

The Catholic Record.

Published Weekly at 484 and 486 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. LUCE, KING, JOHN NICH, P. STYLES and M. C. O'DONNELL are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transact all other business for the CATHOLIC RECORD.

Rates of Advertising—Ten cents per line each insertion, space measurement. Approved and recommended by the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa, and St. Boniface, and the Bishops of London, Hamilton and Peterboro, and the clergy throughout the Dominion.

London, Saturday November 25, 1899.

SABREVOIS MISSION.

A letter from a correspondent of the Mail appears in the issue of that journal of the 15th inst., in relation to the Sabrevois mission, the only Church of England mission, we understand, which is maintained for the express purpose of undermining the faith of Catholics in the Province of Quebec.

The Mail's correspondent states that on Sunday, the 12th inst., appeals were made in several of the Anglican pulpits in Toronto on behalf of this mission, it being customary to make an annual appeal throughout the dioceses of Ontario as well as Quebec to have it maintained; but he points out also the absurdity of making such an appeal. That its object is the proselytism of Catholics is made clear by a quotation from the report for 1892, which says:

"The chief aim of the committee in conducting the mission shall be to reach the French Roman Catholic population, especially by the engagement of colporteurs, and through them to bring Roman Catholic children into the schools."

On this point the Mail's correspondent, who is himself an Anglican, very sensibly remarks:

"This is the chief aim of the committee. Well, it is a very serious responsibility, this sort of proselytism, this unsettling of religious convictions. It may be a duty. On this point I am not prepared to pronounce. But apart from this aggressive work there are existing agencies, a Church in Montreal, a mission school at Sabrevois, four clergy, a catechist, three lady teachers, and it seems clear that those should be maintained; and if due economy were observed there would be less need for appeals outside of Montreal and Quebec."

The Church of England is far from being a successful missionary Church in its efforts to convert the heathen. In Japan and India it maintains certain missions to bring the light of the gospel to the benighted natives; but in all these instances it has been distanced by the Presbyterians and Methodists, who of late years have exhibited considerable zeal in propagating their various systems among the people of these countries. The Church of England missions, according to the testimony of the most unexceptionable witnesses, have been total failures in both these Empires, and there is no present likelihood that they will succeed better in the future than they have done in the past.

This consideration leads to the very pertinent question, would it not be more reasonable for that Church to endeavor to improve their foreign missions to the heathen rather than to sustain the Sabrevois mission, which aims only at upsetting the faith of those who already know Christ?

It cannot be denied that Catholics as a rule are more zealous church-goers than members of the Church of England or any other sect. Statistics on this point have been frequently gathered by persons anxious to ascertain what proportion of each denomination are faithful in attendance at church services on Sundays, and the invariable result has been that Catholics are the most regular of all in this respect. It must, therefore, be inferred that the Sabrevois mission, if it have any result at all, will only make the French-Canadians whom it will affect more careless in the discharge of the duties of religion. The Mail's correspondent, therefore, very sensibly suggests that the contributions given for the purpose of unsettling the religious convictions of the French Roman Catholics might be much better employed for other purposes. He reminds his co-religionists that the annuities paid from their widows' and orphan's fund have been cut down one half, and that their own mission fund is in debt. He is therefore of opinion that it would be much better to replenish these funds than to contribute towards proselytizing the French Catholics of Quebec, especially as this work ought to commend itself to the two dioceses of Montreal and Quebec, if to any, and these dioceses are perfectly able to maintain it. He might have added that as far as the conversion of French Canadian

children is concerned, the Sabrevois mission is a failure.

There is another feature connected with the case which is pointed out by the correspondent. It appears that the total receipts of the Sabrevois mission for 1892 amounted to \$5,780.33, of which \$1,194.16 came from the parent society, and \$4,586.17 from collections through the eight dioceses of the ecclesiastical province. Of this amount the collecting agent and the secretary—superintendent alone received \$2,171.88, or more than 37 1/2 per cent. The collecting agent collected not more than \$1,232.72, out of which he was paid \$1,200 as salary, and \$471.88 for travelling expenses, a total of \$1,671.88, or nearly 40 per cent. Toronto diocese contributed \$1,016, of which about \$100 go, not for mission purposes, but to pay the collector. The collector, in fact, puts into his own pocket nearly \$1 out of every \$10 he collects. The correspondent wonders how the committee can conscientiously employ a clergyman to collect money, under a pretence that it is for the support of a mission, while he is conscious that 40 per cent. of it is for himself.

From these interesting details it is evident that if the Sabrevois mission does not convert or pervert the French Canadian Catholics, it affords, at least, a snug berth for a few officials, lay and clerical.

It is pointed out that the zealous ladies who collect in Toronto for missionary purposes, do so gratuitously, and the Mail's correspondent is of opinion that there should be no paid collectors for missionary objects. If, however, the contributors are satisfied with the way their money goes, we have no reason to complain of such financial management; but we may legitimately protest against the organized efforts made to sap the faith of the people of Quebec. We are especially surprised that the Church of England should undertake such a work; where as a large percentage of its clergy admit that with the exception of the high authority exercised by the Pope, the Catholic doctrines are the pure and undefiled teachings of Christ and His Apostles. After such an admission it must follow that she has been the bulwark of Christianity for more than eighteen centuries, and her children should be allowed to practice their religion without interference.

END OF THE WORLD DELUSIONS.

On Sunday, the 5th inst., the female members of the Swedish Evangelical church in Hyde Park, Chicago, had a great disappointment. It had been announced by the parson, O. H. Larson, that on that day would occur the general resurrection, and the ascension of the just to heaven, and for six months the congregation, who are mostly women, had prayed together for several hours each night to prepare for the great event. When the appointed day arrived, as the hour of the Resurrection was not known, thirty-five girls and women of the congregation assembled in the church at an early hour, and waited all day and far into the night, even past midnight, for the expected ascent, until they found that they had been deceived; then, tired out with their long watch, they returned to their homes a very much disappointed company.

It is now admitted by the minister that he made a mistake in his calculations as to the day when the Resurrection and Ascension should take place; but it is supposed that another day will be appointed for the great event.

Mr. Larson, the minister in question, is only following the example set by the celebrated Lutheran minister, Jurien, who, as early as the sixteenth century, several times fixed a date for the end of the world and the general judgment. He claimed the right which his master, Luther, declared to belong to all true Christians, the right of interpretation of the Scriptures according to his individual conception of them, and by this means he maintained that he had discovered the exact day for the consummation of all things on earth. Finding that he and his thousands of deluded followers were deceived when the appointed day arrived, he fixed another date with a like result. He lived long enough to find a similar disappointment for the third time, yet he was not discouraged in his prophecies even by this. He fixed a fourth date for the event, but this time the day was so far ahead that he died before it came, so that only his followers met with the disappointment on this last occasion.

It is a favorite practice with sensationalist preachers to fix a date for the end of the world. This draws attention to them and advertises them extensively, and they find thousands of followers among those naturally inclined to superstition. About three years ago a Philadelphia Second Adventist caused several hundred of his dupes to sell their property and go up a high hill, from which they might be ready to ascend to heaven when the expected moment should arrive, and it is within the memory of many of our

readers that one Miller, who foretold the end of the world for a certain day, had thousands of followers all over the United States and Canada. These were known as Millerites. Of course, when the day came there was, as usual, a disappointment, and the sect gradually disappeared, notwithstanding the efforts of missionaries who perambulated the country, preaching in the groves and squares, for the purpose of keeping up the excitement.

It is needless to say that recruits for these sensationalist sects were obtained from all the Protestant denominations. We have never heard that any Catholics were deceived into joining them. Catholics, as a general rule, are preserved from such superstitions by the teaching of the Church, which is the pillar and ground of truth, according to the inspired Apostles.

The celebrated Dr. Cummins, of Dublin, one of the most anti-Catholic of Protestant clergymen, was also a dabbler in prophecies which were never fulfilled. Such nonsense is, however, always sure to secure a good congregation among some of the Protestant sects, just as Dr. Wild's fancies about the lost tribes of Israel, together with his violent and rabid diatribes against Popery make him a most popular preacher in "enlightened Toronto."

MCCARTHYITE PARSONS.

The announcement has been made that the notorious Rev. Dr. Douglas, of Montreal Methodist Seminary, is to be one of the speakers at the proposed McCarthyite convention which, according to present indications, is to be held in Toronto some time in December for the purpose of organizing the new or third political party.

With a view to ascertain the truth of the announcement a representative of an eastern journal called upon the doctor, but though the latter was very free in expressing his views he does not seem to have declared positively that he will take part in the convention. With the principles enunciated by Mr. McCarthy, however, he appears to be in full accord, and the impression generally accepted by the public is that he will be one of the great guns at the convention.

At this we are not at all surprised. Dr. Douglas proved by his speeches at the Tilsenburgh Methodist conferences, year after year, that he is always ready to revile Catholics, for no other reason than because of their religion. Our readers will remember that he denounced Sir John Thompson's acceptance of the premiership on the plea that he is a Jesuit. In this, of course, he displayed his ignorance; but it is well understood that the real objection is the Premier's religion. The doctor now, in the published interview, declares that "he is as strongly opposed to the fiscal as to the religious policy of the Thompson Government."

What is this religious policy? We are not aware that the Government of the Dominion has any religious policy whatsoever. Religion is a matter for men to settle with God without the intervention of Government.

On the Manitoba school question, Dr. Douglas pronounces very decisively against the liberty to Catholics to educate their children as they desire in the Catholic faith. He declares against any dogmatic teaching in schools, and he is willing even to sacrifice what Protestants usually insist upon strongly—the reading of the Bible in the schools—the object being plainly to deprive Catholics of their freedom of education, not only in Manitoba, but throughout the Dominion. Were it not for this he would denounce the absence of the Bible from schools as loudly as any of his brother ministers.

He wishes ethics to be inculcated, as if it were possible to do this on a solid basis without dogmatic teaching. On what principle can we insist upon a code of morals, unless there be a God to whom we are responsible, and unless God has revealed his law to mankind? And if He has revealed that law, it is necessary to know who has authority to enforce it. Hence ethics cannot be properly taught unless they be based upon the whole body of Christian doctrine.

Dr. Douglas says: "The Ten Commandments and the Sermon on the Mount are quite sufficient, and upon some such common ground Christians could, and should, agree upon a national educational system against which the charge of Godless schools could not be justly made."

A mere smattering of Christianity can never be a sufficient basis for Christian ethics, and the question is not what Dr. Douglas thinks upon this

subject, but what is deemed necessary by parents, on whom God has imposed the duty of educating their children fully in the things they ought to know.

The doctor seems to be entirely astray in his conception of Archbishop Ireland's "Faribault Plan." He says:

"I believe the time will come when Catholics, emancipating themselves from the influence of the clergy, will abandon sectarianism in educational affairs. The tendencies of the times are all in that direction. This is proved by the liberal attitude of Cardinal Gibbons and Archbishop Ireland, and their liberal action was generously met by the Protestants of the United States. In all the Common schools inaugurated on the Faribault Plan, the rights of Catholic teachers are recognized and when they are properly qualified they are engaged everywhere."

Such is not the case. The everywhere dwindles down to comparatively few localities where the Protestants have been liberal enough to tolerate the Faribault Plan. Even in Faribault itself, and Stillwater, the localities where Archbishop Ireland adopted this plan at first, the Protestant ministers and the Apapists would not permit it to be carried to successful operation and the Catholics were compelled to return to the system of Parochial schools as the only means whereby they could secure for their children the education which they conscientiously believe they should give them.

The Faribault plan may work fairly well in some places where Protestants are imbued with the broad principles of toleration and justice, but it could never be carried out where men are actuated by the spirit manifested for years past by Dr. Douglas and his political leader, Mr. D'Alton McCarthy. The separate school system as we have it in Ontario works fairly well, being founded upon the just principle of apportioning the public funds equitably to all who contribute towards them. There are some details which in all justice should be amended, but the principle itself cannot be given up for the precarious Faribault Plan, which Archbishop Ireland favors in some places on the principle that where full justice cannot be obtained, it is sometimes expedient to accept half.

Another of Mr. McCarthy's clerical lieutenants is Dr. Wild of Toronto. At the Stratford McCarthy meeting he brought up anew the old story of Romish aggression in the Jesuit Estates Act of Quebec. It has been shown over and over again that this was simply an act of tardy justice to a virtuous and zealous missionary and educational order of priests. Dr. Wild showed his usual intolerant spirit throughout his speech, which he concluded by telling his auditors that "we want no Pope in Canada, and we do not want a large portion of the people of this country to accept dictation from a foreign authority."

To this we need only say that we are not prepared to accept dictation from Reverend Dr. Wild as to the character of the religion we shall believe in.

It is a curious fact that Methodist and Congregational preachers, who are loudest in their professions of love for civil and religious liberty, are the most anxious to deprive Catholics of that liberty. They have also always in their mouths a denunciation of Jesuits and other Catholic priests for aiming at political power, yet we find that they are themselves the principal meddlers in politics. The Catholic priesthood are too much occupied with their spiritual duties to compete in political meddlings with these disturbers of the peace. Nevertheless we can assure these demagogues that Catholics are sufficiently on the alert to maintain their rights.

THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY ON NOVELTIES.

The Archbishop of Canterbury, while making his visitation at Ashford on the 10th inst., declared it to be "more than weakness to pursue novelties and trivialities to our very altars, such as Romanism never knew until after the Church had dismissed even older and more sober inventions, and had with valor and ability fought her way back to an untarnished standard."

He added that "Large-minded men might be amused, yet surely would be indignant at being assured that 1,200 Roman Catholic Bishops had refused to admit the validity of English orders. Such a refusal contained no argument whatever."

We can only wonder that an ecclesiastical dignitary of learning, who claims to fill the episcopal chair of St. Augustine and a St. Anselm, should utter such incomprehensible nonsense, and that being uttered, the representatives of the Associated Press should deem it worth their while to telegraph it to this side of the Atlantic.

What means this "pursuing novelties and trivialities to our very altars?" The only meaning we can conceive which the Archbishop had in view is that certain "advanced Ritualists," or High Churchmen, being convinced that the whole testimony of antiquity is to the effect that Christ in instituting

the Holy Eucharist at His last supper, instituted a sacrifice which is to be offered up by the priests of the New Law, have introduced into the Church of England the practice of "saying Mass," and have adopted vestments somewhat similar to those used in the Catholic Church when Mass is celebrated. Indeed there is no doubt that such is his meaning, for he evidently refers to the trite contention of the Evangelical party just as it was recently proclaimed by Archdeacon Farrer.

Apart from the fact that the Anglican clergy are not validly ordained priests, and are therefore incapable of offering up the holy sacrifice of the Mass, there is neither novelty nor triviality in these practices as found in the Catholic Church. The novelty is in Anglicanism, which abolished the usages of fifteen centuries and substituted rites of its own. The Ritualists are aiming at the restoration of ancient rites and doctrines which will make their liturgies and religion resemble somewhat those of the Primitive Church, even though the resemblance be but crude and imperfect.

That the Mass as a sacrifice is no novelty is sufficiently evident from the early history of the Church in all nations. It was the oft expressed desire of St. Monica, the pious mother of St. Augustine, that her son should become a priest that he might be able to offer the holy sacrifice for the repose of his mother's soul after her death.

The dogma that the Mass is truly a sacrifice is taught by the Fathers of the Church with the greatest unanimity. To say nothing of the Roman liturgy, which teaches this unequivocally, the liturgy of St. James, which is much used in the East, has these words: "We offer to thee the unbloody sacrifice for our sins and for the ignorances of the people," and again, after the consecration, "We offer to thee this awful and unbloody sacrifice, O Lord, that thou mayst not deal with us according to our sins, nor repay us according to our iniquities, but that thou mayst blot out the sins of us thy servants beseeching thee, and deal with us according to thy great and unspeakable mercy and love for mankind."

Words similar to these occur in all the liturgies which have ever been in use among the Christian Churches, whether Catholic, Schismatical, or heretical, previously to the Protestant Reformation, proving conclusively that the Sacrifice of the Mass is a doctrine which dates back to the days of the Apostles. There is not a single liturgy which teaches the modern Protestant doctrine on this subject.

We shall add here only the testimony of St. Cyril of Jerusalem, whose evidence is peculiarly valuable, because he occupied that primal See which is the centre from which flowed the faith of the Eastern Church. It is a testimony that the faith of the East equally with that of the West was firmly fixed in the belief that the Mass is a true sacrifice for the living and the dead.

"By this sacrifice (thusia) of propitiation we pray God for the peace of the whole Church, for the right rule of the world, for the emperors, for our soldiers and companions, for those afflicted with sickness, or pressed down by afflictions, and for all who need help. We pray and offer this victim for all."

Now as regards the ceremonies and vestments used at Mass, it cannot be overlooked that according to all liturgies, whether Eastern or Western, such ritual usages were always commanded; and many of them are cited by ancient ecclesiastical writers as having been handed down from the Apostles. They are, therefore, neither novel nor trivial. They are used to excite devotion and reverence for so sacred a function as the holy sacrifice of the Mass, and the Church in employing them follows the example which God Himself set in the Old Law in prescribing the ceremonies of each species of sacrifice, and describing the vestments to be used by Aaron and the other priests. He insists that they shall be fashioned with glory and beauty. Their use is therefore neither novel nor trivial.

But the Archbishop of Canterbury seems to forget that even the Anglicans of the Book of Common Prayer has a Ritual, plain it may be, still a ritual upon which it insists on the plea that the Church has authority to define such things for the sake of order and decorum. If a man deemed it worth their while to telegraph it to this side of the Atlantic. What means this "pursuing novelties and trivialities to our very altars?" The only meaning we can conceive which the Archbishop had in view is that certain "advanced Ritualists," or High Churchmen, being convinced that the whole testimony of antiquity is to the effect that Christ in instituting

Church and by the Highest of Anglican Churchmen.

In reference to the validity of Anglican Orders, though His Grace makes little of the refusal of 1,200 Catholic Bishops to recognize them, it is no slight evidence to the usage of the whole Christian Church that all the Bishops unite in the belief that Anglican Orders lack the essential characteristic of Apostolicity. But if anything more is to be added, it is to be found in the fact that the 500 Oriental Schismatical Bishops reject them with equal unanimity. We know that Anglicans generally view the situation with feelings far different from those of mere amusement, as the Archbishop pretends.

Another novelty to which we feel bound to draw the attention of our readers is the fact that His Grace uses the term altar as applied to the Anglican communion-table. What is an altar? The word used in the Greek New Testament with this meaning is thusiasterion, the place of sacrifice. It implies, therefore, that on the Christian altar sacrifice is offered. How can the Archbishop of Canterbury and Archdeacon Farrer justify their use of the term altar in contradiction to this Apostolic usage? "We have an altar," i. e., a place of sacrifice. How can these Anglican dignitaries claim to be of the Apostolic religion when they maintain that they have no sacrifice? Truly they will find plenty of novelty and triviality to condemn without going beyond their own doctrines and practices.

OUR DEPARTED ONES.

It is to be hoped that all Catholic shall remember during the month of November, that in another world, which they may see with the eyes of faith, there are thousands of suffering souls appealing to them for assistance. It is their sacred duty, and few are there, we ween, so heartless as to neglect it. The Catholic doctrine that we may help our departed friends, that we may in the guise of prayer visit them and care for them as fondly as when they worked or played or lived with us, has been often derided by Protestants as the figment of a sickly imagination. And yet what truth appeals so convincingly to human reason? That instinct that has lived in the heart of humanity always and in all places, of assisting those who are separated from us by the abyss of death, has been crystallized by the Church in her teaching of prayers for the dead.

Our separated brethren, in denouncing this "superstition," as they term it, take much care to impress upon their auditors that it is thoroughly opposed to the customs of the early Church. This species of argument is used with effect when dealing with persons who have never seen the outside of a book relating to that period of Christianity, but it is useless when proffered to those who have from one source or another gleaned information regarding the teaching of early Catholicity. Their contention has not even the equivocal merit of novelty. Back in the fourth century we find Arius declaring that "the prayers and alms of the living did the dead no good." Surely Protestants do not appeal to the heresiarch! This heresy was refuted by St. Epiphanius, who wrote that this Church "has the tradition from Christ that prayers are profitable, though they do not extinguish all sins."

Terullian says of a faithful widow: "She both prays for him and begs a refreshment for him in the meantime and keeps his anniversaries. For unless she does these things she has repudiated her husband as far as in her lies."

St. Cyril writes thus: "Lastly, we pray for all that die amongst us; thinking it to be the greatest help that can be to their souls to have the holy and dreadful sacrifice of the altar offered in supplication for them." (Cat. Mystag. 5, page 241.)

The Fathers of the third, fourth and fifth centuries maintain that prayer and alms-giving refresh and benefit the souls detained in purgatory, and declare it to be a teaching sanctioned by Christ and His Apostles. In the Catacombs there are many proofs that supplication for the departed was believed in by the early Christians.

A TRUE PICTURE.

The Toronto Mail is being estimated at its proper value by its contemporaries. Not being able to find a resting-place in either of the great political parties, for reasons best known to itself, it hoisted the no-Popery flag and made a constituency amongst the narrow-minded bigots of the Province. The following extract from the St. Thomas Journal, edited by a stalwart, honest Protestant gentleman, Mr. James Brierley, gives a plain and truthful picture of the Mail's tactics:

"If there is one paper more than another in this province which has sought to divide the people on lines of religion, it is the Toronto Mail, which has, ever since its great flop, found anti-Romanism the one policy to which it could steadfastly adhere. Probably this has been due to the fact that no paper of

person has sought to deprive visible prominence as a distinctive possession. It possesses a distinctive variety of its own. Our party has lost no opportunity the Mowat Government denominated National Favoritism, it has sought to take advantage, prejudice and timidity. For a paper with such an aim to charge the police being the cause of the rise of Protective Association is certainly a unique quality of nerve."

BIGOTRY REBELLION.

It is a great pleasure to many and Christian by a portion of the press in regard to the wave of gripe like, which is now us. The Brockville Review particularly commends respect. Some time since lists against Mrs. Sheppard brought suit against it, "jured" her character." However, withdrawn a ment, but she caused the paper a great deal preparing their case. The Recorder in the county fruit, for in the abundance this woman's come unprofitable.

The Recorder has no mention to the P. P. A., its issue of the 16th inst. reference to it as well as a showman, Dr. Will

Considerable adverse made on the utterances Toronto, who said in addition at Stratford that "the fact when a man became a Roman religion made him ugly a. Of course it was a very to make, and one who man of Dr. Wild's intelligence then it is just as a piece of Protestant Protective is being worked for all it Ontario. The people who not only affirm their belief Catholics are bad, but the very bad, so bad indeed that tion is taken by every man in will not vote for a Roman office, nor will he give a member of that Church. hostility is declared by all to everything with a Roman, and the test of me who aspires to enter its ranks must be prepared to wear wherever he sees it. Warfare, but it is not neither is it fair, honest or

The sentiments of gentleman who edits to be commended, a country over will their hour of persecution the courage to publish. Many more, no doubt, does, but are too timid in the pursuit of a man out, gentleman; you fear from exhibitions norance, falsehood and

CATHOLICS IN EMPLOY.

The chief character A. orator is falsehood; principal organizer, H. W. onto, is a man eminent position he occupies. Forest, the other day. "The bestowal of a reward Peter Ryan, of Toronto, who he gave of the way got more than they were. The following official in the Globe on Saturday Protestants and 9 C position of registrar which proves that grammes is not equal that he is not honored, Another orator, a M we are told in the re "Then went on to asserting that they going to the appointment Sheriff of Oxford."

As there are in the tario forty-one Pro Catholics holding the we will merely say whether either did not know ing about or made statement—probably society of which he built on a foundation. We give the G and it will prove ver ing matter for the all along misled by

In order to correct made in the public r to the number of Cath Ontario Government statement has been p ment, giving the of Protestants and Ca the salaries paid, w salary. The statement by each department: Executive Council an

Depart Officers and clerks 11 Protestants, with 2 Catholics, with sal ing. Depu Administrat Officers and clerks 53 Protestants, with ing. 7 Catholics, with sal ing.

Depu Department Officers, clerks and parment of Education Mod. Sch. Sch. Practical Science, with the Department