

ation and truth of Scripture, and to the rejection of the very foundations of Christian faith amongst millions separated from the Catholic Church.

In case of Catholics, no appreciable effect has been produced. Catholics can afford to be tranquil and confident amidst the prevailing doubt and confusion. The Catholic Church is old enough to have seen the rise and progress and decay and reappearance of all existing heresies. The arts and sciences are her hand-maidens. Recent discoveries in every department she watches with intelligent interest. She is not opposed to the most searching and minute inquiry, as is often ignorantly stated, because she will not at once adopt what further investigation or the lapse of time may prove to be untrue. She weighs carefully, even though conservatively, the newest theories propounded by the

Higher Criticism.

She will not at once adopt a novelty, more particularly when it seems to conflict with the traditions of the past, but she will not reject it because it is a novelty, and ultimately she will adopt it, no matter how novel, provided it is established by solid proofs.

During the time of inquiry and examination Catholics hold their souls in peace, because they know that truth is great, and will ultimately prevail. This confident attitude of Catholics is well illustrated in a modern work of fiction, 'When it Was Dark,' written by a non-Catholic, in which, by the machinations of a Jew, the denial of the Resurrection of Christ is supposed to have gained wide credence amongst professing Christians. Some were simply astounded, and knew not what to think or where to turn for light and leading. Some were completely deceived, abandoned their faith, and gave themselves up to a life of sensual enjoyment. Others lost all interest in the good works in which they had been engaged, and became utterly apathetic. But Catholics, as the author observes, were the only persons unaffected by the pretended disproof of the Resurrection. They simply went on in the confident belief that time would unravel the mystery and dissipate the cloud which hung over the Christian world for a time. They were unmoved, because they rested their faith, not on the learning or persuasiveness of any individual, but on the authority of the Church, which is 'the pillar and ground of truth'; which is guarded by the infallible promise, and protected by the efficacious prayer of her Divine Founder.

But when a new theory is broached, or a new real or pretended discovery made, it is not merely in works of fiction that we find how weak, how shifting, is the authority of private judgment in the minds of the multitudes who profess to hold it as a sure guide in the interpretation of the Bible.

A Typical Instance

is before the public at the present time. An English clergyman has denied the Fall of Man from his primal state of innocence. This denial, I take it for granted, regards the FACT, not the mere debatable question of the literal or figurative account of the Fall given in the Book of Genesis, otherwise there would be no sufficient reason for the widespread alarm, and heated controversy, to which the denial has given rise. The denial of the FACT of the Fall involves the denial of the whole scheme of Redemption. It overthrows, in the minds of those who adopt it, the foundation on which St. Paul rests his reasoning in the fifth chapter of his Epistle to the Romans, 'Wherefore as by one man sin entered into this world, and by sin death: and so death passed upon all men in whom all have sinned. . . Therefore, as by the offence of one, unto all men to condemnation: so also by the justice of one, unto all men to justification of life. For as by the disobedience of one man, many were made sinners: so also by the obedience of one, many shall be made just' (vv. 12, 18, 19).

In a word, the denial of the FACT reduces Christian revelation to chaos.

But how is it received by so many of the Bible-reading, Bible-loving men and women of our day? With undisguised approbation by some, with hypothetical adoption by others, and with shame-faced and half-hearted diffidence as to its adoption or rejection by more. Many who reject the authority of the Church are willing to rest their faith on the authority of one man, of whose claims to be a safe guide in less important matters very different opinions have been expressed. Meantime the authority of the Bible is being steadily undermined amongst large masses of men, and those who are weak in faith or lax in morals are hastening to the conclusion that nothing in Scripture, nothing in any form of revelation, is binding on the consciences of men.

THE REV. DR. BARRY.

The London 'Daily Chronicle' has been publishing a number of opinions on his views. Amongst those given is that of the Rev. William Barry, the well-known Catholic writer, who says:

As a Catholic priest I have no opinions of my own. I teach what the Church teaches, and if I wanted to teach anything else I should begin by going out of the Church. That seems to me the difference between a Protestant and a Catholic—a Protestant chooses what he will believe, and a Catholic accepts from his Church what he ought to believe.

I don't know whether Mr. Campbell could find a second man in his own Church who agrees with him, and it is quite probable he does not much mind whether there is a second man; but with us it is quite different. We don't think the Church is worth anything unless it teaches us. We don't profess to teach it.

I have very great respect for Mr. Campbell, and especially for his social work and for his endeavor to be on good terms with all kinds of Christians, but I am very much astonished at his complete change from the Calvinistic beliefs to one which is clean opposite to them. The Calvinist believes in predestination and in reprobation. Mr. Campbell does not believe in reprobation at all. He thinks that sooner or later all men, whatever they have done, will be made perfect by the Divine action; and I think that creed is a very bad one.

I think it leads to the destruction of free will, and personally I most strongly disbelieve in it. Then Mr. Campbell says he does not desire to be called a Unitarian, and I suppose he knows best what he would like to be called, but in the account of his creed which I have just read in the 'Daily Chronicle' I do not see anything that is not Unitarian, and that it seems to me is the extraordinary change.

Mr. Campbell has simply boxed the compass. He has just gone round from one side of the circle to the other. Of course, I am simply speaking of his creed and his principles, and not for one moment of Mr. Campbell personally, for whom, I say once more, I have a great regard. Nothing is more certain than that the Roman Church would condemn the points of the new theology on which he lays stress, and which seem to me the revival of many early heresies. Now that may be called bigotry. We call it dogmatic teaching.

Presentation to Father Fay, Blenheim

In the presence of a large gathering in St. Patrick's Hall, Blenheim, on Thursday evening, February 28, the Rev. Father Fay, who is about to take a trip to Europe, was presented with an address and a purse of sovereigns. Shortly after eight o'clock (says the local 'Herald') the members of the presentation committee took their seats on the platform, Mr. C. O'Sullivan, J.P., presiding, and the Rev. Father Holley made a few introductory remarks. It was, said Father Holley, a pleasurable occasion, for they had met to wish Father Fay an enjoyable and successful tour. The leave he had obtained for his trip emphasised the good opinion that he earned from his ecclesiastical superiors, and the estimation in which they held the work he had done in this parish during the last nine years. He himself had known Father Fay since boyhood, and knowing his worth and his happy disposition, it was with very great pleasure that he had come here to renew his associations with his old friend. He was now still more ready to recognise Father Fay's worth, because he knew that the nine years he had spent here had been a period of hard work and duty faithfully carried out under very trying circumstances, with courage and patience, and in a manner that had retained for him the goodwill of not only the Catholic parish, but the whole of the community. The proportions that the purse of sovereigns had reached were proof of what the people thought of Father Fay. For his own part, and on behalf of the people present and many others who were present in spirit, he wished the Rev. Father Fay good health, and every other good fortune so that he might come back to them benefited and strengthened, with his mind stored with useful knowledge and pleasant memories, to continue his labors amongst them.

Mr. J. Terry said that, on behalf of the parishioners, it was his pleasure and duty to convey to Father Fay on the occasion of his leaving the district for a time their appreciation of the manner in which he had performed his work amongst them; likewise an assurance of the high esteem in which he was held.

LANGFORD and RHIND

... (late W. and H. Langford), ... 16 LONDON ST. Phone 688

Funeral Furnishers and Embalmers

Christchurch

Addresses—HERBERT LANGFORD, 16 London St., Richmond. Phone 689. JOHN RHIND, 48 Montreal St., Sydenham, Phone 1608.

Town Office—182 CASHEL ST.