

The Catholic Record.

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

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum. EDITORS: REV. GEORGE R. NORTHGRAVE, Author of "Mistakes of Modern Infidels."

THOMAS COFFEY, Publisher and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY, MESSRS. LUKE KING, JOHN NICH, P. NEVEN and M. C. O'DONNELL are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transact all other business for THE CATHOLIC RECORD.

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

London, Saturday, Sept. 2, 1893.

THE FRENCH SCHOOLS OF ONTARIO.

Our readers will remember that in 1889 three special commissioners were appointed by the Ontario Government to inspect and report upon the condition of the schools in those localities in the Province where the French language predominates, the intention having been chiefly to ascertain whether English was efficiently taught therein. The gentlemen appointed to this Commission were Mr. J. J. Tilley, Inspector of County Model Schools, Rev. Professor Reynar of Victoria University, and Rev. D. D. McLeod of Barrie. The report then given was accepted by the country as thorough and impartial. It showed, indeed, that it was advisable to take steps for the improvement of these schools, particularly in regard to the teaching of English; but it showed also that the statements of the Toronto Mail that these schools were grossly inefficient were much exaggerated, the purpose of that journal being to excite animosity against the French-Canadian population.

On the recommendation of the commissioners the teaching of English has been greatly facilitated by the establishment of a special Model school at Plantagenet for the training of French teachers, to make them capable of teaching English also. The same three gentlemen who made a visit four years ago to these schools were recently commissioned to make another visit for the purpose of inspecting them again; and they have just issued their report, which shows that the progress of the schools has been most satisfactory. As the French Model school was intended especially for the counties of Prescott and Russell, the recent visit was also confined to these two counties.

In the report of 1889 the commissioners stated that the French Canadians were "not only willing, but desirous, that their children should learn English." The fact that the county and township councils gave \$1,000 towards the erection of the Model school, besides raising their annual grant from \$150 to \$250 for the current expenses of the school, is now mentioned as an evidence of this desire. The students in the Model school are given teachers' certificates only when they have proved their competency by passing the prescribed examination in English.

In 1889 the commissioners reported that out of fifty-six schools, English was very satisfactorily taught in seventeen, fairly in twenty-one, while in eighteen there was very little English. When it is considered that the population was almost entirely French in these localities, it could not be fairly said that this was an unsatisfactory showing. However, it now appears that there has been great progress in four years. There are now in the two counties sixty-five French schools, in thirty-nine of which English is very satisfactorily taught, in 15 it is fairly taught, and in 11 poorly. The number of classes reading English in 1889 was 177. Now the English reading classes number 268. Outside of readers the number of English text-books used in 1889 was 25. Now there are 119—an increase of 376 per cent. The time devoted to the study of English was two hours daily in 1889. Three hours are now given to English in all the schools. The number of children learning English has also greatly increased. In 1889 there were on the school-rolls 3,210 French children, of whom 2,434 were learning English. Now out of 3,610 French children, 3,581 are learning English. The number reported as not learning English has decreased from 726 to 59 in the four years, and of these 59, nearly all had been only a few weeks at school.

In the standing of the teachers the improvement has also been very satisfactory. In 1889 the number of teachers who knew English well was reported to be 26; 20 were reported as knowing English fairly, and 19 as being "not competent to teach Eng-

lish with any degree of efficiency." It must be borne in mind, however, that in several of the schools in which were teachers who could not teach English there were others who could do so. The classification for 1893 shows 51 teachers who know English well, of whom 19 are reported as excellent; 11 are fair, and only one incompetent to teach English.

In 1889, out of 67 teachers, 18 were teaching on permits. Now only three are teaching on permits, 47 being graduates of the new Model School at Plantagenet. Four have Normal School certificates, and two have certificates granted through the regular county examinations.

We heartily congratulate the Minister of Education on his success in raising the status of the French schools in every respect, and especially in the introduction of a more thorough English teaching.

The French Canadians of the counties in question were not at any time opposed to their children learning English; but they were laboring under great difficulty to obtain teachers who were efficient in both languages, until the Plantagenet Model school was instituted. We are glad to observe by the recent report of the commissioners that the teachers trained at Plantagenet have found employment in other counties besides Prescott and Russell, some of them having obtained places even in the school districts of Quebec.

ARCHDEACON FARRAR AND APOSTOLIC SUCCESSION.

In our last issue we made some remarks on Archdeacon Farrar's recent onslaught on Ritualism, showing that the High Church party have become too powerful in the Church of England to be readily suppressed by the so-called Evangelicals who detest them so heartily. On this continent, throughout Canada and the United States, as well as in England, the battle of the factions is regarded with much interest, and there are great rejoicings even among Presbyterians and Methodists because the Archdeacon of Westminster has ranged himself on the side of Low-Churchism, with which they sympathize. In spite of all this, however, it may well happen that in the conflict which is threatened the tables may be completely turned; and the party finally suppressed may be the Evangelicals themselves, who are just now engaged in making so boisterous a display of prowess. At least it is probable that if any party is to be driven out of the Church, it will not be the High Churchmen, who already control more dioceses than any other section of the Church. This view of the case is confirmed by the fact that the Evangelicals have already partly succeeded, having formed the new sect known in the United States and Canada as "Reformed Episcopalians."

The Ritualists have never acknowledged that they owe to the Catholic Church the light they have received from their study of antiquity, and it is not our purpose here to vindicate their cause; but we cannot refrain from showing how egregiously this new champion of Low-Churchism has mistaken and miscalculated the strength of the foundation on which Catholic doctrine is based. The Archdeacon, it would seem, has failed to remark that the chief reason why Ritualism has made such progress among the Anglican clergy is that the more they apply themselves to the study of the primitive Church of Christ, the more convinced they become that the doctrines of that Church were identical with those of the Catholic Church of the present day. They did not draw the correct conclusion that the modern State Church of England is an agglomeration of errors; but as they were of opinion that they could reform it, and by patchwork make of it a real branch of the universal Church, they contented themselves with introducing by degrees some of the doctrines and practices which, as they were satisfied, were part of the ancient Church, in order to restore that purity of doctrine which was lost at the Reformation.

One of these doctrines against which the Archdeacon is especially opposed he calls "Sacerdotalism." The secret of his opposition he lets out when he says:

"Even Archbishop Laud said that Apostolic succession was a very good thing if you might have it. He by no means expressed himself that the doctrine of Apostolic succession could be absolutely proved."

The Archdeacon, then, is conscious that the Anglican clergy cannot prove that they have the Apostolic succession, on which they claim to be priests and

Bishops. Yet elsewhere he admits that the Church lays much stress upon its possession: "Now Apostolic succession is made the absolute keynote of the existence of the Church."

The legitimate inference to be drawn from all this is not what the Archdeacon would infer, but that the Church of England has hitherto maintained a woful error in claiming possession of this gift which is acknowledged to be so desirable. Thus the preface to the form of ordination declares that "It is evident unto all men diligently reading the Holy Scripture and ancient authors that from the Apostles' time there have been these orders of ministers in Christ's Church: Bishops, priests, and deacons, which offices were evermore had in such reverent estimation that no man might presume to execute any of them except he were first called, tried, examined, and known to have such qualities as are requisite for the same, and also by public prayer with imposition of hands were approved and admitted thereto by lawful authority."

This is in the highest degree the very Sacerdotalism against which Archdeacon Farrar protests most strenuously as follows:

"There is, for instance, no shadow of even possible doubt what is the teaching of the Bible, of the prayer book, and of the Church of England about the clergy. The setting up of the Presbyteriate as a sacrificial priesthood, the pretence that the ministry is vicarious, not representative; the assimilation of the English clergy to the 'massing priests' of the Middle Ages; the claim that our Presbyteries perform acts of sacrifice as substitutes for the people, are demonstrably unjustifiable."

The question of priestly sacrifice which is here introduced, and that of priestly absolution, of which the Archdeacon speaks elsewhere in his recent manifesto, would draw out this article to too great a length if we were to treat of them now; but we shall quote two or three more passages which will show that his notion of the Christian priesthood is altogether alien from that given by the three authorities referred to by himself and the Book of Common Prayer—Scripture, ancient authors, and the Anglican standards of belief. From the Book of Common Prayer we have already quoted sufficient for this purpose. We may add the following:

"To the intent that these orders may be continued and reverently used and esteemed in the United Church of England and Ireland; no man shall be accounted or taken to be a lawful Bishop, priest, or deacon in the United Church of England and Ireland, or suffered to execute any of the said functions except he be called, tried, examined, and admitted therunto according to the form hereafter following, or hath had formerly Episcopal consecration and ordination."

So plainly is the necessity of Episcopal ordination derived from the Apostles herein set forth that it is clear no churchman would presume to reject it if it were not evident from history that the Anglican claim to Apostolic succession is entirely without foundation, just as Archdeacon Farrar practically acknowledges to be the case.

From holy Scripture we find that Christ chose His apostles. (St. John vi, 71.) "Have I not chosen you twelve?" They did not choose themselves for their office, nor were they elected by popular vote. "You have not chosen me, but I have chosen you, and have appointed you." (xv, 16.) "And no man taketh this honor to himself, but he that is called of God as Aaron was." (Heb. v, 4.)

So also successors to the Apostles were appointed after the manner in which Timothy and Titus received authority from St. Paul: "Neglect not the grace that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with imposition of the hands of the priesthood." (1 Tim. iv, 14.) And "For this cause I left thee in Crete that thou shouldst set in order the things that are wanting and shouldst ordain priests in every city as I also appointed thee." (Titus, i, 5.)

We need not continue these quotations. It is clear that ordinations to the Christian ministry must be derived from the Apostles, who originally "ordained priests in every Church." (Acts. xiv, 22.) Archdeacon Farrar's theory that such Apostolic succession is not requisite is simply the last resort of those who know they do not possess it.

We shall quote from "ancient authors" referred to in the form of Anglican ordination only the following passage from St. Augustine, remarking that the testimony of all antiquity is to the same effect:

"The succession of priests, from the very seat of Peter to whom the Lord committed his sheep to be fed,

down to the present episcopate, holds me in the Church."

Again: "Count the priests in that list of Fathers even from the See of Peter. You see who succeeded to each one. He is the rock which the proud gates of hell conquer not."—Book against the Donatists.

If this was sufficient proof of the truth of the Church in the days of this illustrious doctor, the absence of that succession in modern sects is sufficient to prove that they are not and never can be the Church which our Lord Himself built upon a never-failing rock.

BRIGHT PROSPECTS.

We notice with pleasure a growing desire to judge aright the Catholic Church and look at her with critical, dispassionate gaze. This no doubt may be ascribed to the tendency of the age to sift and weigh statements before admitting them. Time was and a popular orator might guide thousands into error; but that time has gone—never, we devoutly hope, to return. No intelligent man permits himself to be nourished intellectually by the ideas of others, much less to embrace every passing opinion. There will be fire-eating parsons till the consummation of time, and there will be beings so devoid of self-respect as to hail their utterances as the outpourings of a sublime wisdom; but these classes are obstacles, sooner or later to be crushed, to the progress of humanity.

Look at the P. P. A. and you have an example in point. What are they but hindrances to a nation's onward march? They add nothing to the treasure store of kindly thought and manly deeds. Their aim is the spoliation of others rights, and their means are unblushing effrontery and caldumny. Already they have been held up to the scorn of all true citizens; and though feeling disgust at the very mention of their organization, yet we deem it our duty to refute their falsehoods and to prove them recreant to every duty to which God-fearing men are faithful.

They commenced their campaign with declaring that the Church is hostile to the State. The same objection was made by a writer in the last number of the *Queen's Quarterly Review*. The Church is indeed superior to the State, inasmuch as the soul is superior to the body and heaven to the world; but towards it she bears no hostility. She protects and guards it by principles that alone can save her from the perils of anarchy and despotism. She points out the divine origin of society and of government. "There is no power but from God, and those that are, are ordained of God." Therefore, he that resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God. Holding fast to the teachings of Scripture, she has denounced the various opinions of modern times that are not consistent with the right view of the origin of government, and which, if acted upon, would carry society back to the times when the weak was the prey of the strong and when force alone was right.

Socialism denies that power comes from God, and propagates the idea that all men are equal; and Leo XIII. tells it: "That an inequality of rights and powers emanates from the Author of nature Himself, of whom all paternity is named in heaven and on earth. As in the Church He has instituted a diversity of degrees and offices, so too He has established in civil society different orders in dignity, in right and in power; so that the State, like the Church, might form one body, composed of many members—some more noble than others, but all necessary to one another and all laboring for the common good."

She invests the State with a sacred dignity. She demands for it obedience, because its authority comes from God. Again and again she reiterates this, and well and wisely, for this alone can restrain the wayward caprices and lawlessness of individuals. The Church is the advocate of no particular form of government. This is left to the choice of the people; but the authority that gives the king or president the right to command obedience comes from God. This alone does she affirm, and who, reflecting on this point, can with any show of reason or justice declare that she is hostile to the State. A Government without authority is subject to every whim of the multitude and loses its essential character—stability; and such must be the fate of all Governments that renounce God and look to the people for a consecration of its power.

She aids the State by bringing home to every individual the divine principle that "God alone makes kings to

reign and law-givers decree just things." But she also protects personal liberty. "The kingdom is not made for the king," says St. Thomas, "but the king for the kingdom; for God has constituted kings to rule and govern and to secure for everyone the possession of his rights. Such is the aim of their institution. But if kings, turning things to their own profit, should act otherwise, they are no longer kings, but tyrants."

This principle has actuated her to shield suffering peoples against the attacks of tyranny; and again and again has she compelled kings to stay the hand of oppression. We see her, in the person of her Pontiffs, exhorting repentance from a Theodosius, from Henry IV. of Germany; and we must needs say that the word liberty has a real and sublime significance.

When men and women were bought and sold like chattels in the marts of Europe, she rung forth her denunciation of the infamous traffic, and in 1167 she declared that all Christians should be exempt from slavery. Hume, her arch enemy, forgetting his intense hatred for a moment, wrote the following words: "Without the Papacy all Europe would have fallen very easily into one or many caliphates and would have submitted infallibly and disgracefully to Turkish sway and to Oriental oppression and stupefaction."

We might multiply quotations, but it were useless to say more of the truth—proved by every page of history—that the Catholic Church has placed the State on a sure and solid foundation and safeguarded personal liberty.

The worn-out objection that a Catholic cannot be a good citizen is a favorite argument of the A. P. A.

It is false—utterly false! The Church does not interfere in secular matters. She exercises jurisdiction in her own sphere and renders to Caesar the things that are Caesar's. And again, are not Catholics as law-abiding, as eager and earnest for the welfare of the community as their neighbors? Have they not in the neighboring Republic proved, on occasion arose, to be good and true men. The one name that stands out as the object of execration is that of Benedict Arnold. Place him in your calendar, followers of the A. P. A. He sold his birthright for a mess of pottage; he sacrificed honor for gold, and sought to draw his comrades into the ambush of the oppressor. But he met his fate, merited a thousand times. He wanted liberty for himself, and little recked he of the slavery that he planned for others.

The Catholics waited and fought and sheathed their blades till victory recompensed them.

It is an old story, but one to be remembered at the present time when bigotry's waves are threatening to wash away the landmarks of justice and charity.

A FORGERY REPRODUCED.

One Mr. Stewart, of Stouffville, Ont., is in dreadful alarm lest the Catholics of the United States are prepared to rise in arms during the month of September to dethrone President Cleveland and take control of the Government of the United States, and to exterminate all the Protestants of the country. The *Mail*, the only journal which would print such an absurdity, admitted to its columns a letter from Mr. Stewart to the effect that this was commanded by the Pope. As the Catholics of the country number only about one-seventh of the population of the States, it would surely be no easy matter to attempt such a thing even if every Catholic in the union took up arms for the purpose—a thing which it is impossible to imagine could occur; yet, on the authority of a bogus letter pretended to have been issued by the Pope, but which was really an invention of the A. P. A., Mr. Stewart makes his statement of the case.

The pretended encyclical was published also in Canadian P. P. A. papers, but no attention was paid to it by any reasonable person, and other journals treated it with the contempt it deserves, and never even alluded to it. We shall even give the *Mail* what credit is due to it by acknowledging that it was honest enough not to play so far on the credulity of its readers as to publish or comment upon the ridiculous document.

Mr. A. B. Macdonald, of Prescott, has a letter in the *Mail* of the 14th ult., in which he refutes Mr. Stewart, and quotes from a letter written by Rev. C. C. Starbuck, D. D., a Protestant clergyman of Andover, Mass., which estimates the forgery at its true value, showing also that respectable Protestant journals were ashamed of the

calumny and exposed its absurdity in their columns. From Mr. Starbuck's letter Mr. Macdonald makes the following extract:

"It (the pretended encyclical) is so coarse and clumsy a style of imposture that one would think that even our current Protestant ignorance of Papal formulas of speech and the course of Roman Catholic thought would suffice at once to detect it. How many religious papers have exposed it? The *Independent* and *Christian Union* have, I know, and I hope they are not the only ones. If the Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church would issue an encyclical pledging their official character for its spuriousness they might shame it out of existence, but I doubt whether the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church could do so."

Mr. Stewart asks "Why have not the journals which published the Pope's letter been prosecuted for publishing such a libel as they contain?" and he seems to think that this query is sufficient proof that the letter must be genuine. He has not taken into account the possibility that the A. P. A. and P. P. A. journals publishing the forgery have not been seen by the Holy Father, and that for this reason he does not prosecute the perpetrators of the forgery. Indeed, if the Holy Father were to prosecute all who believe him on this continent and in Europe, he would have to devote his entire time to the work of so doing, and would therefore need to give up his work of attending to the affairs of the Church throughout the world to attend to the P. P. A. conspirators.

But perhaps Mr. Stewart means: why do not some of the Catholics of the United States prosecute? It is very doubtful whether they would have a case for a libel suit, when it is the Pope who is libelled and not themselves. At all events, Mr. Macdonald gives a very satisfactory reason for this, as follows:

"It is only necessary to state that if every journal that published lying and slanderous articles against the Church was prosecuted the clerical authorities would have little or no time to attend to anything else."

REV. MR. ADAMS' CONVERSION.

The New York *Sun* has, anent the conversion of the Rev. Henry Adams to the Catholic faith, the following words well worthy of perusal:

"He refused to remain in a false position, though by getting out of it he sacrificed material advantages prized by everybody. Mr. Adams has merely joined a long procession of Protestants who felt the need of the support of a Church they could learn to believe in as infallible. They could not stand alone. They could not be happy and in religious doubt at the same time. They could not settle the great problems of life and death for themselves; but they required that these should be settled for them, so that the whole subject might be taken from their questioning. . . . When Protestants give up the divine authority of the Bible, what other authority have they to rest upon save the authority of an infallible Church? They must go one way or another. They must pass over into Agnosticism, or they must yield their wills to the Church, trusting it as divine. Therein lies the great and enduring strength of the Church of Rome. It stands of itself and on its own foundation. It claims the final and infallible authority. It has no Briggs controversy over the Bible, for the Bible rests upon the authority of the Church."

This is a very logical statement of the position. The Protestant Church is powerless to solve the awful questions that demand an answer. The Bible can be nothing more for them than a book of sublime wisdom, for how can they prove it divine? Not from itself or from the personages who wrote it. And when they style it the Word of God they invoke the authority of the Catholic Church. "I would not believe in the gospel," says St. Augustine, "unless the authority of the Church moved me."

This want of authority is felt by any Protestant who cares to think; and we have no doubt but that many ministers would, were they not burdened with families, desert their illogical position and find rest in the Catholic Church. This view will be scoffed at by those who believe with the early Protestant leaders that it is not allowed before God to hate the Church only half way; but we speak of free men, who rebel against the torments of the intellectual prison in which they have chosen to immure themselves. They must recognize the fact that they are groping in the dark, that they are powerless to resist the encroachments of infidelity, and that to the oft-repeated cry "What is Truth?" they can answer nothing. Men seek a solution of their doubts and questionings; and a Church only whose voice sounds clear and true can quiet their fears and teach them what is due to themselves, to others and to God.

THE CONSPIRATORS A

We have been advised that A. conspirators have made a cutting out for themselves. claimed all along that leaders and many of the file of this combination are citizens than those confining Kingston Penitentiary, and of events will prove our tell that this is the case. Since the property of two Catholic incendiary's torch has been the property of two Catholic the *Lucan Record* of the 2nd take the following, which account of the latest outrage.

On Monday night about fire was discovered in the kitchen of the Royal hotel, men and citizens were sent out, but all their efforts were in vain, and soon the hotel was completely destroyed. The fire was also Mrs. Brown's hotel, Mrs. Brown's loss is \$70,000. The hotel was the property of the hotel, the fire was burned out last six months. Mr. J. C. hotel-keeper, had his [sic] contents, valued \$1,000, last March. There is no Catholic doing business in and we should not be surprised that he will be the next victim of the progress of the fire. It has been told, the me P. P. A. looked on with. They had the bolts drawn pump-handles, lest any of charity, might attempt building. As soon, how fire attacked the house of who is a Protestant, the again put in the pump all worked with energy property.

It is time that our fellow every denomination a danger that is in their doings of these lawless is true, be a menace to Catholics directly, but forgotten that the whole suffer untold loss unless ures are taken to stop abominable curse the planted by a gang of robbers whose sole purpose life of our country access to the well-filled Ontario's treasury.

"LIE! LIE! LIE!" WILL STIC

This seems to be the by the anti-Catholic weeks since we noticed extract in the *Christian* Toronto, and we ma editor of the *Catholic* to him if such matter at time in its columns:

The *Catholic Telegram* is a very outspoken Catholic paper. It Jesus have control of ful journal in Christen *Catholic*. They were tion of power by the That paper has done to the cause of truth combatting of secret s Or late, especially durin it has conducted a unpriestly warfare Ireland and those o pleased to style "Li been a sewer of filth, in the four quarters of had a mouthful of sh void it in that lgr Dirty fellows ever themselves of the lice is the Jesuits are no United States as th before."

We have received editor of the *Telep* Schoonenberger, exp that such sentiments used to that paper anxious to be supplie the paper in which peared. It will be subject dealt with is rence, and the edi have recollection of a passage occurred department. We the editor of the *C* *ian* would be gu ing the sentiments extract. It is likely some exchange—pos P. P. A. papers, who honest living, pand dices of uneducated cooting all sorts of heads about the C clergy and its instit