

The Catholic Record.

Published Weekly at 484 and 486 Richmond street, London, Ontario.

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

REV. GEORGE R. NORTHGRAVES, Editor.

THOMAS COFFEY, Publisher and Proprietor.

Approved and recommended by the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa, and St. Boniface, and the Bishops of London, Hamilton and Peterboro, and the clergy throughout the Dominion.

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.

Advertisements—Ten cents per line each insertion, agate measurement.

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

London, Saturday, January 16, 1892.

FANATICISM REBUKED.

The Orangemen of Detroit, who are for the most part an importation from Canada, feel very sore over certain Catholic religious processions which have recently taken place in that city.

On the 13th ult. a church was dedicated by the Right Rev. Bishop Foley, and he was accompanied to the new church by a procession in which the Knights of St. John, the Catholic Cadets and other Catholic societies took part, besides some bands of music.

Several of these organizations have handsome uniforms, and some of them bear arms, and are skilful in military manoeuvres. On this occasion they applied their training to add eclat to the demonstration in honor of the opening of the House of God.

The Orangemen took offence at this, and inaugurated a movement to prevent such demonstrations in future. The demonstrations were perfectly harmless, and highly commendable, and certainly they were not intended to give offence to any one, as they were purely of a religious character; but several religious banners were displayed by the processionists.

Along with the Catholic banners, it has always been customary to display the flag of the United States, which, in that country is, of course, very proper. It may well be supposed that this is one of the objections which the Orangemen have to such demonstrations, but their indignation is chiefly directed against the display of Catholic banners.

The violence, however, which they have frequently employed in Toronto and elsewhere in Ontario in order to effect their purpose would not suit the atmosphere of Detroit, and so they were obliged to content themselves with passing resolutions against the Catholic demonstrations on the plea that they obstruct the use of the streets by the citizens generally, and that those who are worshipping in the various churches are interrupted in the due observance of the day.

The Orange resolutions ended in smoke, as they deserved, but they succeeded in enlisting some of the Baptist preachers on their side, and at a small meeting of these ministers held on the 21st ult. resolutions were passed declaring that they were much pained at the "conduct of so-called religious processions in our city on the Lord's day, these parades often taking the form of a military display of men in arms."

A deputation was then appointed to wait on the Mayor to ask him to take steps to prevent such demonstrations hereafter.

The delegation waited on Mr. Mayor Pingree, and presented their petition in accordance with their resolution; and they were courteously informed that he would consult the legal advisers of the city council on the subject. He accordingly sent the resolution to Judge Speed, who, after duly considering the matter, gave his opinion in writing, and the document was published by the Detroit papers.

The judge states that the city council has no authority to prevent such displays as the ministers complained of. It has no power to enact laws dictating the manner in which the Sabbath is to be observed. It is not forbidden that men in arms shall parade to church, even when accompanied by bands of music, if they conduct themselves in an orderly manner; and it is not pretended that the Catholic young men were otherwise than orderly and well conducted.

As to interfering with public travel, the judge pointed out that in modern cities processions of large bodies of men frequently take place, and it is not considered that they interfere seriously with the public convenience. He, therefore, declared it to be his opinion that the courts would regard as invalid any ordinance forbidding such processions.

There was, in fact, a case decided by the Supreme Court of Michigan which applies directly to the present case. The Judge said that the Supreme Court refused to admit the

claim of the municipal authorities of Grand Rapids to prevent the marching of the Salvation Army on Sunday. He also quoted the opinion of the Chief Justice who said, when delivering judgment:

"All persons who resort to cities must accept the inconveniences with the benefits which attend such communities. Those things which must be expected must be endured if they are within the bounds of propriety."

We are informed that the Baptist ministers are very indignant against the mayor and the judge for having treated them discourteously; but they have only themselves to blame for the ridiculous position in which they placed themselves by becoming a catspaw for the Orangemen. We witnessed a somewhat similar display of spleen on the part of the Ontario ministers who received a like snubbing from the Governor-General, Lord Stanley, when they similarly interfered in matters which did not concern them on the occasion of their presentation of a petition to the Quebec settlement of the Jesuit Estates disallowed. The pent-up rage of the bigots of this province was then let loose against Lord Stanley and his advisers, but they might as well have "bayed the moon," and the Baptists of Detroit are in the same position. The event may teach them to mind their own business, and in that case it will be of great benefit to them. It is a lesson they needed very much.

RELIGIOUS AND SECULAR EDUCATION.

The late Dr. Brownson, who passed through so many grades of Protestantism, including Universalism, and even through Spiritualism and Infidelity, before he found in the Catholic Church a haven of rest secure from the various winds of doctrine by which he was tossed about, was well qualified to tell of the secret springs whereby these bodies caused their ideas to be set in motion and promulgated among the American people. He was endowed with extraordinary mental powers; his energy was commensurate with his learning; and he was both ardent and earnest in promulgating his views, in whatsoever company he chanced to be at the time.

He has told us that the system of secular, or Godless, schools was sprung upon the people of the United States by agreement of an Infidel association, or committee which recommended it for the express purpose of preparing the way for the diffusion of their principles of negation in religion, and we know by the results, which have transformed that country almost into a nation of unbelievers, that the scheme was wonderfully adapted to attain the object for which it was inaugurated.

It is not surprising, then, that the Infidels of Canada, especially those earnest ones who interest themselves in propagating Infidelity, should be enamored of the scheme, and should endeavor to have it regarded here as the only plan which is deserving of Government support.

Mr. Allen Pringle, of Selby, Ont., is one of the propagandists we have described. He has written pamphlets with the express object of undermining or destroying Christian faith, and he is not merely a deist, but he has aimed in his writings at raising in Canada a crop of Atheists. In this respect he goes beyond even Bob Ingersoll and Tom Paine. Col. Ingersoll does not profess to deny the existence of a God; but he pretends to have a higher conception of the nature of God. "If there is a God," than that which is given in the Bible. Tom Paine expressly declares in his "Age of Reason," that he believes in a God, and that God's existence is proved by His works. But Mr. Pringle's pamphlets pretend to prove that from such premises God's existence cannot be inferred.

It is not a matter of surprise, therefore, that Mr. Pringle should advocate, in a letter which appeared in the columns of the Mail a few days ago, the complete secularization of the schools as the only method of education suitable to the people of Ontario. In fact, he regards secularized schools as the most efficacious means for the propagation of his Atheistic principles, and so far he is in the right. There is no surer method to raise a generation of Atheists than entirely to exclude religious teaching from the schools.

Mr. Pringle's letter may possibly have one good effect. It may bring the Protestants of this Province to understand why it is that there is one class of people who are in earnest in the advocacy of secular education, pure and simple. A letter which appeared in the Mail of the 7th inst. from Mr. Clare L. Worrell, of the Kingston Mil-

itary School, proves that some Protestants penetrate Mr. Pringle's purpose. Mr. Worrell, who seems to have been an experienced teacher of Ontario, says:

"His (Mr. Pringle's) article is throughout a piece of special pleading on behalf of secularism, while the true subject for consideration is left untouched. There is certainly a difficulty in 'teaching everybody's religion to everybody,' but I deny that it is impracticable. On the contrary I assert that no solution of the school question will ever be reached until its practicability be fully demonstrated. The great majority of people on this continent are Christians, and as such believe that the perfect man does not consist of body and mind alone, but that he has a spirit as well, and therefore there is no complete education so long as the spiritual part is not developed equally with the physical and intellectual."

There appears to be some confusion in Mr. Worrell's ideas in the notion that the mind and spirit are two distinct parts of human nature, but his argument that the spiritual in man should be developed, in a complete system of education, is irrefragable. The object of a State school in a mixed community should not be to rear all children in Mr. Pringle's creed, which ignores God; but it should assist parents in affording to their children a complete education, doctrinal and moral, as well as secular. Thus Mr. Worrell maintains:

"Those who are responsible both to God and man for the proper bringing up of a child have surely a right to say on what principles he is to be trained—provided always he does not demand what would be reasonably likely to produce evil results."

But Mr. Worrell argues only for the rights of the majority: "the rights of the majority should be respected." This is very true; but minorities have rights as well as majorities; and it is the more necessary to respect rights of minorities than those of majorities. The majority is able to maintain its own rights, but the minority depends much on the good will and equity of the majority, who ought on that account to be all the more considerate to their weaker fellow-citizens. Mr. Worrell, notwithstanding his advocacy of religious education, declares that "Separate schools have too many attendant evils to be desirable." The very fact that he desires religious education to be necessary demonstrates the necessity of Separate schools for Catholics. We could never consent to have Catholic children taught such religion as teachers hostile to their faith would impart. There is no common religion which might be taught by Protestant teachers of different creeds to Catholic and Protestant alike, and as we are convinced that Mr. Worrell means well, we think he would himself see the justice of the Catholic claim to Separate Catholic schools in which the religion of Catholic parents would be taught, if he would only consider the logical consequences of his own reasoning.

PRESBYTERIANISM vs. UNITARIANISM.

A young Japanese named Mr. Tozo Ohno is studying in Knox College, Toronto, for the Presbyterian ministry, which he proposes to exercise in his own country in due time. He is now being indoctrinated with the theology of Calvin, which it appears he readily accepts as the revealed truth of God, notwithstanding the fact that Presbyterians themselves are calling out loudly for a revision of their standards which will exclude from their creed those distinctive doctrines which render Calvinism so odious to the Christian sentiment which pictures God as a Being infinitely holy and incapable of the injustice which strict Calvinism attributes to Him in His dealings with the reprobate.

When the revision of the Presbyterian doctrine will be concluded, there is no doubt that the chapters of the Westminster Confession which teach that God has passed by a large portion of the human race, in the distribution of His grace, to such an extent that it may be truly said of them that they were created for perdition, will be expunged, or changed so as to be brought more into accord with the belief of modern Presbyterians, who, as it is well known, do not believe this doctrine.

The Unitarianism of to-day is undoubtedly the outcome of Presbyterianism, though it must be admitted that the teaching of that sect which includes a denial of the divinity of Christ dates back to a much earlier period than the days of Calvinism. This teaching is similar to that of the Arians, who had propagated their error to an alarming extent even before the assembling of

the Council of Nice in the year 325. But the unmistakable terms in which the divinity of the Son of God was declared by the council in the famous Nicene Creed was a death-blow to the dangerous error, which, though it was still maintained with pertinacity for a considerable period by many, finally died out, and was not revived until the reaction took place in Presbyterianism against the doctrines promulgated by John Calvin.

Unitarianism and Universalism are practically the same thing under two different names. The chief difference between the two consists in this, that the former system gives more prominence to the doctrine that Christ is only a man, while the latter insists more upon the final salvation of all mankind. These two sects, however, maintain both of these doctrines. Convinced of God's justice and mercy, they preferred to believe that all men are finally saved, rather than adhere to the doctrine which they had practically been taught by their Presbyterian parents and ministers, that God had created some men for the purpose of damning them eternally, and that such were shut out from the benefit of redemption, not by any want of good will on their part, but because God did not give them grace sufficient to preserve them in the paths of justice and rectitude.

Notwithstanding the fact that Unitarianism and Universalism thus owe their existence to the grafting of a truer conception of God's mercy and justice upon the erroneous Presbyterian theory, these sectaries are held in great horror by orthodox Presbyterians; and Mr. Tozo Ohno has inherited this horror. He has considerable ability, and has many times lectured in English at missionary meetings, especially those which had for object the conversion of Japan to Presbyterianism.

At these meetings Mr. Ohno has several times deplored the divisions which exist among Protestants as being one of the chief obstacles to the conversion of the country. In this he is undoubtedly correct, as the astute Japanese mind naturally leads to the enquiry whether Christ has revealed all the contradictory doctrines which are being taught by the missionaries of the various sects, and the enquirers are very slow to embrace any of them when they find that these inconsistencies all arise from the doctrine of private interpretation, which is almost the only thing they agree in teaching.

But Mr. Ohno finds another obstacle in the spread of infidelity under the form of Unitarianism. It is evident, therefore, that he has been carefully instructed in Knox College, to the effect that the Unitarians are not Christians. But why should a Presbyterian college thus teach its students to regard as un-Christian, or anti-Christian, a sect of which Presbyterianism is the undoubted parent?

After all, the Unitarians naturally and logically deduce their doctrine from the doctrines of Presbyterians, and considering that we have of late heard so much of exercising Christian charity by having the sects recognize each other as working for one object, notwithstanding their diversity in creed, we cannot understand why the Unitarians, who claim the right to put into practice the great Protestant principle of private interpretation of Scripture, should be thus unceremoniously treated as non-Christians.

From the Catholic point of view, it is easily understood that we should be on our guard against those who, rejecting the infallible authority of the Church of God, teach a gospel different from that which has been handed down from the Apostles; but Presbyterianism, which repudiates the existence of any unerring living authority, seems to us to be very un-maternal in rejecting fellowship with a Church which is one of its own children by logical inference.

We may also remark here that as the Japanese Presbyterian Church has already adopted what may be considered a revised creed, shorn of extreme Calvinism, it will be necessary for Mr. Ohno to change his creed when he will return to Japan, otherwise his teaching will not be acceptable. Of course the Knox College professors taught him full blown Calvinism; for they had to bind themselves so to do in order to be Presbyterian clergymen. Should they not have anticipated revision by teaching Mr. Ohno the future instead of present Presbyterianism, in order to fit him for his work? Doing this might not have been very consistent, but it would have suited Mr. Ohno's circumstances better than what seems to have been done in his regard, for he may find it difficult

to understand that what is true doctrine in a Toronto Presbyterian pulpit, will become false if preached in Yeddo or Tokio.

We observe that a Unitarian correspondent in the Mail of the 5th instant is very justly indignant at the manner in which Unitarianism is treated by Mr. Ohno's professors.

OLD TESTAMENT PROPHECIES.

The case of Rev. Dr. Workman, a Professor of Victoria University, Cobourg, which in 1890 and '91, created so much excitement in Methodist circles, has been once more a subject of debate between the regents of that institution. It will be remembered by our readers that the Doctor was the Professor of Old Testament exegesis in the theological department of the university, a position very similar to that which Prof. Briggs holds in the Presbyterian Union Theological Seminary of New York. The resemblance between the two professors does not stop here; for Professor Workman gave utterance to views, not indeed precisely the same with those expressed by Dr. Briggs, but which tend to destroy the force of one of those strong evidences to which the defenders of religion have always confidently appealed as demonstrative of the truth of Christianity.

In a lecture delivered first in the university, and afterwards in Elm street Methodist church, Toronto, the professor set forth the view that there is no prophecy in the Old Testament which had actually Jesus Christ in view as the Messiah who was to come on earth for the redemption of mankind, and no fulfillment of any prophecies in the New Testament, in the sense that passages of the Old Testament which foretold persons or events, found their accomplishment in the New.

In May, 1891, the Regents of the university called the professor to account for this heretical teaching, and as he occupied two positions, one in the theological and the other in the arts department, he was dismissed from the theological chair, though permitted to retain his arts professorship.

The Doctor was dissatisfied with this decision, so he requested the Board of Regents to reconsider it, and for this purpose they met on Wednesday, the 6th inst. After a warm discussion, which lasted till 2 o'clock a. m. on Thursday, it was decided by a vote of 10 to 8 to adhere to the previous resolution of the Board, whereupon Dr. Workman, considering the decision to be a slur upon his teaching, resigned his position, and his resignation was accepted on the same vote.

While we certainly do not recognize any authority in the Methodist Church to decide controversies of faith, inasmuch as it is but a human institution, and is itself in a state of rebellion against the one Church which Christ instituted, and which has continued without interruption to the present time, we prefer that the sects of Protestantism should adhere to those doctrines of Christianity which they still retain, rather than that they should decline into utter infidelity, as so many among them are doing. We therefore freely say that the action of the Cobourg Regents compares most favorably with that of the Faculty of the Union Theological Seminary, and the Presbytery of New York, in sustaining Dr. Briggs, whose teachings were still further on the down grade than that of Dr. Workman.

At the time when the Dr. was dismissed from his theological position we gave some instances of prophecy which had clearly their fulfillment in Christ. We shall here state only one fact, that Christ Himself frequently appealed to the Old Testament prophecies as being fulfilled in Him; as when at Jerusalem He said to the unbelieving Jews: "Search the Scriptures, for you think in them to have life everlasting; and the same are they that give testimony of me." (St. Jno. v. 39.) This passage of itself is sufficient to refute completely Dr. Workman's theory, and to make it a matter of surprise that any one should profess to believe, as Dr. Workman does, that Christianity is a Revelation from God, while denying a truth so plainly and frequently proclaimed as this is, by Christ and His Apostles.

It is not a good omen for the perseverance of Methodism in sound doctrine, that the adherents of Dr. Workman were able to make the vote so close on a question so vital to Christianity.

It is not the good we intend to do to-morrow, but that we are doing to-day, that the devil is afraid of.

POPE PIUS IX. AND THE FREEMASONS.

The statement made by Mons. Floquet, the President of the French Chamber of Deputies, during the debate on the Concordat with the Pope, regarding Pope Pius IX., has renewed the discussion of an exploded calumny which the Freemasons many years ago circulated against that illustrious and holy Pontiff. When Paul de Cassagnac arraigned the Freemasons for their persistent attacks upon religion, Mons. Floquet called him to order saying, "I will not permit any one to insult the Freemasons, for I am one myself, just as Pope Pius IX. was."

It is no wonder that Mons. de Cassagnac was indignant that this barefaced falsehood should be repeated by one from whose position we ought not to expect an unproved, and much less a notoriously false, statement, and, advancing toward the President's chair, the resolute Bonapartist said: "Mr. President, in the name of my political friends, and in the presence of this Chamber, I say that you are a liar."

The reply was not in the style we would wish to see preserved in the debates of a respectable deliberative body; but it is certain that M. de Cassagnac had truth if not politeness on his side, and in the heat of debate, under great provocation, we can palliate, if not entirely excuse, his bitterness.

It is difficult to conceive why the Freemasons are so anxious to make it appear that Pius IX. was a member of their organization. If it were true, it would be an evidence of his folly and insubordination when he was a young man, that is to say, at the time of his becoming a Mason; and we might reasonably infer from his subsequent strong condemnation of the society that he had repented of his folly and had abandoned it when he discovered for himself the evils inherent in the organization.

The story concerning the late Pope's connection with the Freemasons originated in the Italian Freemason papers about thirty years ago. It was stated that he had joined the lodge of the "Endless Chain" in Palermo in 1839, and a document was published which purported to be the diploma granted to Giovanni Mastai Ferretti, which was the Pope's name before his election as Head of the Church. Another story was to the effect that in the same year as mentioned above—1839—he became a member of a lodge in Philadelphia, and it was said further that there were some documents in possession of one of the lodges of Philadelphia in which the name of Jeano Marie Mastai Ferretti figured as a Freemason.

Both of these stories were investigated at the time when they were published, and were proved to be untrue. It was found that there was no such lodge as the "Endless Chain" in Palermo in 1839; and as to his having been initiated into a lodge in Philadelphia, it was proved that though he had been sent by Gregory XVI. on a mission as Legate to Chili, the Holy Father was never in North America. It is also said that he was never in Palermo. The Pope himself denied that there was any truth in either of the statements, though he never thought it worth his while to issue any official denial on the subject, as the statements were beneath his notice. But an investigation was made by Mons. Caubet, once chief of the Paris police, and a high Masonic official, into the statement concerning the Palermo initiation, which he found to be an impudent fabrication without foundation in fact.

The Philadelphia fabrication was exploded in 1865 by the Grand Master of Pennsylvania, Hon. Richard Vaux, and the Grand Secretary, John Thompson, who published a letter with their signatures in the *Monde* *Maconique*, stating that the name of the Pope was not to be found on the register of any lodge within their jurisdiction, and that the nearest name to that of the Pope was found on the register of a lodge in Havana, the name being Martin Ferrety.

The anxiety of Masons to have it believed that the Pope was a member of one of their lodges is quite on a par with their usual practice of pretending that it is a common thing for priests and practical Catholics to be Freemasons. They make this pretence for the purpose of inveigling Catholics into their ranks. But the fact is that all who join the order are excommunicated from the Church by the very act, and they cannot be absolved, except when in danger of death, until they are absolved by the Pope himself from the sentence of excommunication which they have incurred.

This penalty is inflicted by the Pope