

The Catholic Record.

Published Weekly at 481 and 486 Richmond street, London, Ontario.

Price of Subscription—\$1.00 per annum.

REV. GEORGE R. NORTHGRAVE, Author of "Mistakes of Modern India."

THOMAS COFFEY, Publisher and Proprietor, Thomas Coffey.

Messrs. Luke King, John Nigh, P. J. Neven and Miss Sarah Hanley are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transmit all other business for THE CATHOLIC RECORD.

Agent for Newfoundland, Mr. James Power of St. John.

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

Approved and recommended by the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa and the Bishops of London, Hamilton, Peterborough and Owen Sound, 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 sign 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, obituary and marriage notices, as subscribers must be in a condensed form, to insure insertion.

LETTER OF RECOMMENDATION. UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA, Ottawa, Canada, March 7th, 1900.

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 truly Catholic spirit pervades the whole. Therefore, with pleasure, I can recommend it to the faithful.

Believing you and wishing you success, I remain, Yours faithfully in Jesus Christ, D. FALCONIO, Arch. of Larises, Apost. Deleg.

LONDON, SATURDAY, OCT. 22, 1904.

THE GENERAL ELECTIONS.

It is a very great pity that our general elections cannot be conducted on lines having reference only to questions of public policy.

In matters of this kind men may hold quite opposite views, and still be sincere and honest citizens. But the importation of racial questions—racial race—into political life cannot be too severely condemned.

Senator Chiquette a few weeks ago made a speech in Quebec having reference to the present contest, in which it is said he made some complimentary reference to the Premier and the race to which he belonged.

The Quebec Chronicle reported him as follows: "Are our religious interests not better assured in the hands of one of our own, like Sir Wilfrid Laurier, than in the hands of an English Protestant like Mr. Borden?"

The Senator wrote the Quebec Chronicle emphatically denying the use of the above words; but that paper, being apparently a party sheet of the lower order, refused to publish his denial.

Equally reprehensible is the conduct of the leading Conservative organs of the province of Ontario, the Toronto Mail and Empire and the Hamilton Spectator and nearly all of the less prominent papers of the same side of politics.

They published the report as it originally appeared in the Quebec Chronicle, but they will have no denial. What the Honorable Senator is reported to have said is just what they require for party work.

This dishonest report of his utterance has been scattered throughout the province of Ontario. Every Orange lodge is ringing its changes. And the demon of religious bigotry and race hatred is invoked in all of these districts, where men have been taught the horrible doctrine that their Catholic fellow-citizens are not to be trusted and that their religious belief is something which every Protestant must look upon with dread and misgiving.

What wonder, then, that the men who have stooped so low as to bedevil their fellow-citizens in this way have been thrown out of place and power as unworthy the confidence of the great mass of right-thinking, broad-minded and patriotic citizens of Canada?

Will any one say that we are too severe? It cannot, we think, be claimed that we are when we find the first lieutenant of the leader of the Conservative party, Dr. Sproule, Grand Sovereign of the Orange order and member for the East Riding of Grey, giving utterance to the following sentiments in his annual address to the Grand Lodge:

"While we, as Orangemen—loyal supporters of the crown—should be very chary about criticising the actions or conduct of our ruler, it seems to me, as head of this great order in Canada, instituted for the supporting and maintaining of the Protestant religion, that I would be remiss in my duty did I not at this time and place express my regret at the recent visit of King Edward to the Pope.

We were all delighted at the cordial reception by the rulers of the various countries which he visited, thus showing the friendly feeling which at present happily exists between Great Britain and other nations, still I cannot see why His Majesty should desire to visit his Holiness the Pope, who is the head of the Church which believes in his infallibility, and which has, since time immemorial, been the enemy of our country, as Protestants hold dear.

The protest against this visit wired to the King by the Protestant Association of England has my commendation, because the history of the past

has left behind it a lingering suspicion that such visits and secret conferences may be the forerunners of something not in the interest of the sacred rights we hold."

Need we ask, what a dangerous thing would it be were firebrands of the Dr. Sproule order given power to rule the destinies of our country?

But firebrands as Dr. Sproule and his Orange brothers are, the worst sample comes to us from the intensely Orange constituency of Carleton. A meeting was held on Friday last at a place called City View, which is about six miles from Ottawa.

During the course of the proceedings Mr. J. E. Caldwell, the Liberal candidate, made a speech, and when he had finished his remarks he asked if some of those present wanted to say anything. No one desired to do so, but the chairman, Robt. Nelson, we are told, arose and made an attack on Mr. Caldwell for supporting a French Premier and a French Government.

The Press report then goes on to say that Mr. Nelson "got very hot over French intolerance, French disloyalty, French bigotry and French illiteracy and then attacked Bourassa. He wound up his harangue by wishing to God that the province of Quebec were sunk into the depths of the sea."

Mr. Nelson is, verily, the exponent of that mad bigotry and stupid ignorance which is so much in evidence especially in the rural constituencies of Ontario.

The Toronto Mail and Empire and the Hamilton Spectator are but the mouthpieces of that robust bigotry which has dragged the Conservative party of this Province in the dust. It would, however, be unfair to charge the whole Conservative party with the responsibility for this conduct.

There are men on that side of the political fence who bear a high character—men who are liberal-minded, conscientious and patriotic—men who would do no ill to a Catholic neighbor were the power placed in their hands. But, unfortunately, the influence of these men counts as little nowadays in the party ranks in this Province.

Its destinies seem to be guided by men of the Dr. Sproule, Sam. Hughes and George Taylor order—men who trade on bigotry—men who have been lifted into Parliament by the waves of bigotry—men of the mediocre order, whose only chance of obtaining prominence is to play on the chords of religious bigotry when addressing their ultra-Protestant and Orange constituencies.

And, sad to say, these deluded men are only too ready to respond, giving thus a lamentable exhibition of a large dark spot—a cloud of evil omen—still existing in our province despite our boasted enlightenment and our claim to be abreast with the civilization and progress of the new century.

Far different are the utterances of that grand character who comes to us from the banks of the St. Lawrence—the French-Canadian Sir Wilfrid Laurier. In all the speeches which he has delivered in this province—taken apart from questions of public policy, with which the RECORD has no concern—his great mind and his burning words have been engaged in the noble work of fostering unity amongst all the people of the country, irrespective of creed, race or color.

For this he has been deservedly commended by all who truly love Canada—by all who are sincerely desirous that her future should be a glorious one.

All good Canadians—Canadians worthy the name—should frown upon attempts to resurrect the bitterness and the rancour of the past; and we hope the time is not far distant when the men who engage in this ignoble work will not be elected to take a seat in the legislative halls of our Dominion.

A MAHOMETAN PROPAGANDA.

It was announced some few years ago that the Sultan of Turkey and his advisers were seriously considering a plan to turn the tables on the Christian missionaries who have established mission stations in the Turkish Empire for the conversion of Turks to Christianity.

Several obstacles to the carrying out of this plan prevented its development into a fact. It was so novel an enterprise that but few persons who had or were supposed to have the ability would undertake the work, and it was feared that the only result would be to spend a great deal of money to no purpose, which could be much more profitably employed otherwise.

A wealthy Englishman, Mr. Webb, who is a convert to the Islamic faith, was found afterward who offered to undertake the work, and to establish Mahometan missions in England and America, and the work was to be begun in London and New York; but the proposal was never acted upon.

Now the matter has been brought forward again in what appears to be a somewhat practical form, and it is stated that a central Mahometan mosque is now soon to be established in London, England, which will serve

as the head-quarters of the missionaries who will endeavor to propagate the Islamic religion throughout both the British Empire, and the United States.

A Turkish pasha is said to have employed Robt. Williams, the well known architect, to prepare plans for the erection of the mosque, and these plans are to be submitted to the Sultan and a large committee of pashas before being finally adopted.

We cannot for a moment believe that the proposed mission will have much success in making converts to Mahometanism; but who knows? Countries which furnish recruits to Mormonism, Eddieism, Dowieism, Theosophy, and Spiritism, are perhaps far enough gone into folly to give converts to Mahometanism.

The proposed Mosque, it is said, will be a magnificent structure of red and yellow stone, with marble and jasper decorations, and will be surmounted by a cupola, and a golden crescent 200 feet from the ground. Besides being the Moslem missionary headquarters, it will be the place of worship for Mahometans from all countries whether India, Egypt, Persia, or Afghanistan.

MORE CHRISTIAN SCIENTIST MALPRACTICE.

The Christian Scientists have scored a victory before the New Hampshire Supreme Court, which we believe is the first victory they have gained on a charge of malpractice when the results of their treatment have been disastrous.

A Mrs. Jennie Spoad of Concord, N. H., entered suit to recover damages for alleged injuries done to her as the result of treatment by Irving W. Tomlinson, a Christian Science practitioner of the same city. Tomlinson had failed to cure the plaintiff, who put herself under his care for treatment of a serious illness under which she was laboring.

She claims that the cure was greatly delayed by the time spent in taking Tomlinson's treatment, and we do not doubt that this was really the case. The Supreme Court, however, dismissed the case, not on the ground that the Christian Scientist treatment was of any benefit to the patient, but because she put herself under the treatment knowing its character, and that Tomlinson was no medical practitioner.

There was, therefore, no deception practiced upon her, as would have been the case if a quack doctor had practiced upon her, deceiving her with the application of useless nostrums.

No doubt the Christian Scientists will congratulate themselves greatly on their first legal victory, as they have hitherto been left sadly in the mire in the persecutions entered against them, and they are in the mood to make the most of the smallest point in their favor.

But it is a victory of the Pyrrhic order, that is to say, another such, and their stock will be depreciated below redemption. Another such victory and their cause will be ruined in public estimation. It is the delusion of the patient in believing in the Eddyite pretensions that saves the malpractitioner in the case; and it is because Mrs. Spoad should have known better than to have employed a Christian Scientist that she is barred from receiving damages.

The number of instances in which the sick have been hurried to death through giving themselves up to be treated by Christian Scientists is alarming; yet when people do this in regard to themselves, we cannot say that there is any injustice done to them, since they are themselves the cause of the damage inflicted upon them.

MISCONDUCT IN CHURCH.

In his sermon of Oct. 4th the Dean of Norwich (England) found it necessary to preach strongly against a practice which prevails in the Cathedral of that city of which he has charge, that is, the habit of young and thoughtless people using the Cathedral during the time of divine service for the purpose of carrying on love-making and flirtations.

It is very blamable to desecrate a church in this manner; and yet we are aware that such things are frequently attempted, especially in the large city churches in which there are usually large congregations at night. So far as we have noticed in Catholic churches in Canada this conduct is not often attempted by members of the congregation, who have generally too much respect for the House of God to desecrate it in this manner, but by strangers, who think nothing of turning the house of prayer into a den of thieves.

We believe that the best remedy for such a state of affairs is to appoint a sufficient number of stewards of known respectability and exemplary character to correct those who are guilty of the unseemly conduct complained of. The Dean of Norwich has determined to adopt precisely this plan, and seventy stewards and a detective have been enrolled for the purpose in his Church. These have been directed to correct all persons who are found whispering or

giggling in the church, and to compel them to take front seats, where their conduct can be readily noticed; and if they continue to misbehave, they will be politely but firmly conducted out of the church. This ought to prove an effectual remedy to the evil.

ANOTHER WONDERFUL HEALER!

The Toronto Mail and Empire, in its issue of the 11th inst., publishes a special despatch from Rochester, N. Y., which describes the unheard of results produced by a Professor Thomas F. Adkin, through a wonderful discovery made by him, which it is to be expected will upset modern medical practice.

The professor, it is said, discards the useless drugs and medicines used by doctors, yet heals hopeless invalids of diseases pronounced incurable by physicians and specialists, and succeeds in restoring life and health when doctor after doctor failed.

The professor claims and offers evidence beyond doubt, so says the despatch, that he has made the human heart beat again in the body of a woman given up to death. By means of this discovery, he claims he has made the blind see, and the lame walk, and has permanently cured paralysis, consumption, rheumatism, Bright's disease, and a host of other diseases heretofore supposed to be incurable.

It makes no difference to him if the patients live a thousand miles away or near by. He declares that he believes there is no disease which he cannot cure, and that he intends to go on effecting wonderful cures, healing the sick and afflicted, as long as he is able to attend to their cases.

It is undoubtedly a wonderful story that is here told, and the professor names several cases of persons whom he has cured living in different parts of the United States, and at great distances away.

We must say that the story reads like that of Aladdin and his wonderful lamp. We have not made enquiries of the parties named by Professor Adkin as his references; but we certainly do not give credit to the story any more than we give to the pseudo-Elijah of Zion City, Ill., or to Mrs. Eddy, who invented Christian Science, or than we gave to the pretended Faith-Healer Schlater who had thousands of devotees in the far West and the Southern States some years ago.

Notwithstanding the boasts of all these healers, there were not published any truly authenticated cases of diseases healed which had been thoroughly investigated by experts; and while we do not pretend to such knowledge of the medical art as to pronounce that there may not be new medical discoveries which will astonish the world by their simplicity and efficacy, we advise our readers to be on their guard against delusive promises of quacks or pretentious professors on whose declarations there is no confidence to be placed, until there is better reason than has yet appeared in Professor Adkin's case for putting trust in them.

PROTESTANT OR CATHOLIC?

Among the subjects which were announced as likely to be dealt with by the Protestant Episcopal Convention now in session in Boston, was the advisability of changing the name of the Church itself.

Soon after the independence of the United States became a fixed fact, it was deemed necessary for the Anglicans of the new nation to declare also the independence of their Church, and thus the Protestant Episcopal Church was constituted. But though in the beginning it was deemed that this name was very suitable, after a time the inconsistency of calling an organization which claims to be the Church of Christ, Protestant began to dawn upon its membership, and especially upon its thoughtful clergy.

Against what did it protest? There was only one possible answer to this question. The name is historic, and brings the mind back to the origin of the word as a religious designation. The name arose from the fact of the German nobles at the diet of Spire who protested against the Catholic Church on April 19th, 1529. It implies that the sole, or at least the main purpose of the Church which adopts it as a title, is to pull down what already exists. It implies that its Christianity is a negative, not a positive quantity.

We had occasion some months ago to point this out when we refuted a lecture delivered in Montreal in which it was maintained that the word Protestantism stands for something positive, viz., a testimony to the truth; for this view of the case is unhistorical on its face; and the fact is fully recognized by those members of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States who, having become ashamed of the name and its associations, are clamoring for a new name by which their Church may be called.

In fact the name Protestant implies the pre-existence of the Catholic Church, uninterrupted since the days

of the Apostles. It recognizes the perpetuity of the faith against which it protests.

And what name will the Episcopalians of America adopt? This we cannot tell; but Bishop Grafton of Fond du Lac, speaking in St. John's Church on Sunday declared that the proper title of the denomination is "the American Catholic Church." This is the most preposterous of claims. In no sense is the Protestant Episcopal Church either the American or the Catholic Church. To be called American it should be such either in its origin, or by its preponderance over all others on this continent, or at the very least it should preponderate in the United States, the people of which with no small amount of presumption usually call themselves "the American people."

We might pardon the Episcopalians for being equally presumptuous, if they were really the largest religious body in the country; but they are one of the minor sects, and the presumption is un pardonable. They stand only ninth in the order of importance. The Catholics stand first, the Methodist Episcopalians are second, and there are three Baptist denominations, each of which comes before the Protestant Episcopalians, among them being the "Regular" or Colored Baptists!

Neither can it be said that the Episcopalians are American in spirit or in origin. They are of English origin, and their sympathies were almost entirely with England and against the Americans in the revolutionary war. But perhaps they were the first settlers who established a church in the country? They were not. The French and Spaniards both antedated them. There is therefore no possible ground why they should be called "the American Church."

Neither is there any ground for calling it the or a Catholic Church. The Catholic Church must be universal—but a National Church cannot be universal. The Protestant Episcopal Church was made local from the very fact that it nationalized itself when the United States became a nation.

We can scarcely conceive that the Boston convention will attempt to perpetrate the folly suggested by Bishop Grafton, but should it do so, the chief result we foresee will be that it will make the denomination more ridiculous in the eyes of the American people than it has ever been before, even in the absurd discussion which took place between Bishop Potter and the Vicar of Hexton last summer, or the ritual rumpuses which occurred in Los Angeles and other places within the last few years.

THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CONVENTION IN BOSTON.

The troublesome question of divorce is being earnestly discussed at the general convention of the United States Episcopal Church which is now being held in Boston.

The trouble lies in this that it has for long been the practice of the ministers of the Church to remarry any divorced persons who present themselves for marriage, when the cause for which the divorce was granted was adultery, if the applicant were the supposed "innocent party."

There had been, before the present practice was adopted, a good deal of laxity in this matter, ministers taking to themselves the liberty of marrying any persons who presented themselves provided only they were free under the civil law to contract marriage. But it was soon found that this mode of procedure put the Episcopal Church into as scandalous a position as any other Church in the United States. Marriage was no longer a religious act, but merely a civil contract, which could be dissolved at the will of either party, on the most trivial pretexts, and families were broken through the separation of husbands, wives and children, to an alarming extent. A limitation was afterwards put to the freedom of Episcopal ministers in this regard. A canon was passed many years ago whereby they were forbidden to remarry parties who had been separated for any other cause than adultery. This checked the evil to some extent, but even this course has been found ineffective toward remedying the evil entirely. It is so easy to include a charge of unfaithfulness when a divorce is applied for, that it is nearly always done; and thus it can always be used as a pretext that this unfaithfulness exists in the case. And, farther, from the fact that unfaithfulness is required as a condition on the part of the Church to make the practical legality of the divorce admissible, members of the Church will in most instances take good care that this condition shall not be lacking.

The proposition now is to forbid clergymen to remarry divorcees under any circumstances, while the two parties who have been divorced are living, except when they come to the clergyman to be remarried to each other, the

plea being then that they have become reconciled.

Bishop Doane of Albany is peculiarly in earnest to have this proposition adopted. Preaching at the Church of the Advent in the afternoon of Sunday, the 10th inst., he said:

"I think that the time has arrived when my own Church should deal with the marriage question. Although the Church of England does not permit the remarriage of persons who have been divorced, the Episcopal Church of this country allows the marriage of the innocent person in case of infidelity. Many of our clergymen decline to marry any person divorced for any cause, and an attempt is being made at the present convention to have their views embodied in a canon, which shall displace the present one.

"According to the marriage ritual of the Prayer Book, nothing but death can sever those who have been united in holy matrimony, and I think it is time the canons of the Church should agree with the Prayer Book."

Coadjutor Bishop Greer added that "It is not only the duty of society but of the officers of the Christian Church to preserve the sanctity of the home, to keep it pure and inviolate; for marriage is not an institution to be broken by the pleasure of men, but a union indissoluble, inviolate, against which the gates of hell cannot prevail. God Himself created it, an everlasting mystery, similar to the union of Jesus Christ and His Church. I believe, therefore, that the Church should bring marriage into harmony with the prayer book."

The Rev. Dr. W. W. Webb of Nashotah, Wisconsin, told of the enormous extent to which the evil of divorce has spread over the United States. "There have been," he said, "sixty thousand divorces in the United States during the past year. There are signs that the people are realizing that the divorce evil must be checked. Some of the States have improved their laws within the past few years, but there is still need of a general reform."

It will be noted here that the speakers are very plain in announcing that the American canon is a violation of the law of God, which the prayer book sets forth properly.

We fully agree that the Church should not depart from the law of God, but what are we to think of the Church which has done this according to its ablest divines? Can that be the Church against which, according to our Divine Saviour's pronouncement, the gates of hell shall not prevail; but of which He will remain to the end of time? Can it be the Church which St. Paul calls "the Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of truth?"

It will be noted also that Bishop Doane admits that in a pronouncement of the American Church, there is a notable departure from its parent Church of England. It is evidently because these Churches have ceased to be one, under one visible Head on earth, that they already disagree on a notable point of God's revelation; for the indissolubility of the marriage tie is undoubtedly a matter of God's revelation, God having said of it: "What God hath joined together, let no man put asunder."

There can be no clearer demonstration of the necessity of a Pope, or a divinely appointed Head for the universal Church of Christ, than these admissions of eminent prelates of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States.

And here, it might be said, the presence of English and Canadian prelates shows the unity of the faith between the bodies to which they belong. So far is this from being the case, that their presence is an irrefutable evidence of multiplicity. The convention is the only supreme body in the American Episcopal Church. The strange Bishops are merely guests present by courtesy and not by right. They may be allowed to give an opinion or an advice in regard to matters under discussion, but they will have positively no voice in the decisions reached. Of this the American Bishops have already assured the public, and not even the Archbishop of Canterbury can veto any of the proceedings.

There is, therefore, absolutely nothing to show that these churches have one faith, or that they will continue to hold nearly the same doctrines for any length of time.

Unity of faith can be kept only by unity with and submission to the divinely appointed successor of St. Peter, Pope Pius X., and his successors.

Several Canadian Bishops present at the Convention offered the greetings of the Anglican Church of Canada. Among them Bishop Hamilton of Ottawa gave an interesting address on the divorce question. He said:

"The facilities for divorce which have devastated 60,000 homes in your country in a single year, do not exist in our country, thank God."

He then informed the Convention that when the Canadian Confederation was accomplished, three Provinces had divorce courts. Prince Edward Island also had a divorce court, but this has not yet had any business to do. In thirty-two years, Parliament has granted 16 divorces to the Province