

The Catholic Record.

Published Weekly at 181 and 183 Richmond street, London, Ontario.

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

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

REV. WILLIAM FLANNERY, THOMAS COFFEY.

Publisher and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY, MESSRS. LOKE, KING, JOHN NICH, P. J. NEVEN 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, acute measurement.

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

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

Persons writing for a change of address should invariably send the name of their former post office.

London, Saturday, August 22, 1891.

ORANGE RITUALISTS.

The Huntingdon "Gleaner" has constituted itself the champion of pure Protestantism, in denouncing the course of the Grand Orange Lodge, which during its session recently held in Kingston had a funeral service at the tomb of Sir John Macdonald.

The "Gleaner" is an ultra-Protestant journal, and, after the Montreal "Witness," was the most forward paper in the Province of Quebec in unsuccessfully endeavoring to stir up the Protestants of that Province to join in the crusade against the Jesuits on the occasion when the Ontario parsons devoted themselves to the same purpose in this Province.

The "Gleaner" now points out that it was a very un-Protestant act to hold a funeral service over a body which was seven weeks buried. It adds that Sir John was buried with the usual ritual of the Church of England, and it asks, "does the Grand Lodge consider the scriptural order of prayer of that Church so inadequate that it had to be supplemented two months afterwards by their own service?"

It is not usual for Protestants to go to the graves of their deceased friends to offer up prayers after they have been several weeks interred, so the "Gleaner" considers that the action of the Grand Lodge is an insinuation that the well-known practice of Protestants generally is an indefensible neglect of duty.

The members of the Grand Lodge are loud in the profession that they are Protestants of the most decided character, and, as the "Gleaner" says, "a little better Protestants than anybody else." As Protestants are strong on the point of demanding scriptural warrant for any religious practice, the "Gleaner" is fully justified in asking, "Where do they (the Orangemen) find warrant for offering prayers over remains already committed to the grave by the minister of an Evangelical Church? There seems, however, to be some confusion in the "Gleaner's" mind in respect to the offering up of such prayers. We do not see why it should specify the case of the recitation of prayers after the funeral service has been once performed. If prayers at a funeral service are at all praiseworthy, surely it can do no harm to repeat them, even though they have once been recited by an "Evangelical minister." We do not know of any passage of Holy Scripture which makes the prayers of an Evangelical minister of more permanent benefit than those of any just man. The apostles were, indeed, appointed by Christ to be His legitimate ministers, and St. Paul claims that they, himself included, are "the dispensers of the mysteries of Christ," and the special prerogatives of the apostles undoubtedly pass down to their lawful successors. But the so-called Evangelical ministers make no claim to have apostolic succession. This is, indeed, one of the great differences between the Evangelicals and the High Churchmen, whom the Evangelicals detest and denounce so heartily, that the High Churchmen are alone in claiming that they possess this apostolic succession. Hence there cannot be anything in Scripture to place the prayers of Evangelical ministers in any higher rank than those of laymen.

We might inform the "Gleaner" that there is Scriptural warrant for prayers for the dead, and that no exception is made for the case when prayers have been offered by an Evangelical minister. We read in 2 Maccabees xii, 46, that "it is a holy and wholesome thought to pray for the dead that they may be loosed from their sins."

Of course we are aware that most Protestants in this country refuse to acknowledge the books of the Maccabees as Scripture, but they are quoted as such in the Church of England Homilies, which in the thirty-fifth Article of Religion are declared authoritatively

to contain "godly and wholesome doctrine."

But independently of this passage we find the people of Israel praying for Saul after his death. (1 Kings [P. Bible I Samuel] xxxi.) David did the same for Saul, Jonathan and others who were slain. (2 Ki. i, iii.)

But, of course, all this is not according to Protestantism, and the "Gleaner" very fairly brings the Orangemen to account, inasmuch as none are more loud in condemning this pious Catholic practice.

The "Gleaner" finds other reasons, however, for condemning the Grand Lodge. Sir John Macdonald joined the Orangemen when he was a young man and thoughtless, but when his judgment was more mature he ceased to keep up his connection with the order. It was certainly a piece of toadyism which deserves only contempt for the Grand Lodge to parade his membership in it under such circumstances. The "Gleaner's" interpretation of the matter is that "the singular performance at Kingston was merely designed to commit the Orangemen of the Dominion as a whole to the yoke of a political party by the worship of its late chief."

This consideration may have had some influence upon the Orange Grand officials; but it is certainly something rich that Ballykilbeg Johnson, Mayor Clarke, Mr. Clarke-Wallace, etc., should need to be lectured by their Quebec brothers of Equal Rights notoriety for imitating the Catholics in praying for the dead. Have the Orange Grand officers turned to be Ritualists? One thing, at all events, is made clear by the "Gleaner's" comments, that the Lodge funeral service was merely a travesty on religion.

WHITHER DRIFTING?

The tendency of modern Protestantism toward Rationalism at the present time is so decisive that it ought rather to be described by the word drift, as the entire system is surely and not slowly going towards utter unbelief. It is a strange metamorphosis that the sects which but a few years ago were noted for their strong belief in the supernatural, and for their firm faith in the fundamental dogmas of Christianity, should to-day be declaring that belief in dogmas is not essential to Christianity at all, but is rather an obstacle to the reception of Christian truth which they now regard as merely a philanthropy, or worship of humanity, not founded, as Christian charity really is, upon love for God, but rather upon a sentiment which exists within us, which makes us grieve when we behold our fellow-creatures suffering.

The most needful commandment of all is stated by our Lord to be "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with thy whole heart, and with thy whole soul and with thy whole mind." This He calls "the greatest and the first commandment." Love for our neighbor is put in the second place—"and the second is like to this, thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." (St. Matt. xxii, 37, 39. But Ingersollism and the form of Protestantism which is popular to-day sets aside entirely the first of these commandments, and in reality the second becomes altogether a sham, for if we take away the need of belief in God, or in God's teachings, our responsibility entirely disappears, and it is absolutely impossible to establish that we are under any obligation to love our neighbor.

This new theory of Protestantism is justly causing great alarm among those in the different sects who still cling to the belief that there is such a thing as Christian truth. The sternness with which the Presbyterian General Assembly dealt with the unbelief of Dr. Briggs was so recent that our readers will remember it perfectly well; but we might as well attempt to break the power of the Niagara cataract with a paper screen as hope that the torrent of infidel thought will be arrested by the action of the conservative element in any of the important Protestant denominations. Dr. Briggs defies the whole power of the Assembly, and he is backed by the faculty of the theological seminary in which he holds his professorial chair, and he is at this moment forming the minds of the rising generation of Presbyterian clergymen. Can we doubt that their next generation will be more strongly impregnated with infidelity than the present? There may be, and there is undoubtedly, a conservative element which still adheres to some of those revealed truths which habit has taught us to believe are essential to Christianity, even in the form in which Presbyterians hold it; but St. Paul tells us that "a little leaven cor-

rupteth the whole lump." (1 Cor. v, 6, Gal. v, 9.) Can we doubt that, with the favorable circumstances under which it is operating, Presbyterianism will be leavened with the new theology, or rather, absence of theology, which is now agitating it so rudely? This new theology is already predominant in the Free Kirk of Scotland, in which of late years it has gained several decisive victories in the General Assembly. In the Established Kirk it has not yet positively prevailed, but there is not in the General Assembly the power to crush it out; and even in the milk-and-water condemnation of Dr. Briggs by that body we see the powerful influence which it wields.

We apply to the resolution of the General Assembly at Detroit the epithet "milk-and-water," because it did not even amount to a condemnation of Dr. Briggs' teachings. It merely refused to approve his being placed in a new professorial chair in the theological institution in which he is already a teacher.

The Episcopalians in the United States are already inoculated with the theology of unbelief to an alarming degree. It will be remembered that the Rev. Mr. Macquary, who was condemned for heresy, was almost sustained, the vote against him being a bare majority of one, in the ecclesiastical court which tried him. It is well known, also, that Rev. Heber Newton, of New York, has been teaching for years the doctrines for which he is now being subjected to a trial. It was an aphorism of St. Augustine that "the Church of Christ neither approves of heresy nor tolerates it by silence." The Church which has for so many years tolerated Dr. Newton's teachings must, according to this rule, be in a most pitiable state. But we are not left to mere conjecture on this subject. The recent election of Bishop Phillips Brooks to preside over the diocese of Massachusetts tells more clearly than any words of ours that the Episcopal Church of the United States is helpless to resist the encroachments of the theology of denial. Dr. Brooks has openly sympathized with Dr. Newton's teachings, and so far was this from being an obstacle to his election, there is not the least doubt it was the most powerful one of the reasons why he was placed over the Church in Massachusetts.

Dr. Brooks' election was not of merely local importance. If it were so, we might suppose that the drifting were limited to the Church in Massachusetts. But his election had to be confirmed by a two-thirds majority of the Bishops and their councils in all the dioceses of the United States. It is evident, therefore, that the taint is general. If "a little leaven corrupteth the whole lump" what are we to think of the dough which has already been two-thirds transformed into leaven?

It has hitherto been supposed that Methodism has not been affected to any great extent by the modern unbelief, but even in Canada it has felt the influence. It is not long since Professor Workman of Victoria University issued his book on Messianic Prophecy which created a terrible sensation in Methodist circles. So much was this work dreaded, that the orthodox party felt it necessary to induce Dr. Dewar, of the "Christian Guardian," to write a refutation of it which has been received with gladness by the conservative theologians among both Presbyterians and Methodists. But in spite of the fact that there is opposition to the spread of the New Theology, it is known to be working its way, and a telegram from London last week shows that the anti-dogmatic party in England have just elected a clergyman of their party to an important Wesleyan theological chair. The issue was between dogma and denial, and the latter gained the day. May we not reasonably conclude that the drift towards infidelity is becoming daily more and more irresistible?

Bishop Shanley, of Jamestown, North Dakota, was in Washington, D. C., recently. The Bishop speaks most favorably of the strong faith of the poor Indians of his diocese. He relates many incidents to show how loyal to their religion many of them are. One incident mentioned is well worth publication. One day he entered a hut, during the extreme cold weather, and found two little children pulling the warm ashes from the hearth for the purpose of rolling in them to protect themselves from freezing. On the bed was an old Indian in the agony of death. His wife was kneeling by the bed reciting the Rosary, not knowing that a priest was near. The Bishop entered unnoticed and knelt beside him. The joy of the old woman cannot be described, says the Bishop, when she realized that her husband was to receive the last sacraments before his death.

MR. PARNELL vs. THE IRISH HIERARCHY

After the crushing defeat of Mr. Parnell's candidates at Sligo and Kilkenny, it scarcely needed that which followed at Carlow to show that it is impossible he should ever again hope to be considered as the leader of the Irish Nationalist party. A few Irishmen persist in accepting him as their only possible leader; but it is true everywhere in a constitutionally governed country that one who has had for years the most complete confidence of the people should, under the most adverse circumstances, retain a hold upon the affections of a certain number of adherents who find it difficult to shake off that attachment to one whom they have continuously regarded as the only person qualified to lead them to a successful issue. It is not wonderful, then, that Mr. Parnell should still have followers who regard him in the light of the future deliverer of their country.

Irishmen, especially, are noted for the strength of their attachment to old friends; and there are branches of the National League which still pass resolutions of complete confidence in the ex-uncrowned king. But Carlow was, above all the Irish constituencies on which Mr. Parnell placed his hopes, the one in which he expected a most undoubted victory. But Carlow has shown that it is in line with the rest of Ireland, and it was only by means of the solid vote of Ireland's greatest enemies, the enemies of Home Rule, that the hopeless minority in which the late leader finds himself is made to appear a respectable figure.

One of the branches of the league in County Clare is reported as having passed a resolution "thanking the 1,539 brave men who voted for Mr. Kettle and the independence of the Irish party, and against the introduction of Whiggery in Irish political life." Similar resolutions have been passed by other branches too; but when the 1,000 voters are deducted who constitute part of the "English garrison," on whom Lord Salisbury and Mr. Balfour place all their hope of thwarting the wish of the people of Ireland, these brave upholders of Irish independence dwindle down to a very insignificant number.

It is a highly suggestive condition of affairs when we find Mr. Parnell's chief organ in Dublin, "United Ireland," which is his own paper, devote column upon column towards refuting the position of the Irish hierarchy. Thus a late issue of that journal tells us that "Irishmen who have thought that the path of duty in this difficult crisis was to support Mr. Parnell, will be glad to see that not one of the country papers has been intimidated by the clerical and other influences which placed Mr. Hammond at the head of the poll. On the contrary they one and all exclaim in no uncertain tone, 'No surrender! and 'No surrender is the word.'"

This is tall talking, but it will not suffice. To attain to victory, voters are needed, and Mr. Parnell has no longer the votes of the people with him. "No Surrender" may be on his lips, but when all the strongholds are captured from him, he must surrender. The whole contention of Mr. Parnell's supporters is to the effect that there is no one else in Ireland in whom the people can place confidence, no one else who has the ability, tact, and independence to lead the country to the attainment of its purposes.

It is a sorry compliment, not only to the members of the Nationalist party in Parliament to make such a pretence, but to the whole people of Ireland, and we would be sorry to believe that it is the truth. We have no wish even now to depreciate the value of Mr. Parnell's past services as leader of the Irish party down to the very moment when victory was already within sight; but at that moment he made himself the only obstacle to its attainment, and even now the only danger that lies in the way of Ireland's success is the obstinacy which he displays in insisting on being still the leader.

The revelations made in the London Divorce Court were bad enough. They made it impossible that a nation with any medium of self-respect should any longer regard him as its chief representative; and even though a Protestant nation under the circumstances might possibly have done so, a pure-minded Catholic people could not occupy so degraded a position. The supposition that the sham marriage which he afterwards contracted with Mrs. O'Shea should rehabilitate his moral character is too absurd to be refuted seriously. This farcical event only made the impossibility greater.

Mr. Parnell's paper continues to

parade the fact that at its first meeting after the decision of the divorce court, the Irish party sustained him against all assailants. * This is quite true, and we think it was a grave error of judgment; but as no one pretends that the party were infallible at that particular time, they could not be irrevocably bound by such a decision. At all events, Mr. Parnell was leader only because the party sustained him; and when they ceased to do so, he lost all right to that position and his persistence in still claiming the right to lead in spite of the decision of his party is of itself sufficient to condemn him.

There were, however, some considerations which palliated, if they did not altogether excuse, the party for adhering to Mr. Parnell at the moment when the divorce court revelations were made. These need not be discussed here, except to say that they arose out of the generosity of the Irish heart which would not reconcile itself into accepting as true any aspersion on the chosen leader of the people, until at least a chance had been given him for explanations. Too much confidence was placed on Mr. Parnell's ability to vindicate himself from the accusations made against him, and he was generously given all the benefit of the doubtful position in which he was placed.

But, certainly, there is no excuse or justification for the continued attacks of Mr. Parnell's organ on the united Episcopacy of Ireland. Where the choice is between Mr. Parnell and His Grace the Archbishop of Dublin, the public will very readily know which to prefer. We cannot characterize as less than impertinence such language as the following, which we find in a recent number of "United Ireland" in reference to the venerated Archbishop:

"After many shufflings, evasions, apologies, and excuses, Dr. Walsh has at last come before his countrymen and defended his attitude on the question of the Irish leadership."

This style of speaking of His Grace will not improve Mr. Parnell's position before the people of Ireland. They will not be thus easily brought to believe that the Archbishop desires to betray them, and as it is well known that Mr. Parnell indicates the course which the editors of "United Ireland" are pursuing, he will be held responsible for such language, which can only have the effect of destroying utterly any lingering respect which may have remained for him in the minds of the public, in spite of the ridiculous and disgraceful circumstances which made necessary his deposition from the leadership.

It is Mr. Parnell's wish to break up the alliance between Mr. Gladstone and the Nationalist party. Why should the divorce court proceedings be the cause of such a disruption? Is it because Mr. Gladstone's high character for morality would not allow him to hold intercourse with Mr. Parnell, that Ireland must suffer? It is better by far that Mr. Parnell should be laid aside than that the just cause of Ireland should be lost through his misconduct. If he had the cause of Ireland at heart more than his own ambitious plans he would at once have made the sacrifice of himself when he became placed in such a position that he could not be communicated with honorably by an ally whose character is above suspicion.

It is very easy for Mr. Parnell to say that Ireland must not be dictated to by English Whigs; but after all the cause of Ireland cannot be gained for many years at least without the co-operation of some great English party. It is, therefore, absurd to say that the ambition of a man who has brought himself into his present disgraceful position should stand in the way of success, simply for the sake of hurling defiance into the teeth of the Liberals.

The statements of Archbishop Walsh in reply to an American reporter, and to which reference is made in the extract given above from "United Ireland," is an able summary of the reasons why Mr. Parnell cannot be Ireland's leader any longer, altogether apart from the relations of Ireland to the Liberal party of England; and the fact that the course indicated by His Grace is the only one which can be adopted, if the alliance with the Liberals is to be continued, certainly does not weaken, if it does not strengthen, His Grace's contention. But His Grace is not alone in his view. The whole Irish Episcopate without exception, twenty-seven Archbishops and Bishops, have spoken with one voice on this subject, in the pronouncement recently issued at Maynooth. Surely, if any men are entitled to say what is proper under the existing circumstances, these are the men to do so.

EDITORIAL NOTES

A RECENT issue of the New York Tribune finds faults with the Pope and accuses him of intolerance and of not keeping up with the enlightened character of the age, because he is endeavoring to keep religious orders to the "stringent and severe regulations drawn up by their founders, but from which the members have gradually emancipated themselves." Yet there has been no complaint more constantly made against the religious orders than that they have fallen away from the strict laws under which they were originally established. It is hard to please those who are determined to find fault. Fault is found with the orders which become relaxed, and fault is equally found with the Pope for restoring the primitive regulations.

Mr. BALFOUR stated recently in an address to the Primrose League that the next general election will take place on the new voters' roll which is now being prepared. This assertion is understood to mean that the election will take place in 1892.

SISTER MARIA CAPRINI, who was a prisoner in the hands of the Mahdi for eight years, having been captured at El Obeid, and having escaped from his power in company with another Sister, both of whom stained their faces in order to pass as negroes, intends to return again to Africa as a missionary, notwithstanding the terrible sufferings she endured while in the Mahdi's power. At one time all the members of the community who were captured were summoned before the Mahdi, and were ordered to be decapitated because they refused to abjure Christianity, but the Mahdi changed his mind on entering into conversation with them, and they were sent back to prison after being stripped of their clothing. But it is impossible to intimidate these heroic ladies.

ANOTHER by-election was held at Walsall, Stafford County, England on the 12th inst, for the seat left vacant by the death of Sir Chas. Forester, Liberal. The Gladstonian candidate, Ald. Holden, a thorough Home Ruler, was elected by a majority of 538, the vote standing: F. Jameg, Conservative, 4,951; Ald. Holden, Liberal, 4,899. In 1885, before the Home Rule issue was before the electors, the Liberals had had a majority of 1,877 in the constituency. This is the 89th by-election held since 1886. The Tories held 63 and the Liberals 26 of the seats thus thrown open for a new contest. Of these 89 seats, the Tories have lost 29 which they held before, and the Liberals 1, so that they are now represented by 44 Tories and 45 Liberals. Sir William Harcourt in a recent speech delivered before the National Liberal Club, commenting on the Liberal gains at these by-elections, pointed out that in the 88 seats which had been contested up to the time when his speech was delivered, 375,000 votes had been cast, giving a popular majority of 15,000 to the Liberals, whereas at the elections of 1886, 325,000 votes had been cast, giving in the same constituencies a majority of 9,000 to the Conservatives. His inference is that the Salisbury Government will be routed at the coming general election.

The Rev. Joseph Cook is in great alarm at the progress made by the Catholic Church, in the number and influence of her members in all parts of the United States. He asserted recently that the Jesuits will control the next presidential election. If this be true, it does not appear that the lectures which he and Fulton have been delivering all over the country have had much effect upon the common sense people who predominate, except in the way of making them disgusted with all such mountebanks who go about creating dissension. It is only a couple of months since Mr. Cook declared before a small but select audience in Montreal that "the Jesuit party determine the succession of Premiers at Ottawa. The Jesuits trouble the rev. gentlemen to an amazing degree."

The oldest church in Louisiana, which is the Church of St. Francis in Pointe Coupee parish, is in danger of being washed away, together with its graveyard, by the Mississippi. Measures are being taken to remove the church, and subscriptions are being collected to protect the remains of one of the most distinguished men of the State—Julien Poydras, the first delegate of Louisiana Territory to Congress, and of President of the convention which framed the Constitution of Louisiana when it became a State in 1812. The memory of President Poydras is preserved in the name of the town of Poydras, twelve or thirteen miles from New Orleans.

ARCHDIOCESE

Daily British W

In the presence blage, yesterday Archbishop Cleary stone of the new with the House of was assisted by Williams, Spratt, G and Keough.

Previous to the sion moved from the tion of the new tets of Charity w lowed by altar bo Archbishop in the official robes. T lines on the lawn, and priests went to the special service His Grace had cross sides with a trowe formed and walked sprinkled the ston

On returning to th the corner-stone. by 2 feet 1 inch, an

In conclusion His brief address in w would bless them building a house people, for those w lives in working their health and reason of their s friends in the wo God pressed upon people, and they care of their frie sisters. This hot over by good Sis

house of happiness will be lightened, where they will f and learn to lov and be taught to k Jesus Christ, who the future. May the inmates, and charge of the pool

The new buildi 88 feet by 56 he heated by wo electricity will l The plans, draw lands, show that will be a kitche dining room fo invalids' room 23 6 in. The ceiling The ground floor dormitory 30x52 feet; reception small reception r by 14 feet and a 14 feet ceilings

The first floor women's apartme dormitory 35x55 26x18 feet (du from the baseme feet; four recept 6 inches by 35 12x14 feet each rooms 12x18 fo

In the second dormitories, to l Two of them wil 6 inches, one 2 one 41 feet 6 inches; Cellu An attic will b purposes, and l will furnish the all the modern s On the outside, he two large li depth of the H north of the H which it is cor marble, with ir ing will be roo The main entrance columns of Cle named with s solely cut sunc on it. The sty cess of the builc 000.

The following tion on the cor Has Sorocru Christi paure fractis et corp necnon orph insiduat, E deserviant, P Archiepus, Ki ritibus exorcis MDCCCXCI.

Archbishop C Special to On Saturda Grace, the A arrived in Gay purpose of d new Church of stone of the ne the church, f from Kingst H. Folger, vited His G own vehic Mr. Folger app were met by O'Gorman, dr horses, whilst the visiting c C. H. Gauth the Rev. Jo the Rev. T. New York Gynn, Brew T. Kelly, Se members of a grand of bands of G scene of w ing strains at the presby fied that the congregation Accordingly, beautiful n stearnars, l