unless he had been assured that the latter, while conscious, had expressed a desire to become a Catholic. We have not the least doubt that when all the facts are known it will be seen that this is what really occurred.

The story goes on to state that on the day of the funeral, the Orangemen had a grave dug in the Protestant cemetery for the deceased man on the plea that during life he had been "at one time an Orangeman." This part of the story makes it clear that Mr. Harvey had long before abandoned Orangemen, yet ten Orange lodges turned out and took the corpse by force to the Protestant cemetery and buried it there.

The case is evidently one of those instances of Orange violence and mob law for which that Order has been notorious in years gone by. The Orangemen have undoubtedly rendered themselves amenable to the penalties of the law by their conduct, and it will depend upon the firmness of Mrs. Harvey whether these penalties be visited upon them or not, and that the body be re-interred in the Catholic cemetery.

History often repeats itself, and this incident has many points of resemblance with what occurred many years ago in Hamilton at the funeral of Sir Allan Macnab. The Orangemen on that occasion also mustered in force, but did not proceed to violent measures. Sir Allan became a Catholic on his deathbed, as was well attested by a number of witnesses, Protestant as well as Catholic: still an unsuccessful effort was made to force his widow to allow him to be buried in a Protestant cemetery. Her firmness prevailed, however, and the Orange lodges contented themselves with dispersing to their homes, and allowing the funeral to proceed to the Catholic church and cemetery without molestation.

The fervent and diligent man is prepared for all things.

THE RITUALISTIC WAR.

The Rev. Dean Farrar, of Canterbury, about four or five years ago put himself forward with great confidence as the leader of a new and determined crusade against the Ritualistic movement in England, and by his anti-sacerdotal attitude at the time appeared to give a new courage to the extreme Low Church party.

In a recent interview with a journal reporter he takes a much more modest stand, from which it may be inferred that he has discovered that the task he had set himself to perform was too huge to make success possible, and now he describes the situation in the following lugubrious strain:

"The English Church is passing through the fire of controversy and dissension, and deep division is being produced. There is no distinct mode of knowing where we are. A house divided" was never truer in its application than when applied to the Church of England to day. A Church in two sections is always undesirable and productive of harm. A Church with two such extreme parties as constitute the English Church at this moment is in a struggle for life or death. God only knows whether the Church will be permanently crippled. As far as I can see, unless the extreme party and by that I mean those who are practicing a distinctly Ritualistic ritual—relinquish their practices, the inevitable end must be dissolution or disruption."

Further on he declared his conviction that the "English Prayer Book is in all conscience liberal in its scope, but when a certain section follows Rome in worship, in all things except recognition of the Pope's infallibility, there is surely just ground for complaint."

Being asked whether in his belief the Ritualistic movement is a distinct Roman tendency, or simply a divergence of views regarding the scope of the prayer book, he answered:

"Many of the extreme party have already openly vowed for Rome in all but the Pope's infallibility, and make no secret that they are striving to see the Roman and English Churches united. To bring about such unity, the Church of England would have to sell itself body and soul, for it is well known that the Roman Church will not sever one millimetre part of an inch. Within the Church of England, there are agencies actively working on behalf of Rome."

This is very plain language, but it shows that the Catholic Church is strong in the conviction that it holds the unchangeable truth of God. If she were floundering in the mire of error, she would find it to her advantage to escape therefrom, but her consistency in maintaining always the same doctrines, shows that she is persevering in the teaching of "the faith once delivered to the saints."

The immutability of the doctrinal teachings of the Catholic Church, thus attested by one of her bitterest enemies, is the strongest possible evidence that the Catholic Church teaches only the truth as she learned it in the beginning from "the Paraclete, the Spirit of Truth." It is the Churches which have changed their doctrines from time to time, and are willing to change them again to suit the convenience of the moment, and to adapt themselves to the whims of men, that are conscious they have never had the whole truth. We do not doubt that it is the consciousness of this which has led the Ritualists so far as to have re-adopted all the doctrines which had been repudiated by the Church of England since the time of the Reformation. They were aware that they must come to the truth, as the truth could not change to adapt itself to them.

THE MANITOBA SCHOOL QUESTION.

The Brandon Sun, which is Mr. Sifton's paper, complains bitterly, in its issue of May 26, because the Federal Government of Canada does not at once hand over to the Government of Manitoba the value of the school lands held in trust for educational purposes in that Province.

Thanks to the Senate of Canada, the school funds thus held in trust, which the Sun values at \$15,000,000, have not been frittered away, nor should they be frittered away by being handed over to a Government which has hitherto not shown a disposition to grant to the Catholics of Manitoba their educational rights, which are still withheld in spite of the constitution which, as our readers are aware, guarantees that the Catholics should not be deprived of their right to Separate schools as established from the date of the first formation of the territory into a Province.

Our readers are well aware that the agreement then made guaranteed to Catholics and Protestants alike, that whatever might occur in the future settling of the Province, the minority should preserve its rights to Separate schools. It is undoubted that if in the course of events, it had happened that Catholics had retained their original preponderance of population, there would have been no effort made to deprive the Protestant minority of their

rights, but the case is different as the majority is now Protestant.

At the present moment the Dominion Government shows an unaccountable apathy in regard to Catholic rights, but we have confidence that this will not always be the case, nor will this state of affairs be of long continuance. In the meantime, the Dominion Government should not put it out of its own power to extend justice to the Catholic minority. The retention of the school lands fund intact in the hands of the Dominion Government will be the most efficacious means of bringing the Manitoba Government to a sense of justice and the demands of that Government for the handing over of the school lands fund should not be acceded to. If the Dominion Government should be disposed so far to yield its right to insist on justice to Catholics at least the Senate should intervene as it did before, so scandalous and suicidal a step as that the Government should deliberately put it out of its own power to enforce the granting of justice to the Catholic minority at any future time.

It will be remembered that when the remedial bill was proposed by the late Government, the chief difficulty encountered in the framing of a workable Separate School law under the supervision of the Dominion Government, arose from the want of funds which the Government could use for the purpose of putting the laws into operation. This difficulty will exist to a much greater degree if the school moneys now at the disposal of the Federal Government are put out of reach. They should, therefore, be retained, at least so long as full justice is not done to the Catholic minority who are in justice entitled to have a due share in the public funds devoted to educational purposes.

It was to meet just such circumstances as have arisen that the Senate was instituted under Confederation, especially so that the rights of minorities should be carefully protected, when for any reason a majority in the House of Commons proved to be negligent of their duty in this regard. If the House of Commons, therefore, through partisanship should forget its duty when a bill comes up to make an apportionment to relieve the needs of the Greenway Government in regard to education, we depend upon the Senate to see justice done, or at least to make it sure that the Government shall not be allowed to let the power of seeing justice done pass entirely out of its hands.

PSEUDO-CHRISTIAN SCIENCE.

Our attention has been called to a lecture on Christian Science delivered in Peterborough, Ont., on May 25th, by the Rev. Carl Norton of New York, the purpose of which was to prove that "Christian Science is both Christian and Scientific."

It could scarcely be supposed to be possible that in this nineteenth century, which has been marked with so numerous discoveries, and has advanced so rapidly in every department of science, there should be found any considerable number of people who would accept the fanciful theories of the so called Christian Scientists, which require us to close our eyes to the great improvements which have been made in medicine down to the present time. But however rapid the advance of the age in real science, it appears that there is no limit to the number of people who are ready to be led away to adopt the most extravagant fads, provided these find advocates who are able to clothe their crude notions in a flow of plausible or incomprehensible language.

Hence it is asserted by the advocates of Christian Science that the religion they have invented has now thousands of adherents in all the large cities of the United States, and many likewise in our own Canada.

The Christian Scientists have made their theories into a religion, with a set of dogmas for which they claim undoubting faith as if it were a revelation from God, instead of being, what it is, the mere imaginings of the fantastic lady who is the author of this new creed, Mrs. Mary Baker Eddy.

The Rev. Carl Norton begins his lecture by an explanation of the atonement by Christ on the cross, which is somewhat more in accord, or perhaps, we should say less in discord, with the teachings of Christianity than has been usual with the Christian Scientists whose lectures have fallen under our notice. Most of the lecturers on this subject have maintained that sin has no existence, and as a consequence that Christians are under no obligation to avoid the evil of sin. It is also a favorite doctrine of these teachers that there is no personal God distinct

from the works of God's hands, but that Man himself is God.

Mr. Norton does not make such a statement as this, but these teachings are undoubtedly found in Mrs. Eddy's writings, and inculcated by her disciples. We must say, therefore, that Christian Science as a religious system teaches these doctrines, and Mr. Norton does not repudiate them. If, therefore, he should succeed in making converts to his faith, he will make converts to these doctrines, which are, in reality, a pure Atheism, though he seeks to please the fancy of those to whom he addresses himself by appearing to insist upon the infinite power and knowledge of God. And yet in some of his veiled sentences we can find this dangerous Atheism lurking. Thus he says that

"God hath in no wise withdrawn Himself from the needs of suffering humanity," and "the divine Omnipotence, alias God, governs the universe, including man."

These statements are, of course, truths, if by God we mean a personal, self existing, and infinitely perfect Being. But when we are aware that the Christian Scientist does not thus understand God, but describes him to be etherealized matter, or even Man himself, his teaching ceases to be the truth as it has been revealed to us.

Knowing the teaching of Christian Scientists generally, we cannot help thinking that Mr. Norton means the same thing when he says in his lecture, as reported in the Peterborough Examiner of May 26:

"Christian Science teaches the radical idea of universal mental causation and contends for the contagion of health and righteousness rather than the continued spread of disease and depravity as the only contagious elements of existence. By teaching what we call matter to its lowest denominator, especially the operation of the ex-rays as said that it is but an externalization of the human mind, and can be governed by Mind."

Thus it appears that all matter emanates from the mind of man, and the human mind governs it in all its manifestations. This universal human mind, the supreme governor of all things, is therefore the God of Christian Science, and in a covert way Mr. Norton declares that he is at one with his brethren of the Christian Science faith. We can now understand also that when Mr. Norton, in common with other Christian Scientists, declares that man must pray to God so that he may be healed from his maladies, the meaning is that he must pray only to himself. All this nonsense is not worthy of serious refutation.

We may be told here that we are not dealing fairly with Mr. Norton in attributing to him this horrible Pantheism, which is merely an Atheism veiled under a form of almost unintelligible words. But we have no desire to attribute to him any doctrine which he does not teach. If he does not mean to suggest this teaching to the minds of his hearers, we ask his pardon; and we are willing to give him credit for not intending anything of the kind if he disclaims the intention of so doing. But we do not hesitate to say that any persons who will accept what Mr. Norton actually teaches will be compelled to accept the whole creed of this fictitious Christian Science, and with it all the atrocities of Pantheism and Atheism which that creed inculcates. It is evident to any reasoning being that a non-personal God is no God at all. He is a Being which does not and cannot exist, and there is no doubt that this is the kind of a God in which Mrs. Eddy and her followers generally make profession of belief.

Another point which strikes us as remarkable in the doctrines of the Christian Scientists, as explained by Mr. Norton, is the stress he lays upon the atonement for sin effected by Christ. He points out that the word atonement signifies at-one-ment. It is true that this is the etymological source from which this word is derived, and it is appropriate, for it means that we propitiate God through our Redeemer and become united with Him. Nevertheless there is danger of error in insisting too much on the mere derivation of a word, for words often have a meaning in their concrete use which is not conveyed by their mere etymology.

The atonement effected by Christ, as Christians understand it, implies that Christ took upon Himself the punishment of our sins and suffered for them in our stead, thus really redeeming us by His sufferings.

But Mr. Norton cannot deny that though he himself is very guarded not to shock Christians by too openly attacking this manner of belief in the atonement, the Christian Scientists generally openly avow their belief that suffering and sin are but imaginary things, the existence of which ought not to be acknowledged by Christians, and Mr. Norton him-

covertly put when he says nominated in lea are not tacked thro physics of m

The meani ology becom thrown upon the Christiana not long ago showed how simply by w person afflict believe that or that it process is the calls "the mental caus sickness is cau tion of the m imagination

But in this an atonement of our Lord, themselves is easy to see tian Scientists fundamenta while it pro Mr. Norton purposely to is propagati Scientific. ready said and we shall scientific.

Christian diseases sin which is pro maintains Christ appr physician in says: "Th not a physio Christ, the method of ous Christ

This mea is approved cause it is of medicine the healing drugs. I called, reje and rejects which God cine." Th scientific is

Mr. Norton lous cures tains that to His dis whereby a to heal the

We adm power to miracles a by the fait in favor of

But Christ to heal by would be f the ordina cines, an should be God; and Christ H written, th thy God."

The fac Science is ly made deaths wh rejection Scientists eric Haro only a few occurred Buffalo, I ders, who care of th and Elizaus and lutely ref ians, tho been with cal treata ly worse tian Scien on a chan

THE R. Cardin of the C friend: to be no or Bisho light to p ing inequ equals. taking a placed, I the top, hate it, might be in the op to susta one in myself looked u position, respect those w rest wh down fr been jum has exu

THE R. Cardin of the C friend: to be no or Bisho light to p ing inequ equals. taking a placed, I the top, hate it, might be in the op to susta one in myself looked u position, respect those w rest wh down fr been jum has exu