

The Catholic Record.

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

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

EDITORS: REV. GEORGE R. NORTHBROOK, Author of "Mistakes of Modern Infidels."

THOMAS COFFEY, Publisher and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY, Messrs. LUKE KING, JOHN NICH, P. J. NEVES and W. A. NEVES, are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transact all other business for the CATHOLIC RECORD.

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

Approved and recommended by the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa, and St. Boniface, and the Bishops of 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. Arrangements must be paid in full before the paper can be stopped.

London, Saturday, July 11, 1896.

A PROPOSED PANACEA.

The Montreal Witness has published two letters from Dr. Denovan on the subject of national education wherein the theory of a purely secular system of State-schoolism to the exclusion of all religious education is more boldly advocated than any Canadian, lay or clerical has hitherto ventured to maintain.

The doctor would abolish all voluntary and private schools, and would oblige all children of school-age to attend a public school in which only secular subjects are taught. He declares that this is "the only system which can be hopefully advanced to solve the present difficulties of our confederated provinces." Headed that "The ancient Spartan system of education is the only true one, viz., sound secular mental culture applied to all the rising population without any regard to social and monetary distinctions or to parental religious opinions and superstitions."

We cannot say that we are greatly surprised that amid the great diversity of opinions entertained in the minds of men, there should be found some persons who maintain this vulgar, and by his expressions of contempt for "parental religious opinions and superstitions" the doctor lets the cat out of the bag, and shows without any attempt at concealment that his purpose is the total abolition of religion from the minds of the rising generation. He evidently regards all religion as a superstition which ought to be eradicated, and we willingly admit that the method he proposes is the surest way to attain the end he has in view. Still there is something of inconsistency in a Canadian citizen who claims to be a lover of the liberty of the people, to advocate what lower down he calls "the despotic system of Spartan education indiscriminately applied" as the only remedy possible "by which we can free ourselves from the tyranny of secret societies, trades, unions and priestly plotting and plumping at civic and parliamentary elections."

The ancient Spartan mode of education which Dr. Denovan so much admires treated the child as the sole property of the State to be brought up as a mere athlete, the one purpose being to make of him a soldier.

When we read in history of the heroic defence of Thermopylae by Leonidas and his three hundred Spartan soldiers against the countless hosts of Xerxes, we are apt to be carried away by enthusiastic admiration for those dauntless warriors, but Christianity has taught us that there is something more necessary than the merely athletic training which was established in Sparta by the greatest of heathen legislators. The morality of the young, which was entirely neglected in Spartan education, is of far more importance than the mere cultivation of bodily strength and activity. Hence the educational system proposed by Dr. Denovan cannot be thought of for a Christian country. The Spartan system might do very well for Zululand, which is said to be the only country in the world where no God is recognized by natives, but it is not suitable for Canada and the nineteenth century.

We are told in history that Lycurgus, who established the Spartan system of education, thought so little of the cultivation of the mind that not only religion, but all arts and sciences were driven from the school room. The legislator thought only of strengthening the bodies of the young. Would our modern educationist who lays down his principles of education so positively imitate all these features of the old Spartan methods? We can scarcely believe that he knew the peculiar character of Spartan education when he lavished on it such unstinted praise; but there is one thing that the doctor evidently has in view—he desires to make the rising generation a generation of infidels, and he does not conceal his wishes in this regard. We will not transfer to our columns the flippancy

with which he demands that the scriptures, or parts of them, should be admitted into the school room, not as a sacred book, but as specimens of literature side by side with Milton and Tennyson, and that the sayings of Socrates and Christ, Mahomet, Columbus, and John Wesley should be read merely as the words of remarkable men, "on the dead level of secular ground."

We are pleased to notice that our Montreal contemporary is shocked at the pushing of pure secularism so far as Mr. Denovan desires. The Witness admits that people who are sensitive about right and wrong should have something to say about who will teach their children, and what they should be taught, and that what we need is rather more liberty to parents to select the teaching to be given to their children, than more bondage. This is precisely our contention when we maintain the rights of Catholics to establish Catholic schools.

MR. GLADSTONE AND REUNION.

"The Grand Old Man," William E. Gladstone, has written a characteristically kind letter which will be found in another column. It treats of the investigation into the validity of Anglican orders which has been going on for some time at Rome by a special commission appointed by the Pope for the purpose, and of the effect of an unfavorable decision upon the question of the reunion of Anglicans with the Catholic Church.

Many of our readers are, of course, aware of what is implied in the question of the validity of orders, but for the benefit of those who may not exactly understand the matter we will give a few words of explanation.

It is of Catholic faith that there are in the ministry of the Church the distinct orders of Episcopacy, priesthood, and inferior ministers, and the Council of Trent has defined that the rite whereby these orders are conferred is one of the seven sacraments.

This sacrament is administered only by Bishops, but it is held that even though the ordaining Bishop may have fallen into heresy or schism, or may have been excommunicated or suspended, the orders conferred by him are valid, just as Baptism by such a one would be valid also: that is to say, the inherent power of conferring orders remains, though it is unlawful for him to exercise it, inasmuch as he has been deprived of all ecclesiastical jurisdiction.

For this reason the schismatical Churches of the East have preserved the succession of bishops and priests, and on their return to Catholic unity there would be no need of re-ordinating them. It would suffice that jurisdiction to exercise their inherent powers should be granted them.

The question of the validity of Anglican orders depends, therefore, upon whether the first Anglican bishops were consecrated by real Bishops with the proper intention to confer valid ordination, and secondly, whether a proper form of ordination was preserved in that Church, so that a continuous succession of real priests and bishops might be kept up.

The question is somewhat complicated, and its decision requires careful investigation into the history of the case. There is a record preserved at Lambeth in which the consecration of the first Anglican Bishop, Matthew Parker, is described, and as from him is derived the succession of Bishops in the Church of England, the question of validity depends partly on the authenticity of this Lambeth document. It was not quoted by early Anglican controversialists when the validity of their orders was called in question, and it is certain that the first Anglicans maintained that no form of ordination is necessary to constitute a Bishop or a priest, but that appointment by the crown suffices for the purpose.

The Lambeth record was not produced till half a century after the event described therein, and Catholic divines unhesitatingly declared that it was a forgery concocted to cover up the deficiency of ordination when the Anglicans themselves began to believe in the necessity of Apostolic succession in the ministry. Further, it is contended that for a period of one hundred and fifty years a form of ordination was used in the Church of England which did not express the office of either priest or Bishop, and was therefore invalid. During this period, even if there had been a validly-ordained ministry, the valid orders would have been irretrievably lost. Such is the historical question which the Holy Father appointed a learned commission to in-

vestigate, and it is stated that the reports of its labors will soon be committed to the school room, not as a sacred book, but as specimens of literature side by side with Milton and Tennyson, and that the sayings of Socrates and Christ, Mahomet, Columbus, and John Wesley should be read merely as the words of remarkable men, "on the dead level of secular ground."

Mr. Gladstone writes in a very kindly spirit, speaking so respectfully of the Pope and of the Catholic Church that he has brought upon himself the ire of the non-Conformist clergy, who are denouncing him as a traitor to Protestantism.

Upon the conversion of an Anglican clergyman to the Catholic Church, if he is to be admitted to the priesthood, it is the practice at present to ordain him in the usual manner. This ordination would be unnecessary if Anglican orders were proved to be valid.

Mr. Gladstone says that this is a rare occurrence, but it has not been at all rare, especially during the period when the celebrated Oxford movement was at its height. The late Cardinals Manning and Newman were examples; and at the consecration of the former to the Archbishop of Westminster, there were no fewer than one hundred and fifty priests in the sanctuary who had been formerly Anglican clergymen.

Mr. Gladstone admits that Pope Leo XIII. is a ruler of known wisdom. He admits also that the Holy Father has approached the question in good spirit and for the purpose of peace, and he therefore expresses high admiration of the Pope's good intentions, but he evidently fears that the decision will be adverse, and he therefore curiously comes to the conclusion that for the interest of faith as opposed to unbelief, it would be better to leave the question an open one, rather than to decide adversely. He himself thinks that the validity of the orders is not subject to reasonable doubt, but we are of opinion that he looks at the matter from a Protestant standpoint, setting little value on the observance of rites and forms which Catholics regard as essential.

Mr. Gladstone thinks that it would be a greater barrier against infidelity if it could be said that more than three-fourths of Christendom assert the necessity of a ministry which has been transmitted from the Apostles by a continuous succession. Besides he believes that an adverse decision would increase the difficulty of a reunion of the Churches.

To this we must reply in his own words toward the close of his letter, that such "considerations must be subordinated to historic truth."

The Church regards the sacraments with so much respect that she carefully abstains from the reiteration of the sacraments which can be conferred validly only once. It is, therefore, important to settle the question of the validity of Anglican orders, so that if they are truly valid they may not again be reiterated. The Holy Father will undoubtedly examine the matter carefully, but whether the decision be affirmative or negative, he will publish it in the interest of truth without any fear for the consequences which are such a bugbear to the learned and good ex-Premier of Great Britain.

A NEW IMPOSTOR—LOOK OUT FOR HIM.

A young man named Huxley was recently immersed in Washington, according to the Baptist form. He claims to be a nephew of the celebrated professor of the same name, who is an infidel. There is nothing remarkable about this fact in itself, but the young man announced also that he had been a Roman Catholic, and editor of the Baltimore Catholic Mirror. When this announcement was made in the Washington Post the editor of the Mirror at once wrote to the Post the following denial:

"Your issue of Monday last contained a statement that a Mr. Huxley, who was immersed by Dr. Stakeley at the First Baptist Church, Washington, D. C., was recently on the editorial staff of the Catholic Mirror." To this statement we make an unqualified denial. There is not nor ever has been any one by the name of Mr. Huxley connected with the Catholic Mirror in the editorial, reportorial, advertising or subscription departments, nor employed in the composing or press rooms. In a word, no person by that name has been or is employed in any capacity by the Catholic Mirror. Furthermore, he is not known by any person connected with the Catholic Mirror."

What object could the young man have had in making such an assertion respecting the position he pretended to have held? We can only suppose that it is his intention to become a lecturer of the Leyden or Slattery kind, and that he will soon turn up as an ex-Catholic editor who knows all about the Catholic Church and who has seen

the "errors of Romanism," and will now devote his talents to exposing those "errors" on the lecturing platform; or perhaps he will put himself forward as an ex-priest or ex-monk. It is a profitable trade sometimes, but we deem it right to put the public on their guard against a man who by the barefaced lie with which he begins his career, makes it highly probable that he intends to keep up the imposture.

THE DUTY OF THE NEW GOVERNMENT.

We have not at any time approved of the delays to which the Catholics of the sister Province of Manitoba have been subjected in regard to the School question. The question is one which should not have been relegated to the sphere of Dominion politics at all, but it is not the fault of the Catholics of that Province or of the Dominion that this has been the case.

It is now six years since Mr. Greenway inflicted the injustice on the Catholic minority, whereby they are doubly taxed, first for their own schools, which they have maintained resolutely at a great sacrifice, though they have been abolished in the eye of the law, and secondly, for the schools of their Protestant neighbors.

The Catholics pursued the only course open to them to obtain redress, and by so doing showed that the grievance to which they have been subjected is not a merely sentimental one. It touches at the same time both their conscientious convictions and their pockets, and they are not wealthy that they can bear the burden which has been imposed on them.

It was the natural course for them to appeal first to the Provincial Government for redress, but a deaf ear was turned to their representations. They showed that the good faith of the Dominion was pledged to them, but the Greenway Government paid no attention, and they were obliged to have recourse to the courts for redress.

We have always believed that the Dominion Government could and should have given redress by a simple order in Council, vetoing the iniquitous School laws, which so evidently violated the spirit and wording of the Constitution. That the country would have sustained it in so doing is now a fact beyond dispute, but the time allowed for giving so simple a remedy was allowed to lapse. Notwithstanding this we have at length the verdict of the Court of last appeal, that the Catholics have a grievance with which the Parliament of the Dominion has the right to deal.

It has been maintained by Mr. McCarthy and the anti-remedialists generally that this decision does not oblige the Parliament to give redress. In a certain sense this is true. Parliament is supreme in law, and there is no power which can control it, except ultimately the voice of the people. But it is none the less the duty of Parliament to act justly. A grievance has been proved to exist, an injustice has been done, and the duty of Parliament to remove it is clear, as it is also the duty of the Government of the day to lead the Parliament to the fulfilment of its duty.

Notwithstanding Mr. Laurier's opposition to the Remedial Bill, we are confident that he will take steps to settle the question satisfactorily. He has repeatedly declared that he would do this, though it is not yet clear on what lines he will carry out his promise. We are confident that he can follow no other course than that indicated by the Privy Council which interpreted the Manitoba Act in this sense: "you are not to destroy any privileges or rights existing at the time of the union;" and "there is no doubt either what the points of difference were, and it is in the light of these that the 22nd section of the Manitoba Act of 1870, which was in truth a Parliamentary compact, must be read."

As it is the verdict of the people that Mr. Laurier should assume the reins of power, it is but right he should have a fair opportunity to show how he will settle the school difficulty. It is said that he will induce Mr. Greenway to come to terms, and that the latter will concede what he has hitherto so obstinately refused. This may be true, but his course in the past does not lead us to entertain very high expectations in this regard. It must be understood both by Mr. Laurier and Mr. Greenway and their governments that the Catholics of Canada will not be satisfied with anything less than a full recognition of their right to an efficient school law which will enable those of Manitoba to give their children such an education as they can conscientiously approve of. If this be attained it is of little conse-

quence whether such a law be passed by Provincial Legislature or by Parliament. We would, indeed, prefer for the sake of harmony that the Provincial Legislature should be the one to pass such a law, but if the Province still refuse to do this it will be the duty of Parliament to intervene. The Dominion is not composed of entirely independent Provinces, and every Province is therefore bound to respect the supreme law which has been established for the protection of minorities. We must hold by the clauses of the Constitution which point out where minorities aggrieved are to look for redress. As Sir A. T. Galt said as early as 1864, when explaining these clauses to his constituents: "It is clear that in confiding the general subject of education to the local Legislatures, it was absolutely necessary it should be accompanied with such restrictions as would prevent injustice from being done to the minority in any respect. There could be no greater injustice to a population than to compel them to have their children educated in a manner contrary to their own religious belief."

This was said on behalf of the Protestants of Quebec, but Confederation would be a very one-sided affair if the same rule were not to be applied to the Catholic minorities of the other Provinces. Catholics owe it to themselves as a duty to insist that this be done. We would deserve to be treated with contempt if we were indifferent in this matter, a matter of so much importance that the Hon. Geo. Brown, who was no friend to Catholics, declared in one of his speeches during the debate on Confederation:

"I admit that from my point of view that is a blot on the scheme before the House. It is confessedly one of the concessions from our side that have to be made to secure this great measure of reform. But surely, I for one have not the slightest hesitation in accepting it as a necessary condition of the scheme of union, and doubly acceptable must it be in the eyes of gentlemen opposite who were the authors of the Bill of 1863."

The Orange Grand lodge, and the anti-Remedialists generally have a peculiar way of fulfilling obligations which are equivalent to a treaty. "Make the compact, and then should it turn out that Catholics desire its terms to be carried out, break the agreement." But this mode of dealing will be found not to work on the present occasion.

DEATH OF MGR. CARMODY.

The death of Monsignor Carmody, of Halifax, will bring sorrow not only to the faithful of the diocese of Halifax but also to his many friends throughout the maritime provinces. He died at his post—in harness—as he always wished. Whilst the Archbishop and the rector of the Cathedral (Dr. Murphy) were on a visit to the East and Rome he was attacked by a severe bronchial affection, which, despite the unremitting attention of his physicians, bereft the diocese of Halifax of its Vicar-General and of one of its most saintly priests.

We shall not attempt to portray the scenes of his sacerdotal career. True, indeed, is it that the memory of a diocesan priest vanishes quickly from the minds of even those amongst whom he labored; but we feel confident that the story of Monsignor Carmody's life, his toil and trials, his generosity, his adherence to duty for over fifty-years, will be told at hearthstones for many years to come. And well it may, for there is no man more deserving of remembrance than a faithful priest. Hemmed in by the world he must not be stained by it; handling the things of the world his heart must not cleave to them; beset by temptations he must not yield to them; and clothed though he be in flesh and blood, his feet must ever rest on the upward path of self-denial.

No wonder that the priest is tired when death comes to him. Tired but glad—tired of the struggle and glad for the victory, and for the consciousness of having been ever the soldier tried and true. No happiness is comparable to this, and Monsignor Carmody must have indeed been consoled by it as his life ebbed away.

The diocese of Halifax has lost a good man, a good priest—and whilst expressing our heartfelt sympathy we cherish the hope that its people may have always priests like Father Carmody to minister to them.

It seems to us that some of our public men are too fond of giving lectures on "dead subjects." If they have anything new to say, it is quite pardonable, but the same old tale, drawn from encyclopædias, is wearying.

THE POPE'S ENCYCLICAL ON CHRISTIAN REUNION.

The Holy Father, Pope Leo XIII., has evidently confidence in the power of the truth to command respectful attention from those before whom it is placed plainly and simply, and he has just issued a new Encyclical on the Reunion of Christendom which is remarkable for the plainness and force with which he presents the nature of the Church as the means whereby Christ proposed to preserve Christian unity.

The Encyclical will be found in another column. It is one of the most masterly documents which have ever been issued explaining the constitution of Christ's Church.

The daily papers state that it is probably an answer to Mr. Gladstone's recent letter on the same subject, but though it certainly deals with the nature and necessity of apostolic succession in the Christian ministry, of which subject Mr. Gladstone's suggestions to the Holy Father treated, it is unlikely that the encyclical is a consequence of Mr. Gladstone's letter, or that it was issued as a reply to the letter, though it certainly indicates distinctly the course which must necessarily be followed in regard to Mr. Gladstone's proposals; but it is contrary to the known facts of the case.

The encyclical has been some time in preparation, and its leading principles were foreshadowed long before Mr. Gladstone's letter was written. Besides, a Papal encyclical is too important a matter in Church history to be hurriedly prepared, and therefore the present one could not have been intended as a reply to a letter which has appeared so recently that it could scarcely have been considered in Rome, or perhaps even seen there, before the encyclical was issued. We regard it, therefore, as simply a providential coincidence that the Holy Father deals so ably and so fully with the main point to which Mr. Gladstone refers.

His Holiness shows that it was Christ's intention that the Church should be one "living organized society, animated by the invisible vital principle of supernatural life," and that the contrary doctrine is a pernicious error. Among the proofs of this there is one given with new and irresistible force that as Christ's mission on earth was to save the whole human race, His Church should embrace the men of all nations and of all times, so that there should be another Christ invented if men may set up another Church than that described in Holy Scripture as His body.

The Holy Father then shows that there must as a necessary consequence be within the Church a principle by which unity shall be insured. For the preservation of unity the hierarchy of the Church was established, but not to act independently of its visible head.

It is the universal teaching of the Fathers of the Church that the rejection of even one doctrine taught by Christ's Church is a rejection of Divine revelation, and of God's authority. This is sufficient, therefore, to put those who reject a single doctrine outside the Catholic communion, for the Church is man's guide to heaven.

It is mentioned also that the Church seeks only this object, and will therefore not interfere in civil matters, or infringe upon any right of the State. The supreme governing authority of the Church is shown to have been conferred upon St. Peter, to whom alone the power of the keys was given by Christ, with the duty to feed both lambs and sheep. St. Peter alone, therefore, has this supreme authority, and it passes to his successors who succeed him in the Roman pontificate.

The episcopal order receives its authority from Christ, and is essential to the constitution of the Church, but the episcopal order must be in union with St. Peter's successor. Hence every Bishop who secedes from Peter and his successors lose the right and power of ruling, because Peter, and not the other apostles, was made the Rock, which is the foundation of the Church. Peter is, therefore, the centre of all Christian unity for the whole world.

By this it is seen that Mr. Gladstone's notion that a declaration of the validity of Anglican orders by the Pope would put the Anglican Church into the position of an Apostolic organization, is a mistake. By the rejection of the supreme authority derived from St. Peter it would still rank as a schismatical society.

The Holy Father's encyclical has received on the whole a very favorable reception from the Protestant press as being written in a kindly tone, but many object to it because it implies

that to bring about an absolutely necessary body of Catholic doctrine the Pope could not so promise, though in merely to discipline the Holy Father would deal, if thereby soul and the kingdom of extended. The Church by Christ to preserve error and from being by every wind of doctrine she must give. As truth is immutable, she must maintain it, or else she is changed, otherwise she is described in pillar and ground of.

It is evident that has no fear that a p the truth will repel the "other sheep" w fold. He states the t because he is the cen body of the successor who are the Bishop Church, and the Holy arily the duty to full Christ to teach His tr and this sincerity w showing the errant truth is to be found, concealment thereof of words.

A PROTESTANT THOUGHTS ON A QUESTION.

We publish in a letter on Separate Thos. Churcher, wh the Free Press of this ago.

Mr. Churcher is a this city, and a b opinions and obser passes must carry g he has arrived at t if the alarming i among young people try and the United checked it can be d religious teaching i not by endeavoring abolish such teachi our population ar in regard to the C Province.

The reference of Mr. Justice Street remarks of the learn by occasion of a n nals whom he had c Hamilton a few we pressed regret that that the number of is increasing, and this is the abolition ing in the schools. now not taught to from wrong, but are of secular knowled graphy, algebra, etc. foundation which their knowledge so come good and usef

Mr. Churcher als other denominations have come to see th ing religious ter have seen that neces gine, and provided arate schools. Sur tectant fellow citize occupied in endeavor own children taugh than in attempting ollic children of this toba of what relig get.

Mr. Churcher's le of careful considera

EDITORIAL.

FRANCE MAISTRE Count de Maistre merits to their mer Canada remember sons?

THE remains of been committed to hence his elegy by some member of omy. We suppo about him will be year, but dead mer

DR. CAPEN delivered on John Boyle worthy of the man the best of its kind for a decade. It sympathetically t great-hearted Iris friends must foret the memory of the

FR. ELLIOT has e for his new vent missions to Prote York diocese. If nness can do it he w