

The Catholic Record.

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

Price of subscription—\$2.50 per annum.

EDITOR: REV. GEORGE R. NORTHGRAVES.

Author of "Mistakes of Modern Infidels."

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 Peterborough, 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 must be paid in full before the paper can be stopped.

London, Saturday, Feb. 4, 1893.

CHURCH UNION.

A meeting of clergymen of various denominations was held in Toronto on the 23rd of January for the purpose of taking into consideration the question which has recently been so much discussed among the Protestant clergy and press—the union of the sects into one body corporate.

The meeting was a purely voluntary gathering, as it was explained that there was no authorization from the sects to which the various ministers belonged to take any positive steps towards the object for which they were assembled, but it was highly representative in regard to the prominence of the ministers who were present, there being fifteen Anglicans of the deanery of Toronto and fifty-five of other denominations, among whom Presbyterians seemed to predominate, though Methodists and others were there also, but only one of these, the Rev. James Grant, a Baptist, gave expression to the general opinion prevalent in his sect on the subject under consideration.

It was explained by Rev. Septimus Jones, on behalf of the Anglican contingent, that his colleagues were present on invitation from the Ministerial Association, to which the other clergymen present belong.

There is no doubt about the main fact that it is the will of God that Christians should be one—one in faith and obeying the voice of the one Church which Christ instituted; and on this point most of the speakers seemed to be agreed.

Rev. Mr. Jones said that "considering the matter in the light furnished by the Scriptures the Church should be more closely united than it is."

The mistake of Mr. Jones is not in his conception of what the Church ought to be, but in the fact that he imagines that the Church of Christ is not what it ought to be; for the promise made by Christ when He built His Church upon a rock was that the "gates of hell shall not prevail against it;" (St. Matt. xvi., 18), and it is styled by the Apostle "the pillar and ground of truth."

Rev. Mr. Jones thus pointedly declared that the contradictory sects represented at the meeting cannot be the ideal Church of Holy Scripture which is always spoken of as one organized body; yet very curiously and most inconsistently he persists in calling this confused medley of jarring sects "the Church."

There is one, and only one, Church which corresponds with this ideal Church of Scripture—the Catholic Church, which alone has taught at all times and in all places the same doctrines. Unity is to be sought, not by a compromise of sects, but by the acceptance of the body of doctrine which Christ taught His Apostles, and which has been handed down by them to after generations, even to the present day.

It is a matter for surprise that the correctness of the Catholic belief that unity of true faith is essential to the true Church, and that the Protestant denominations do not possess it was really admitted by nearly all the speakers, while at the same time they seemed to imagine that if their deliberations would only result in boiling together all their errors into one stew, the resulting mess would be the essence of Christian truth.

Thus Rev. Mr. Jones said if closer union "could be brought about there is no reason to ask how but to accept the guidance of the Master, etc."

He added: "The members of the Church of England had not come in the spirit of men desiring to absorb the other denominations, but with a desire to say 'here we are serving the one God and hoping that that Lord may bring us in fuller light.'"

Why, if the Church of England or any other sect which was represented at the meeting is really the Church which Christ instituted, it ought to be the desire of every one that all others should be absorbed into it, not indeed by corporate union, with their errors

remaining as an integral part of the new combination, but by their repudiation of their specific errors and their unequivocal acceptance of the true faith.

Mr. Jones also said that Provost Body's paper on union would not represent merely his own views, but would show just what the Anglican Church would desire if a union were to be brought about. Provost Body's views must therefore be regarded as of special importance.

1. He declared that it is desirable in negotiations of this kind to "aim after agreement, not after differences." This use of words is very plausible, and all the more specious because there is a sense in which the sentiment is correct. It is right that we should aim at agreement in the one truth as revealed; but the context and circumstances show that the Provost's meaning is that we should minimize and tolerate differences which actually exist on essential points of Christian belief—a meaning which is directly opposed to Christ's commission to His Apostles to teach all things which He had commanded. It is in this same spirit that all conventions of the nature of this one have hitherto been conducted, so that union of some kind may be brought about at the sacrifice of truth. It is needless to add that the result must be an agglomeration of errors instead of an edifice which is the pillar and ground of truth in the sense of Holy Scripture. And it is of just such a gathering that took place once before—a gathering, too, which came to an end because Presbyterianism and Anglicanism were found to be irreconcilable—that the Provost says, "the sense which we then had of the blessed presence of God's Holy Spirit restraining, guiding and controlling us will never be forgotten by any who were privileged to take part in that gathering."

We might suppose that all this was intended as a joke were it not that levity would be profanity on so serious and solemn a theme.

The Provost is right, however, when he quotes approvingly Professor Milligan of Aberdeen, a Presbyterian divine, as saying, "What the Church ought to possess is a unity that the eye can see. Visible unity in one form or another is an essential mark of her faithfulness." But where is such unity to be found except in the Catholic Church—unity of faith, unity of submission to the successor of St. Peter? Why seek it elsewhere?

He is right also in saying, "We cannot forget that schism is not merely a great practical hindrance, but it is beyond question a grievous sin." Once consummated it creates barriers which last on for centuries.

But the sin of schism did not lie in the separation of other sects from Anglicanism, which itself cut loose from the Universal Church. The schism was when Anglicanism was instituted with new doctrines, a new worship and a new head of the Church.

The provost pointed out that Presbyterians lack a ministry derived from the Apostles through Episcopal ordination.

The Rev. Dr. John Langtry, in continuation, showed that this Apostolic ministry is essential to the Church, and he suggested as a means by which unity might be effected that the Presbyterians should accept the Anglican theory. This they are not likely to do, so it can scarcely be expected that any union will come out of the present movement.

Another difficulty was put forward by Rev. Dr. Jas. Grant on behalf of the Baptists. He asked, "Is union near at hand? Is it possible? In my short cut way I answer very kindly, I hope, but very decidedly, 'It is not near at hand.'"

His reason for saying this was that Baptists hold to a truth of Christianity which other denominations deny, and he added: "We cannot barter truth as we understand it, even for union, and we dare not stifle conviction with the bribe of absorbing or being absorbed by another Church."

With no ill will to the gentlemen who held the gathering we must say that we must consider their efforts fruitless until they go about the matter in another way. Let them come to the centre of Christian unity: "Come to me all you that labor and are heavily laden and I will refresh you."

His Lordship the Bishop of Hamilton and Rev. Father McEvay have left on a trip to Rome, where they will take part in the Holy Father's Jubilee. From there they will go to the Holy Land, and returning stay for a short while in England and Ireland. Vicar-General Heenan is administrator of the

diocese during His Lordship's absence. A pleasant trip and safe return is the heartfelt wish of the CATHOLIC RECORD.

THE MANITOBA SCHOOL LAW.

The case of the schools of Manitoba has at length been brought before the Cabinet Council at Ottawa, where it was ably argued by Mr. J. B. Ewart, Q. C., counsel for the Catholic minority of the Province.

Oppressive though we believe the decision of the Imperial Privy Council to be towards the Catholic body, Mr. Ewart appears to take it for granted that as the law stands it must be admitted that it is at least the law until remedial legislation be passed to remove the injustice; so in his argument before the Canadian Cabinet Council, he shows elaborately that the Manitoban Legislature passed the Public Schools Acts of 1880, not indeed in contravention of rights which the minority was supposed to possess at the time of the union with the Canadian Dominion, but in contravention of rights which were conferred upon Catholics and Protestants alike by the Manitoban Legislature after it became a Province.

Journals hostile to the Catholic demand for just treatment try to make it appear that this contention of Mr. Ewart is an absurd one, and in a recent issue of the Mail it was compared with the appeal of an Egyptian beggar who had received daily for some time an alms from a gentleman who passed by. The gentleman, however, afterwards discontinued the alms, and the beggar had him summoned before a magistrate on the plea that he had relied upon the continued receipt of the alms as a mode of sustenance, and that he had therefore a vested right to its continuance. This absurd plea was sustained by the Egyptian official.

It is almost needless for us to say that such a comparison is as unfounded as it is insulting; and the very fact of instituting it is an insult to the good sense of the eminent statesmen who framed the Confederation Act of the Dominion.

There was a certain state of things existing in several Provinces of the Dominion before Confederation took place, and a prominent feature of this state of things was the existence of Separate schools for Catholic and Protestant minorities. These schools actually and undeniably existed in Ontario, Quebec and the whole North-West.

The Fathers of Confederation recognized that the respective minorities valued highly their privilege of educating their children according to their own religious convictions, and so the latter were assured that their privileges would be continued; and it is acknowledged that the Confederation would not have taken place if these guarantees had been withheld. The guarantees are therefore not a dole of alms which may be freely given or denied at the will and whim of one of the parties to the compact. They are an essential part of the solemn compact by which the Dominion was constituted; and it was because all parties thought that the central authority of the Dominion would preserve the balance of justice that the Separate or Dissident school systems were placed under the special care of the Dominion Government and Parliament, which by the provisions in question was expected to be a check upon those Provinces where the majorities might possibly be in the humor from time to time to ride roughshod over the minorities.

Among the clauses of the British North America Act by which the school question is governed is one by which not merely the Separate school system of Quebec and Ontario, which existed when Confederation was brought about, were protected, but it provides that wherever afterwards a Separate school system shall be established it shall not be abolished or rendered inoperative by future Provincial legislation, without appeal. The appeal is to the Central or Dominion Government and Parliament; and it is on these grounds that the Catholic minority of Manitoba are now appealing for redress.

Owing to the adverse decision of the Imperial Privy Council it is useless now to argue that the Manitoban Legislature has not the inherent power to legislate away Catholic rights. We say the power, because whatever may be its power we maintain that it cannot be its right to annul or destroy the authority of parents and teachers of religion as derived from God.

We may concede, therefore, the power of the Legislature, but it exercises this power to commit a wrong when it practically destroys or attempts

to destroy religious teaching in the schools, or imposes a penalty upon parents for providing for such teaching.

But there is a remedy provided in the Constitution for this wrong; and it is to have this remedy applied that the Catholics are now seeking in the case which is pending before the Dominion Privy Council.

We are gravely told by the Mail that because in the United States, Mgr. Satolli, the Pope's representative, has recommended the Bishops to make a friendly arrangement with the State on the school question, we in Canada should therefore abandon our liking for Separate schools.

No one has more vigorously abused Catholics in the past for accepting the authority of the Pope's decisions on questions of faith and morals, when the State thinks proper to interfere in such matters. We are surprised to find the Mail now recommending us to be guided by the Pope. But we still bow as respectfully as ever to the Pope's authority, and if that journal will only read more carefully Mgr. Satolli's instructions, it will find that even if we were to apply them to Canada, to which they are not intended to extend, they are perfectly in accord with the stand we have always taken, to preserve religious teaching.

Mr. Ewart maintains that the clause in the British North America Act which subjects Provincial Separate school legislation to Dominion supervision applies also to Manitoba. We have no doubt that such is truly the case, and that the Dominion Government is bound to remedy the injustice which has been inflicted.

The following from Mr. Ewart's plea is interesting as showing the course he has adopted in urging the Catholic rights to redress:

"Manitoba entered the union in 1870. At that time Protestants and Catholics were there in about equal numbers. The question of education was certain to be one of the first things dealt with by the Legislature which should there be erected, and it became the duty of the Dominion Parliament to formulate such a constitution as would best subserve the interests of the future inhabitants. What power was to be given with reference to education? The people are at present about equally divided, but it is inevitable that one side or the other (we cannot now tell which) will in years to come be in the majority. Shall we leave them to fight it out, letting the more numerous win? Or shall we provide for the future minority? Following the precedent of the Confederation Act the latter course was adopted. Power was given to the Legislature to make laws with reference to education, but no plenary power was accorded."

We have stated above how the power was limited. Part of the limitation has been set aside by the judgment of the British Judicial Committee, but the Dominion Government is none the less bound to protect the minority by having passed now a law which will secure the end which was intended by the framers of Confederation.

The Manitoba Government refuses to plead before the Government Council; but this fact should not terrorize the Government into inactivity on so important a question as the preservation of the educational rights of the minority.

THEOSOPIHY.

The opportunity was afforded us one day last week to listen to an explanation of the so-called religious system which under the name of Theosophy has been recently attracting considerable attention among unbelievers in Christianity.

The word Theosophy is derived from two Greek words, *Theos*, God, and *Sophia*, wisdom, and is intended to mean a knowledge of divine truth as understood by the late Madame Blavatsky, but it is in reality an agglomeration of absurdities derived partly from Buddhism, and partly from the old Pythagorean theory of Transmigration of souls, which means that at death the human soul enters into, and animates some other being.

The explanation at which we had the opportunity of listening was given in Buffalo by Mr. Burnham Harding before a small audience, among whom were several newspaper reporters. Mr. Harding asserted that Theosophy would give an impetus to science, as it would lead to the knowledge of the causes of events, or, as he expressed it, it would "carry science from the plane of events to the plane of causes." According to this theory the human race is the fifth which has inhabited the globe, each race being a reincarnation of the preceding, the one immediately preceding the present being the Atlantean, or gigantic, of high

material but low ethical or moral development.

As we understood the lecturer, it is claimed that Theosophy is a revealed religion. It is put forward rather as a system of philosophy, and it is only worthy of credit to the extent to which it is demonstrable. This being the case we should look for complete evidence of its truth before accepting it at all, but this evidence is entirely wanting, and we cannot see in the system anything more than improved assumption which does not merit the name of a system of philosophy.

Surely if we are to believe that we have had an existence on earth before the present life, we ought to have the clearest evidence that such was the case; but the Theosophists wish us to believe this without furnishing us with any proof further than mere assertion; and this was made clear when Mr. Harding was asked "Does any one remember the body he occupied in a previous state of existence?" He answered, "Oh yes; Madame Blavatsky remembered it. Before she was herself she was her niece, and before that an Indian woman."

He explained further that "we might all remember our previous states of existence except for the reason that 'we try to remember them with our brains which did not exist before this life, and of course cannot remember a pre-existence in which it did not partake.'"

From this the inference seems to be inevitable that it is necessary to become brainless before we can really be believers in Theosophy.

AN UNEXPECTED EFFECT.

Among the complaints made by the Rev. Dr. Douglas, the Montreal Methodist Romaphobist, one is to the effect that English Protestants are unfairly treated in the distribution of Government patronage in the Province of Quebec, and this hypothetical state of affairs is part of the doctor's grievance which he proposes to have redressed on the lines which are being attempted by the Protestant Protective Association—the total exclusion of Catholics from office so far as they can effect this object.

It is notorious that these statements are false. The French-Canadians have always dealt with the Protestants with the greatest liberality, giving them more than their share of public offices. So true is this that both in the Dominion Parliament and the Local Legislature the Protestants of Quebec have much larger representation than they would be entitled to from their proportion of population, and several thoroughly Catholic constituencies are represented by Protestants.

It has been several times publicly attested by Messrs. Joly, Holton, Pope and other Protestant gentlemen that their co-religionists have always been treated with the greatest liberality by the French-Canadian Catholic majority. It is with a very ill grace, therefore, that fanatics like the Methodist parson of Montreal endeavor to excite ill feeling by misrepresenting the facts.

A recent issue of *La Patrie* furnishes some interesting details on this subject among which it gives in round numbers the proportion of French to English-speaking people in Quebec at 1,450,000 to 300,000. To represent the latter there are three Cabinet Ministers out of seven, eight judges out of twenty-four, while all the principal officials in the civil service, both Federal and Provincial, are also English-speaking, and they fill the highest positions in nearly every department, such as those of Chief Justice, Harbor Commissioner, etc.

The people of Quebec are beginning to look into these questions, more particularly since so much attention has been attracted to them by fanatics like Dr. Douglas, with the result that they find matters to be quite contrary to their representations, and are beginning to ask why such preference should be shown for those who seem to appreciate it so badly; and the demand is growing strong that these preferences should cease and that the rights of French-Canadians and Catholics must hereafter be considered more in accordance with their proportion of the population.

The *Patrie* says: "The majority have always shown themselves generous, but there is a limit beyond which generosity takes the name of stupidity. We have reached this, and there are people simple enough to oppose annexation to diminish French influence, as if that influence were not already reduced to its most simple expression."

We do not adopt the *Patrie's* reasoning regarding the facts as an argument in favor of annexation, but they are nevertheless evidence of a state of things which ought not to exist, and if Dr. Douglas' utterance lead the Catholics, French and Irish alike, of Quebec, to look after their rights of equal representation in official positions, Dr. Douglas' escapades will not be without their value—though hitherto we have regarded them as mere follies.

sonings in regarding the facts as an argument in favor of annexation, but they are nevertheless evidence of a state of things which ought not to exist, and if Dr. Douglas' utterance lead the Catholics, French and Irish alike, of Quebec, to look after their rights of equal representation in official positions, Dr. Douglas' escapades will not be without their value—though hitherto we have regarded them as mere follies.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

MR. GEORGE W. KIELY, of Toronto, formerly of London, has made a donation of \$4,000 to St. Michael's College, the interest of which is to be devoted to the education of young men for the priesthood. This is indeed a noble gift, and can we doubt that the donor has thus laid up for himself a treasure in heaven. It may be said that Catholics have not amongst them very many men of more than average wealth, but, nevertheless, it is a regrettable fact that instances of this description are not at all as numerous as they might be. From time to time we notice in the public press announcements that wealthy Protestant gentlemen have donated large sums of money to colleges and other institutions belonging to the different Protestant denominations. It might be said that they have in this regard set an example to our wealthy Catholics worthy of imitation. In Ontario, especially, we have many Catholic institutions struggling for existence, and surely our worthy co-religionists cannot do a more praiseworthy act than bestow a portion of their wealth on institutions which are engaged in the work of God. All honor to Mr. Kiely for his thoughtful and generous bequest! We hope to have the pleasure of frequently making mention of similar actions on the part of other Catholics.

Mrs. DORCHESTER, the wife of Rev. Dr. Dorchester, who has made herself so notorious by his efforts to destroy the Catholic Indian schools in the West of the United States, has succeeded admirably in her work of inspecting the Indian schools, if we are to judge by the amount of cash she has drawn from Uncle Sam's treasury. The Indian schools, it is said, could have been inspected in three months, but she managed to make one tour of inspection last three and a half years, for which she received \$7,662 for salary and expenses, being paid \$6 a day, besides her travelling outlay. This is only a small fraction of the expense to which the country has been put for the anti-Catholic management of the schools under Rev. General Morgan.

Rev. Dr. Dorchester, and his amiable spouse; but it is expected that President Cleveland will relieve this clique of their onerous charge, and at the same time relieve the tax-payers of the heavy burden they are sustaining by paying these useless and expensive officials. Of course, Mrs. Dorchester is made a Government employee simply for the purpose of keeping her husband company, but the tax-payer foots the bill.

ARCHDIOCESE OF KINGSTON.

A Card to the Clergy.

His Eminence, Cardinal Ledochowski, Prefect of the Sacred Congregation of the Propaganda, has written to the Archbishop, acknowledging receipt of 22,950 francs, Peter's Pence, which he presented to Our Holy Father, Pope Leo XIII., in the name of the Archdiocese of Kingston. His Eminence mentions that he had read for the Sovereign Pontiff the letter of Our Archbishop forwarding the Peter's Pence, and assuring His Holiness of the loyalty and warm affection of all His spiritual children in this division of the Christian Family. The list of contributions, especially those of the priests, to which His Grace respectfully invited the Pope's particular attention, afforded ample evidence of their hearty and generous allegiance and filial devotion to the Common Father of all the faithful and their readiness to maintain Him in royal dignity and independence. In return, His Holiness expressed his heartfelt thanks for the rich New Year's gift and for the generosity that prompted it. He instructed the Cardinal Prefect to convey to the Archbishop of Kingston and his "excellent priests" and people His praise and admiration of their zeal and filial devotion to His person; and, in conclusion, He sent His Apostolic Benediction, "most lovingly" to us all. The Papal Benediction and the Plenary Indulgence attached to it, shall be communicated to the entire diocese in solemn form by His Grace from St. Mary's Cathedral, on Sunday, the 5th of February, at noon. The clergy are requested to make this announcement to their congregations next Sunday, and exhort them to prepare their souls for its worthy and plenary reception by the Sacraments of Penance and the Most Holy Eucharist.

JAMES VINCENT NEVILLE, The Palace, Pro-Sec. Kingston, 25th Jan., 1893.