

The Catholic Record.

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

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

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

THOMAS COFFEY, Publisher and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY, MESSRS. LUKE KING, JOHN NICH, P. J. NEVEN and W. A. NEVIN, are fully authorized by twelve subscriptions and transact all other business for the CATHOLIC RECORD.

Rates of Advertising—Ten cents per line each insertion, adage 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 to be paid in full before the paper can be stopped.

London, Saturday, July 18, 1896.

AN ANGLICAN DIVINE ON SEPARATE SCHOOLS.

At the first session of the Anglican Synod of Ottawa held last week the opening sermon preached by Archdeacon Lauder of that city was a remarkable one. He dealt with the educational problem, taking strong ground in favor of religious education and Separate schools.

It has been pretty generally supposed that Catholics alone are in favor of distinct religious teaching in the schools, but for many years past the Church of England has also put itself on record as being in favor of its establishment for Anglican children.

The Archdeacon said: "The present Public school system is no doubt popular and has taken a deep hold on our people, but as a Church we are not satisfied with it and never can be until the knowledge of God and the keeping of His commandments are recognized as an important part of every child's education."

While it may not be possible for us at present to have a Separate school of our own—a right which we have never ceased to assert—let us try in the meantime to make these Public schools more acceptable. Let a ceaseless cry go forth from every pulpit in the land for religious instruction to form a part of the regular work in every Public school. Religious teaching in some measure will help to fill the aching void which, if left empty during the child's school-days, cannot fail to produce evil effects in manhood.

A child governed by unrestrained passions and without a godly influence is very likely to fall into vice and go step by step down to a dishonored grave. Our readers will remember that only a few weeks ago one of our judges had occasion to pass sentence on a considerable number of youthful criminals in Hamilton, and His Lordship then stated that the number of youthful criminals throughout the country has greatly increased, and he justly ascribed the fact to the want of religious teaching in the schools.

As a consequence of this the children grow up without religious principles, and the inevitable result is an increase in the number of young criminals. Archdeacon Lauder is of the same opinion, and there is no doubt he is correct. This has always been held by Catholics, and it is gratifying to observe that the truth of the Catholic position is now being admitted by Protestants, and especially by members of the Church of England.

The Ottawa synod is not the only synod of the Church of England which has pronounced upon this subject. For many years the Toronto synod has annually made the same pronouncement, though recently in a more modified form. It appears that that synod has not confidence that it will be able to obtain from the Ontario Legislature the concession of Separate schools, and it therefore has asked only for the introduction of religious teaching twice a week in the Public schools. This method has been tried in parts of England, but its results have not appeared to be satisfactory.

There is, besides, a serious difficulty owing to the mixed character of the religion of the children. We fully believe that the most satisfactory settlement would be the granting of permission to any religious body desirous of establishing Separate schools to do so, just as Catholics have that right under the school system of Ontario. We have no doubt that if the Anglican body would show themselves really in earnest for the obtaining of a law which would enable them to do this, they would easily obtain it from the Legislature, but down to the present date it can scarcely be said they have shown themselves in earnest in the matter, as they have merely confined their action to the annual passing of a set of Synodal resolutions on the subject, and this has been done only by the Synods of some dioceses, while those of other dioceses are known to be of the contrary opinion, and are opposed to the establishment of parish or voluntary Church schools. The general synod of the Church throughout the Dominion has declared for Separate schools, and

we may therefore regard this as the official decision of the Church.

Archdeacon Lauder, in continuation, gave praise to the Catholic Church for the stand she has constantly taken on the School question. He called upon the Synod to express itself "clearly and distinctly on this subject." He continued:

"If there is one thing more than another in which the Church of Rome has shown wisdom it is in the ceaseless care with which she watches over the education of her children. She scouted the idea that the Church should surrender to other hands that which she should hold. 'Unsatisfactory as things are,' continued the preacher, 'we should encourage private schools where the truths of God are taught. The future of the Church depends upon the proper rearing of its children. The provision for boys in this direction is fairly good, but that for girls is discreditable. They have been left to the mercy of the Public schools, and many parents rather than send them there are sending them to convents, under the control of the Roman Catholic Church. I raise my voice against the exposure of our children to the craftiness of an alien Church when their minds are young and take impressions that may remain with them in after years. It is denied, I know, that the children are influenced away from the faith of their parents, but while this may not be done openly it is done by insinuations of the most beguiling kind."

In reply to the Archdeacon's final assertion we have to say that he does not state the facts correctly. We have known many convent schools in which one-third, and even fully one half, the pupils were Protestants, and we know it as a fact that their religious belief is never interfered with, though we have no doubt that many of the young ladies must be greatly edified by the unassuming piety of their religious teachers, and their zeal in the performance of their arduous duties.

These young ladies will naturally learn that the abuse and misrepresentations so lavishly heaped upon convents and nuns by itinerant no-Popery lecturers are falsehoods, and so far a knowledge of the truth may have an influence upon these ladies in after life which will keep them out of the ranks of fanaticism, but we have not known of a single instance wherein the nuns made any effort to tamper with the religion of their Protestant pupils. There are convent educated ladies to be found in all parts of the country, and we venture to assert that if Archdeacon Lauder will question any of them on the subject, they will give testimony which will bear out our statement to the fullest extent.

CHRISTIAN REUNION.

The letter of Mr. W. E. Gladstone which appeared in our columns three weeks ago is still the theme of astonished criticism by both Non-conformists, and Anglicans of the Low Church party. After styling him at first a Jesuit in disguise, they called him next "a childish Puseyite verging into senility." But Mr. Harold Frederic, the well known and able correspondent of the New York Times, declares that the "manifesto covers more than meets the eye, and there is a more powerful body of English clerics prepared for an arrangement with Rome than was heretofore suspected." The fact that it was the Archbishop of York who gave Mr. Gladstone's letter to the public is regarded as evidence that the Archbishop is favorable to reunion with the Catholic Church, and it is confidently stated that it was at the Archbishop's request that Mr. Gladstone wrote the letter. If this is really the case, the movement towards reunion, to which Mr. Gladstone's letter was a contribution, must have a very strong backing.

It will be remembered that last year Lord Halifax went to Rome as the representative of the English Church Union, notoriously with the object of paving the way for such a reunion. The High Church party are for the most part distinctly in favor of it, if they can only secure favorable terms, and the chief concession they appear to hope for is that their orders be recognized as valid, and there can be little doubt that it was with the view to ascertain whether Anglican orders can be so recognized that the Holy Father appointed a commission to examine into the question. As it is the general conviction among Catholics that the orders are not valid, it is supposed that the decision of the commission and the pronouncement of the Pope will be to this effect. It was to prevent this that Mr. Gladstone's letter was written.

As we have seen, he maintains that the cause of Christianity would be strengthened not only before the Non-conformists, but also in the face of Infidelity, if over three-fourths of the Christian world, as represented by the

Catholic, Greek, and Anglican Churches, not only maintain the need of, but actually possess a ministry which has come down from the Apostles by actual succession through unbroken Episcopal ordination.

Mr. Gladstone has reasserted his opinion on this matter since the publication of his remarkable letter. A Baptist minister, the Rev. Mr. Winn, asked him orally: "If your heart's desire were fulfilled, would you see the whole of Christendom under sway of the Pope? If not, why ask Papal sanction for the validity of Anglican orders or any form of ministry?"

Mr. Gladstone replied: "The Church of Rome recognized as valid a baptism when regularly performed by other Christian communions. For baptism, read orders. Papal sanction would strengthen Christianity."

The Baptist considered the answer very evasive. It cannot for a moment be supposed that Mr. Gladstone's motive, even though it be honestly put forward, could prevail to induce the Holy Father to declare Anglican orders valid, unless they should be really proved to be so by the investigation made into them. The Holy Father will undoubtedly pronounce in accordance with the ascertained facts of the case, independently of consequences.

We can readily understand why the Archbishop of York, and those of the Anglican clergy who at heart wish for union, desire their orders to be recognized. They would wish their spiritual authority over their flocks to be continued in case a union were effected. But we do not see that this matter should be at all regarded as a serious obstacle to the reunion movement. If any considerable body in the Church of England would actually ask for union, the worthy clergy could be ordained to the priesthood and even Bishops to the Episcopate, if the Holy Father considered it advisable to allow this to be done, in order that the new adherents to the Church Catholic might be supplied with clergy, and then a sure Apostolic succession would be obtained instead of a doubtful one. Surely the sentimentality which insists upon the recognition of Anglican orders should not stand in the way of a return to Catholic unity, if that is the only obstacle, for it is an obstacle which can be easily removed.

We by no means imagine that the Church of England as a whole is prepared to offer to return to Catholic unity. Too large a proportion of the clergy and laity are so bitterly opposed to the Catholic Church and her doctrines and practices that we should expect this; but the last half century has witnessed a great change in the Anglican Church, and now a large section of that Church, and it is said the most zealous and devoted section, has adopted by degrees the Catholic doctrines almost in their entirety, and it is not altogether improbable that a large part of this section should knock at the gate for admission to the one fold. It is estimated that there are more than seven thousand clergymen of the Church, including some Bishops, who have thus advanced, and though the proportion of the laity whose views have advanced similarly is not so great, it is by no means inconsiderable; and if the movement for reunion should spread as wonderfully, it may take place on a gigantic scale sooner than has been expected. At all events it is in the nature of things that there will be very many individual conversions should the large movement not take place at all, or be indefinitely delayed.

UNCATHOLIC OPINIONS.

The Rev. T. J. Morgan, who was Commissioner of Indian Affairs under the administration of General Harrison, has recently issued a pamphlet entitled "Man or Baboon," wherein he pretends that there are two views of the negro, "one Catholic, the other Baptist, the Catholic view making him a baboon, while Baptists recognize him as a man." This is notoriously a falsehood. Catholics everywhere recognize the natural equality of all races before God, and there is no difference in their treatment by Catholics generally. This is especially evident in our churches, to which all races are admitted and where all receive the same sacraments. It is well known that the Baptists act differently, so that Baptists and Methodists have actually separate churches and a separate denomination for colored people both in the States and Canada. There are "African Baptist and Methodist Churches." In the South, the Presbyterians also

have a distinct Church for colored Presbyterians, and it is this fact which prevents union between the Presbyterians of the North and South. Mr. Morgan's only proof of his statement is some ambiguous or disrespectful words from two Catholic laymen, regarding negroes, but such individual expressions do not accord with the belief or practice of the Church. The Baptist Home Mission society is engaged in the unholy work of spreading Mr. Morgan's falsehood over the South, in order to prejudice the negroes against the Catholic Church, but we cannot imagine that it will have any such effect, as the very different treatment accorded to them by Catholics and the other denominations mentioned will be an object lesson by which the colored people cannot help knowing the truth of the matter.

The progress of the Church among the negroes has been very great during the last few years, and this is what excites the envy of the Home Mission society. One of the Catholic writers whom Mr. Morgan quotes is a convert from Protestantism, and no doubt he has brought his opinions on the subject of the negro from the sect to which he formerly belonged.

THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY'S DECREE.

The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of Canada, and two Methodist conferences comprising within their jurisdiction a great part of Ontario and Quebec, have made pronouncements on the Manitoba school question, the general purport of all of which is similar.

The Assembly resolutions lay it down as a principle that "Any legislation or governmental action in the matter of education which is intended to confer privileges upon one section of the community that are not accorded to all" should be disapproved.

It is not our purpose to debate this proposition, which may or may not be sound, but it is very wide of the mark, and it does not touch at all the question of the right of Catholics to freedom of education.

We do not debate the proposition because of its irrelevancy to the matter on which the Assembly evidently thought it very conclusive. We may remark, however, that it is a rule which is sometimes departed from when it is supposed, rightly or wrongly, that the public good requires such departure. If it be correct there should in no case be any exemption from church taxation, and yet it is not very long since a large deputation of clergymen of various Protestant denominations waited upon the Ontario Government to protest against the passage of a law whereby churches should be taxed. It appears, therefore, that in the opinion of the Assembly it is only when a general rule like this might be unfavorable to Catholics that they find it convenient to apply it.

There are other cases also when it is not deemed proper to apply this rule. Thus it frequently happens that a municipality deems it proper to offer a bonus to manufacturers who will establish their business in the municipality, and such establishments are frequently exempt from taxation for years.

Does the General Assembly imagine that it is an article of Christian faith that such exemptions are unlawful? We presume that the Assembly in its hasty work overlooked these and similar possible applications of the principle it laid down so authoritatively, as if it were an undeniable Christian truth. But if the grave and reverend men who rule supremely the Presbyterian Church of this Dominion are so easily caught napping so that they lay down a very debatable proposition in political economy as an infallible Christian doctrine, what sort of religious legislation may we expect from such a body?

The Toronto Globe told us not long ago that there is this difference between the pronouncements of the Protestant clergy and those of the Catholic hierarchy, that few if any pay attention to the former, while the Catholics pay respect and obedience to the latter, and, consequently, argued the Globe, the hierarchy should abstain from political pronouncements, whereas the Assemblies and Conferences should be free to make them as they please. We are not very much surprised that the pronouncements of the Assembly have so little weight with its people when they are so crude, as well as so completely out of the sphere of their jurisdiction as is this political principle.

But of course the end the Assembly had in view was to find some reason by which they could show that injustice

inflicted upon the Catholics of Manitoba should not be remedied by the Dominion Parliament.

We contend that the right of having Separate schools is no special privilege. It is founded on the natural and inalienable right of parents to educate their children in accordance with their conscientious convictions. No majority and no State have the right to interfere to the extent of telling parents that they shall not exercise their natural right and duty, and when parents fulfill their duty in this respect for their own children, they have a natural right to be exempt from any obligation to educate those of other people.

We may be, and we are, frequently told that Protestant denominations have not Separate schools. That is their own affair.

In fact they have Separate schools both in Ontario and Quebec, though in some places they do not choose to have them, because they are content with a minimum of religious instruction, or with a purely secular teaching, but the fact that they of their own accord waive their right does not destroy the inherent right of those who wish to fulfill their duty, and therefore we say that it is a fallacy to pretend that Catholics must not have Catholic schools because Protestants, or some sections of the Protestant population, do not choose to establish them. It is as much a tyranny and a usurpation to endeavor to force Catholics to maintain only secular schools, as it would be to insist upon the whole population attending the Methodist or the Presbyterian Church.

The Assembly further asserts that "It deprecates any attempt on the part of any Church to place itself above the State in the civil sphere or to dictate to its adherents in the service of a public trust."

It is easy to see what is meant by this round-about way of making reference to what the Catholic Bishops of Quebec have unitedly expressed in regard to the Remedial law for Manitoba. The General Assembly means to say that the Bishops overstepped their duty by declaring that Catholics should support such a law.

The Assembly makes a great mistake in calling the question one that belongs solely to the civil sphere, and thus its reasoning is not worth the paper it is written on. The question of Christian education belongs pre-eminently to the moral and religious sphere. We do not at all deny the right of the State to insist upon a proper education of all the children so that they may know and be able to fulfill their duties as good and useful citizens, but we do emphatically deny that the State has any right to prevent its citizens from taking efficient steps to have their children properly educated in morals and Christian doctrine, while learning the secular branches which will be needful for them. This being the case, we have only to quote from the Assembly's own resolution to show that the Bishops of Quebec pronounced judgment on a matter which was undoubtedly within their sphere. The Assembly asserts that "The fullest expression of opinion in educational and other public questions which involve moral elements is always competent to Churches, and may become their distinct duty."

Here, then, is another principle laid down, and every one can see that the Bishops did not go beyond their duty in calling upon Catholics to maintain their right by supporting the cause of freedom of education. It is only by misrepresenting the state of the question as being of the "civil sphere" that the Assembly could justify its attack on the Catholic hierarchy.

There were two or three clergymen in the Assembly who vigorously protested against this undue interference with what the Assembly itself called a civil matter, but the resolution with all its inconsistencies was passed almost unanimously. There is a clause in it, however, which admits that there may be in the Manitoba matter some injustice which ought to be remedied. The resolution says:

The Assembly still hopes that the conference between the commission and Province of Manitoba may remove existing difficulties on the subject of public education by such adjustment as while preserving the principle of National schools, may satisfy any reasonable claims of the minority."

It was very kind of the assembly thus to admit the possibility that there may be some grievance which needs adjustment. The Privy Council could see more clearly that such a grievance really exists. But the assembly thinks that Catholics should not use the means laid down in the Constitution for the removal of grievances. They should await Mr. Greenway's condescension.

On this point we have to say that the Catholics of the Dominion have waited on Mr. Greenway's pleasure long enough, while he has refused to take a single step toward the restoration of inalienable rights. He may act even now if he chooses to do so, but the time is past for us to continue beseeching a hostile Government to treat us with generosity and kindness in a matter which is our legal and natural right.

THE TURKISH ATROCITIES.

The Rev. George H. Filian, formerly the Armenian pastor of an Evangelical Church, at Marsovan, but now an American citizen, having been banished from Turkey for preaching, states that one of the causes of the Armenian massacres was the apparently warlike character of some of Moody and Sanky's hymns, which have been introduced into that country and have become popular with the Armenians.

One of the hymns which attracted first the attention of the Turks was that beginning with the stanza,

Onward, Christian soldiers, Marching as to war, With the cross of Jesus Going on before.

Our readers will scarcely be able to repress a smile when informed that when this was translated into Turkish, the Mahometans interpreted it as a deliberate attempt of the Armenians to provoke an insurrection against the Turks. The attention of the Sultan and his advisers was called to this and some similar hymns which seemed to be equally warlike in their tenor, and the conclusion was reached that the Armenians were a band of rebels with murderous intention. There were other hymns equally seditious, such as, "Hold the Fort for I am coming;" and "Only an armor-bearer proudly I stand, waiting to follow at the King's command." All these, and certain passages of Scripture which contain references to arms or battles, were regarded as threats against the Sultan; and once the Turks made up their minds that an insurrection was being planned there was no loophole whereby the accused could escape punishment, and there was great alarm among the authorities.

Hence it was decided to forestall the Armenians, and the massacres were planned and carried out to reduce their number and lessen the probability of a successful uprising.

One preacher who took for his text the words of the Lord's prayer: "Thy kingdom come" was arrested on the charge of extolling the glories of some anti-Turkish ruler, and his life was in great danger until, through the intervention of the British Prime Minister, it was spared, on condition that he should leave the country and never return. As the decree of the Sultan is the supreme law in Turkey, there is no arguing of the case and no appeal allowed. The accused must submit, and think himself well off if he escapes with banishment and not death for his punishment, even though he may be innocent of any crime.

The impunity with which the Turkish authorities have been permitted to exercise their barbarities on such senseless pretexts naturally encourages them to imagine that the Christian powers are too apathetic to extend their protection over the Christians of the Empire, but the history of the century shows that they sometimes carry their impudence beyond the limit within which forbearance is possible, and we do not doubt that the time will come when the spirit which animated the old crusaders will put an end once for all to the Turkish rule over Christian communities.

Crete is at this moment in arms endeavoring to throw off the odious yoke, and though the island is so small the insurgents have already defeated the Moslems in several considerable engagements. On the other hand the Sultan's Government is deeply in debt and unable to borrow money, as England, the chief creditor of the Government, seeing little prospect of being repaid what she has already loaned, is not disposed to make further advances; and as Armenia has been ruined financially, and its population destroyed, there is nothing left there for the Turks to plunder, neither can they plunder the Bulgarians any more, as Bulgaria is now practically independent.

The Cretans hope to become annexed to Greece, the population of the island being Greeks by origin. There will possibly be a disagreement among the powers whether the annexation to Greece will be allowed, but if left to themselves it is not unlikely that the Cretans will solve their own problem. Surely if the Christian powers do not intervene to save the Cretans, and to