

The Catholic Record.

Published Weekly at 181 and 183 Richmond street, London, Ontario.
Price of Subscription—\$1.00 per annum.

REV. GEORGE H. NOTHGRAVES,
Author of "Mistakes of Modern Infidelity."
THOMAS COFFEY,
Publisher and Proprietor, Thomas Coffey.

Agents: Luke King, John Nigh, P. J. Neven and Miss Sarah Hanley are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transact all other business for THE CATHOLIC RECORD.
Agent for Newfoundland, Mr. James Power of St. John's.

Rates of Advertising—Ten cents per line each insertion, space measurement.
Approved and recommended by the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa and St. Boniface, the Bishops of London, Hamilton, Peterborough, and Oshawa, 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 Monday morning. When subscribers change their residence it is important that the old as well as the new address be sent us.
Subscribers when changing their address should notify this office as soon as possible in order to insure the regular delivery of their paper.
Agents or collectors have no authority to stop your paper unless the amount due is paid. Matter intended for publication should be mailed in time to reach London not later than Monday morning. Please do not send us poetry, culinary and marriage notices sent by subscribers must be in a condensed form, to insure insertion.

LETTER OF RECOMMENDATION.
UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA.
Ottawa, Canada, March 7th, 1904.
The Editor of THE CATHOLIC RECORD,
London, Ont.

Dear Sir: For some time past I have read your estimable paper, THE CATHOLIC RECORD, and congratulate you upon the manner in which it is published.
Its matter and form are both good; and a which it is published.
Therefore, with pleasure, I can recommend it to the faithful.
Blessing you and wishing you success.
Believe me to remain,
Yours faithfully in Jesus Christ,
D. FALCONER, Arch. of Ottawa.

LONDON, SATURDAY, OCT. 29, 1904.

THE CHURCH UNION MOVEMENT.

Several times, while commenting upon the movement which appears to have become very popular in the Presbyterian, Methodist and Congregational churches, to unite into one body organically, we have pointed out that such a union cannot be effected without a departure from their doctrinal teaching on the part of two at least of the organizations thus uniting, and probably of all three. We have noted that the three denominations have at the present time differences of belief in regard to doctrines which are held to be revealed by God. To unite these denominations, it will be necessary for all either to accept as revealed doctrines which some of these denominations believe to be contrary to the revealed truth, or to reject what some believe to have been revealed.

The purpose for which Christ established a Church on earth was that His truth should be preached and taught to all nations, inasmuch as the Apostle St. Paul declares: "We have spoken all things to you in truth," (2 Cor. vii. 14) and Christ promises that "the Spirit of truth shall come and teach" the pastors of His Church, the Apostles, "all truth;" (St. Jno. xvi. 13) and the purpose of this is that they may "teach all nations all things whatsoever He has commanded." (St. Matt. xxviii. 19.) Certainly they will not fulfil the end for which the Church of Christ was instituted if they ignore or barter away a single truth which Christ has taught and commanded to be taught.

The truths of the Christian religion are so connected with and so dependent upon each other, that the denial of one doctrine interferes destructively with the whole plan of salvation, and the Church which is ready to barter away some revealed truths for the sake of wheedling men to accept other teachings, or of extending the number of its adherents, betrays the trust committed to it by Christ, to contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the Saints." (St. Jude 3.)

Our view of the case is not without its champions even among the denominations which have seemed bent upon effecting a union.

At a meeting of the alumni of Knox College, which took place in Toronto at the end of September, the Rev. Principal Caven gave an address in which the points in favor of union were set forth ably; but notwithstanding the eloquence of the speaker, he failed to impress the alumni with the desirability of the movement. Professors Gregg and McLaren, Rev. D. C. Hossack and others declared that even if such a union as is proposed be desirable, it is impracticable at present, and the Presbyterian Church would have to give up more than she could afford should she take such action, and this was the general opinion of the meeting, composed of some of the most eminent Presbyterian divines in Canada.

The Rev. Principal Caven declared that on the question of Church government there is now really no cause for dispute between Methodists and Presbyterians, as the ministry of the Methodists is now essentially Presbyterian. In this respect, it must be admitted that, so far as Canada is concerned, Dr. Caven is correct, for though Methodism was originally Episcopal, it has entirely ceased to be so in this country. In the United States Methodism is now nominally Episcopal, but all who are acquainted with the facts of

the case know that Bishops were appointed there, not as an order in the clergy instituted by Christ, but as a convenient rank in the government of the Church, instituted by the Church itself at a recent date for the better preservation of order in so large an organization. In fact, Methodism holds that there is no inspired or divinely imposed Church polity, and therefore it may be said that Dr. Caven is correct in stating that there is no essential difference between the two denominations in the matter of Church government.

Dr. Caven recognizes that there will be greater difficulty in arranging the matter of Church government, with the Congregationalists.

The Congregationalists arise from the old sect which in the time of Oliver Cromwell was known as the Independents, and its palmary principle is that each congregation is independent in itself both as regards Church discipline and doctrine. When it was proposed in 1833 to establish a general Congregational Union for England and Wales, the difficulty of establishing such a union on the basis of independence of congregations was recognized. Nevertheless, a union was effected, and a creed adopted, rather as a means of informing the members what was the general belief, than as a standard to which all should adhere. It was expressly stated that

"It is not intended that the following statement should be put forth with any authority, or as a standard to which assent should be required. Disallowing the utility of creeds and articles of religion as a bond of union, and protesting against subscription to any human formularies as a term of communion, Congregationalists are yet willing to declare for general information what is commonly believed among them, reserving to every one the most perfect liberty of conscience."

It must be plain to a candid reader that with a creed like this, which is changeable from day to day, there could not be any reasonable union with either Methodists or Presbyterians who have a fixed belief. Nevertheless the Rev. Principal Caven said that he did not anticipate any great difficulty from this point.

He states further three indispensable conditions for union, the most important of which is undoubtedly that "the doctrinal formula must be drawn up so that the truths of God shall not suffer."

But how can such a formula be drawn up, while the Presbyterians believe that election and reprobation are truths of God, while the Methodists deny these doctrines, and the Congregationalists leave each person free to believe or reject these and all other doctrines as they see fit?

Professor Gregg said that he appreciated so highly Principal Caven's address, that "he disliked to express his dissent as strongly as his conscience required. In his opinion it would be injurious to morality, to doctrine, and to discipline to effect the proposed union. And it was not his own opinion merely, but that of a large proportion of Methodists and others. He did not believe that the Presbyterian Church would hold together under the strain of a union, and if it were to take place there would be a split.

It was the opinion of the rev. gentleman that when Christ prayed for union, merely a spiritual union was meant. The first thing the Church needed is to be agreed within itself. Is it so agreed? He thought not. The Professors of the Presbyterian colleges are not always teaching doctrines in harmony with the Church, not in harmony with the Bible, to say nothing of the Confession of Faith. Half of the Old Testament is regarded by them as not the Word of God, but as the work of men of whom nothing is known. If there should be union, the doctrinal door would have to be made wide enough to admit all sorts of theology, and the speaker thought it was time to pause.

The Rev. Professor McLaren spoke to similar effect. The Westminster Confession to which the Presbyterian Church has always adhered is strongly Calvinistic, and was drawn up expressly to exclude Arminian doctrine. If the people knew what is involved in union, they would be slow to give it their confidence. It might be possible to draw up a formula of creed so vague that each Church could interpret it according to taste, but the only result of this would be greater friction than ever before.

The Rev. J. W. Pedley, of the Western Congregational Church, stated that the question of union had been thoroughly discussed by his denomination, and there was a feeling that union would mean the abandonment of the essential features of Congregationalism. He would be willing to make such an abandonment if thereby greater Christian unity can be obtained.

The Rev. J. A. Turnbull was of opinion that though union is possible and desirable, it is at present impracticable, and that the day when it can be accom-

plished is still far off.

It is to be regretted that there was no allusion to the only means by which Christian unity can be effected and made permanent, which is by submission to the authority with which the Catholic Church is invested by God as the one fold to which our divine Saviour wishes to bring all His sheep, the Catholic Church, having the successor of St. Peter as its head and teacher.

The chief reason which seems to inspire those who wish to bring about a union appears to be that such a union will make the united body a greater power in the land, and will enable the three Churches concerned to do their work more economically. We have no doubt that such would be the case if a union of hearts and souls were effected; but we fear, and indeed we feel certain that such a union would be effected only at the sacrifice of the Christian truths which these denominations still retain. The benefits of union would be more than outweighed by the loss of Christian faith which would result therefrom.

THE BIBLE AND SO-CALLED HIGHER CRITICISM.

A lively discussion arose at the meeting in Montreal of the Provincial Synod of the Anglican Church on the afternoon of the 13th inst. The cause of the commotion was the opening address given by Bishop Carmichael, the Coadjutor Bishop of Montreal. The address was an eloquent and pathetic appeal to the Church to be loyal to the Bible as being the revelation of God to man, given by God for our guidance till we attain salvation.

The Bishop pointed out that in these days the Bible had been assailed and its truth questioned under the pretence that higher criticism shows that it is not the work of the authors to whom it has been attributed by Christians and Jews for a period extending to fifteen centuries before the Christian era. According to this theory the books of Moses are an invention of the time of the captivity of the Jews in Babylon, and its modern concocters succeeded in persuading the Jewish people that this was the system of religion which they had believed and accepted for many ages as God's revelation. This view of the case he regarded as an absurdity, and he appealed to the Church not to allow these views to prevail but to take its stand at the present time as in the past, on the integrity of God's word and to cling to the Holy Scripture as the ancient standard of the Faith.

Knowing that this clinging to Scripture has been the boasted principle from which from the beginning Protestantism has professed to derive its creed, we should not expect that these sentiments should have met with anything but applause, but this was not the case. At a subsequent session, the Rev. Dr. Langtry moved a resolution thanking Bishop Carmichael for his lucid and powerful sermon, and ordering that it be printed in the journal of the House.

Canon Walsh at once rose and asked Dr. Langtry to withdraw his motion, as a large number of delegates could not accept or endorse the position taken by the Bishop.

Judge Hannington approved Dr. Langtry's motion and "hoped it would not be withdrawn. If this thing is to be discussed and fought out, let us do the fighting now. I remember, when I was young there was a wave of scepticism which reached the Church and the colleges. We were then told that Noah was a myth, that the flood never took place, and that the story of the creation was all a fairy tale, and the like. Hugh Miller came with his glorious testimony of the rocks, and this did much to check the unbelief of the time. But now we have men high up in the Church of Christ who actually tell us the Bible is not inspired. These men are teachers of our young men. Infinite harm will be done if this thing goes on. (Hear, hear.) I say let the synod show its feeling in the matter by carrying Dr. Langtry's resolution unanimously. Let us know where we stand. Is the word of God which has stood for ages, by which we live, and by which many of us hope to die, to be regarded as a mere piece of literature, and this by men who are teachers in the Church? (No. No.) Then let us have a clear expression from this house."

Canon Welch, Rev. Dr. Allnat, Professor Clark, Principal Whitney, all spoke showing their sympathy with the views of the Higher Critics while the Rev. Mr. Inglis, Rev. Dyson Hague, Rural Dean Kerr, Dean Evans, Archdeacon Norton and others maintained the position taken by Bishop Carmichael and Rev. Dr. Langtry. The Higher Critics were in a minority, and finally allowed Rev. Dr. Langtry's resolution to pass unanimously, but not till they showed plainly that many of those clergy who occupy prominent positions in the Church are prepared to maintain that what has always been held by the

Church to be the word of God is not the word of God at all. It is a forgery of later date.

THE MULTITUDE OF SECTS.

The last German census reveals the fact that in that country, the cradle of Protestantism, Martin Luther's religious revolution, called by a strange euphemism "the Reformation," has been prolific of sects teaching all manner of strange doctrines. Among those which retain the name of Luther in their designation are the Evangelical Lutheran, Old Lutherans, Lutherans of the Immanuel Synod and Lutheran Free Church. There are, besides, the Established Church, which is founded on a compromise between Luther's and Calvin's teachings, Evangelical Reformed, old Reformed and Reformed, German, Hessian, French, Walloon, Helvetican and Dutch Reformed, Liberals, Anabaptists, Huguenots, Zwinglians, Waldenses and many others. These have all diversities of belief which keep them hopelessly apart, and the diversities began in Luther's own lifetime, so that he denounced most strongly the tendency among his followers to division on the most trivial pretences. But this tendency he could not suppress. Sects continued to multiply, notwithstanding his assertion of an authority to which all the Reformed should bow in submission. Why should they admit the teaching authority of one who proclaimed the right of every Christian to interpret the Bible for himself? It was an evident tyranny for Luther to claim that his followers should obey him, whereas he refused to obey the established authorities of the Church who had the authority of fifteen centuries in their favor, whereas Luther and his colleagues, the leaders of the Reform movement, had no authority from any one but themselves.

Once admit Luther's right to reform the Church of Christ, and every one can claim the same right. To no purpose did Luther quote the Acts of the Apostles ii. 47, to the effect that "the Lord added daily to the (Christian) Society or Church such as should be saved." It was answered that he himself had established a new Society, and had authorized rebellion against the Church which had existed uninterruptedly for many centuries, so he could not claim that this passage of Scripture gave him any right to rule arbitrarily the Church of God. When they were told that St. Paul condemned schisms, and commanded all to be "perfect in the same mind, and in the same judgment," he was told that if he had any application, all should submit themselves not to Luther, who was himself in revolt, but to the Catholic Church, which possessed whatever authority succession from the apostles conveyed.

But greatly divided as the followers of Luther have become in Germany, they are much more split up in the English speaking countries, as England, the United States, and Canada. In the United States one hundred and fifty sects are named on the census roll, in England about the same number, while in Canada, though the population is not nearly so large, there are one hundred and forty-two sects named, the names of some of which, we are confident, some of our readers have never even heard of. Of course our readers have heard frequently of Anglicans, Presbyterians, Methodists, Baptists, and others which have numerous congregations throughout the country; but there are beside these sects of innumerable names, and of tenets as uncouth as their names. We find Ammanites, or Aymish, Angelicals, Bethelites, Christadelphians, Divine Scientists, Donkhorists, Farringtonites, Irvingites, (who call themselves also Catholic Apostolic), Hornerites, Huguenots, Hamanians, Jude's Church, Mormons, Manicheans, Miclats, Swedenborgians, One Body, Pre-Millennials, River-Brethren, Saints of God, Salustians, Star Church, Staven Church, Syenicals, Titans, Zionists or Dowietes, etc.

We do not know how all these will justify themselves for departing from the command of St. Paul "that there be no schisms among you;" but we presume that their excuse will be similar to those given by Calvin, Luther and John Knox. As these said that the Catholic Church needed Reformation, so the great host of heresarchs found that the Reformed Churches from which they seceded were equally in need of being reformed.

CATHOLIC DEVOTIONS.

Some journals in the West have published the following telegraphic despatch, which we copy from the Kansas City Weekly Star.

A CATHOLIC PRIEST AGAINST IMAGE WORSHIP AND THE CARRYING OF BEADS.

"New York, Oct. 4.—To discontinue the veneration of images, to discard the scapular, the devotion to relics, invocation of Saints, and the carrying of beads, were the innovations suggested by an extraordinary article read by the Very Rev. Clement M. Thuente

before the Eucharistic Congress.

"The faithful leave God on the mountain and follow more symbols," he said. "The devout are too inclined to reject food of angels and accept the light food, consisting in the wearing of all kinds of scapulars, in carrying all kinds of beads, in invoking all known and unknown Saints, and in visiting all possible relics."

This statement, epitomizing as it did the sentiments of many clergymen in the United States, and lay members of the Church, made a deep impression. There was a moment's pause and applause followed.

"The question of symbols and the worship of images is one of the causes for a division of opinion between the American branch of the Catholic Church and the Continental branch."

Our attention has been called to this despatch by a subscriber in Alberta, who asks, "Is this true?"

Our readers will scarcely need to be told that there is no division of opinion between the American Church and the Continental Church on the subject of symbols and the veneration of images.

The word worship was formerly used indiscriminately to signify any honor or veneration offered to the Creator or the creature, and in accordance with this usage we frequently find the word employed especially in early English in the sense of the inferior honor paid to creatures. We find it so used in the marriage service of the Church of England, where the man, before placing the ring upon the woman's finger, says:

"With this ring I thee wed, with my body I thee worship, and with all my worldly goods I thee endow, etc."

The late Anglican Archbishop Trench speaking of this passage says:

"Clearly in our modern sense of worship, this language would be inadmissible. But worship or worshipment meant 'honor' in our early English. . . . This meaning of worship is still very harmlessly surviving in 'worshipful' and in the title of 'your worship' addressed to the magistrate on the bench."

In Shakespeare also (Julius Caesar i. 2,) we find:

"If he had done or said anything amiss, he desired their worship to think it was his infirmity."

Many similar passages could be found in authors of not very ancient date; but owing to the change which has taken place in the English language, it is not customary to use the term worship at the present day to express the relative respect which is shown to the images of Christ and His Saints. We say relative respect, because the veneration is referred entirely to the originals of those images and not to the images themselves. There is surely no more impropriety in showing this respect to Christ and His Saints, through their images, than in the respect shown to the statue of the late Queen, or King Edward VII., or to an honored statesman whose statue is erected in any of our public parks.

It is clear, therefore, that American Catholics venerate images, just as Continental Catholics do, but we do not give them the supreme or divine honor which belongs to God alone.

Father Thuente did not condemn the veneration of images, the use of scapulars and beads, the veneration of relics and invocation of Saints. On the contrary, his words as published in the report of the proceedings of the Eucharistic Congress were:

"The Church has at all times sanctioned and recommended the devotions to the Saints, the veneration of pious images and sacred relics, and the practice of wearing scapulars."

But he does warn the clergy to instruct the people that they are not to prefer the creature to the Creator, or to neglect the adoration of Christ in the Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist for the sake of a great diversity of scapulars and beads which might draw the soul from God.

We agree with Rev. Father Thuente that the people must be properly instructed in the nature of the supreme worship which is due to God, and that such worship is not to be given to creatures. We do not think, however, that this instruction is actually neglected by the priests of this continent, for the matter is clearly explained even in the little catechism which is learned by all our Catholic children. We do not think, either, that Father Thuente meant to say that there is a widespread ignorance among devout Catholic people on this subject. But the least important question is what Father Thuente's private opinion is. As a private individual he might easily be mistaken; but the matter of most importance is that proper instruction should be given to the people, and we are satisfied that this is being given by the priests in all parts of the country.

From these explanations, it will be seen that the sensational telegram sent to the Western papers grossly misrepresents the case.

Looking back on the years that have passed, how consoling it would be at the close of your life to feel that you had lived, not for passion, appetite, and the empty pleasures of the world, but for your soul, for God, for the happiness of heaven which would soon be yours to enjoy with angels in that "Paradise of Delights."

RELIGION IN ITALY.

Notwithstanding the hostile attitude which has now existed for over thirty-four years between the Government of Italy and the supreme Ruler of the Church, the last census of the kingdom makes it manifest that the Italian people as a whole still retain an unshaken love for the Catholic Church.

There is, it is true, a deplorably large number who have abandoned the faith. Nothing else could be expected where had newspapers and godless schools are maintained by the State, and so it appears that over 36,000 persons declared to the census takers that they have no religion, while so many as 94,000 refused to make any statement whatsoever concerning their religious belief.

These numbers are saddening, but with so large a population as there is in the whole kingdom, they are not really large, for the total number of Catholics is given at 41,539,000, of whom 10,608,000 are under fifteen years of age. The total number of Protestants is stated to be 65,595. Of these, 16,723 are under fifteen years. Great efforts have been put forth by Protestant missionaries, particularly by Methodists, to turn the Italians to the various Protestant sects; but when it is remembered that of these sixty-five thousand, a large proportion are Waldenses whose ancestors were in Italy before the Protestant Reformation, and who afterward became in a sense amalgamated with the Protestants, making common cause with them, and that there are thousands of foreign Protestants, English, Americans, Germans, etc., it will be seen that the missionaries have had very poor success in converting the people to their sects, though they have spent many tens of thousands of dollars in the so called evangelization of Italy.

The Israelites are not numerous either, considering that they have had settlements in Italy since the beginning of Christianity, and even at the date when our Lord lived on earth.

The time cannot be far off when the trouble now existing between the Government and the Church shall be settled by an agreement between both parties concerned; and when this state of affairs shall exist, we have no doubt the zeal of the priests will be efficient in restoring the power of the faith, and dissentients of every class will return to the fold of the Church, and Italy will become once more so thoroughly Catholicized that sects of all kinds will dwindle to exceedingly small proportions.

THE SITUATION IN FRANCE.

A recent decision of the French Court of Cassation has been given to the effect that Catholic teachers who are members of religious orders may continue to teach in the same schools in which they have been hitherto employed, if they are secularized and wear a secular dress instead of the religious garb.

It was feared that many thousands of the teachers who have been suddenly turned out of their schools under the brutal Law of Associations, would be thrown out of employment, but this decision of the Court has opened a way for them to earn a living in spite of M. Combes' efforts to bring them to a state of starvation; and at the same time many Catholic schools which have been closed will be re-opened immediately, so that the effect will not be nearly so disastrous as was expected. For form's sake, many of the teachers have applied to the proper Government department for decrees of secularization and have obtained them. Thus the laws against religious associations have become inoperative in their case. A despatch from Rome states that this new turn to affairs in France has given great satisfaction to the officials at the Vatican, as it is now certain that French children will not be deprived entirely of Catholic education, and as the zeal of the teachers will not be very greatly diminished, if diminished at all under the new circumstances, which have arisen, it may be confidently relied on that there will still be a fair supply of good Catholic schools throughout the country.

The Dioceses of Dijon and Laval which were rendered vacant by the resignations of their respective Bishops, made at the Pope's request, in spite of the opposition of Premier Combes, have not been filled, as the French Government has not acceded to the request of the Pope to nominate proper persons to succeed them. In the uncertainty when the appointments will be made, the Holy Father has directed two neighboring Bishops to do any Episcopal duties which may be necessary within these Dioceses, and in the meantime, the Vicars-General of each diocese will have charge of the ordinary diocesan affairs, and attend to all necessary correspondence with Rome.

In reality, the Holy Father need not await the pleasure of the French Premier in order to fill the vacant Sees,