

THE CATHOLIC RECORD,

Published every Friday morning at 388 Richmond Street, opposite City Hall, London, Ont.

Annual subscription..... \$2 00 Semi-annual..... 1 00

RATES FOR ADVERTISEMENTS.

12 cents per line for first, and five cents per line for each subsequent insertion. Advertisements measured in nonpareil type. 12 lines to an inch. Contract advertisements for three, six or twelve months, special terms. All advertisements should be handed in not later than Thursday morning. Terms to agents, twelve and a half per cent, on remittances, or one free copy to the getter up of each club of ten.

We solicit and shall at all times be pleased to receive contributions on subjects of interest to our readers and Catholics generally, which will be inserted when not in conflict with our own views as to their conformity in this respect. All communications should be addressed to the undersigned accompanied by the full name and address of the writer, not necessarily for publication, but as a guarantee of good faith.

WALTER LOCKE, PUBLISHER, 388 Richmond Street, London, Ont.

The Catholic Record

LONDON, FRIDAY, FEB. 7, 1879.

TO SUBSCRIBERS.

We hope that all our subscribers who have not yet paid their subscriptions will do so as soon as they conveniently can. Where we have a local agent all monies can be paid to him, thereby avoiding the trouble and risk of sending them by mail. Care should be taken when making payments to obtain a receipt, and subscribers are hereby cautioned against paying money to any person except our duly authorized agents. Our St. Thomas subscribers should pay money to no person except Mr. John Doyle, Merchant, or ourselves.

We are pleased to inform our patrons that we have secured the services of Mr. Patrick O'Reilly as permanent travelling agent for the RECORD. Any favors accorded to him will be duly appreciated by us.

Mr. Boone, 186 St. Paul Street, St. Catharines, is our authorized agent for St. Catharines and district.

Mr. Dan'l. Fisher is our appointed agent for Stratford.

THE POPES ENCYCLICAL.

We publish this week the full text of the Encyclical Letter, which has been addressed by his Holiness, Leo XIII., to the prelates of the Catholic Church throughout the world. We recommend our readers to give it as serious and reverential a perusal as a document from the highest authority of the Church, and dealing with subjects so vitally affecting mankind demands. It would be impossible, within the space of our brief remarks, to dwell upon, or even to enumerate, the high lessons of Christian morality, and the reasonable admonitions contained in the letter of his Holiness; and it would be equally impossible for any one to peruse it without being impressed by the anxious solicitude which it displays for the happiness of men.

GERMAN DISCONTENT.

The Germans are beginning to discover that in spite of the immense wealth of which they deprived France as a war indemnity, they have decreased in prosperity in proportion to the roughshod manner in which Bismarck rides over their liberties, and persecutes equally Catholics and Socialists. France, on the other hand, despite her immense loss by the war, has become immensely prosperous, though she gives full freedom of religious worship. Indeed her religious tolerance is even extreme, for Protestant ministers receive much larger pay than Catholic priests. The discontent and insecurity felt throughout Germany is thus admitted even by the Berlin Krenz. The Emperor William and Prince Bismarck would be better occupied in trying to produce happiness among their subjects, than in fining and imprisoning the Catholic clergy, whose lives are spent in improving the condition of the people. Here is what the Berlin Krenz says:

"A heavy burden of care presses on men's minds, and all the glitter of political achievements of our time cannot conceal that feeling of discontent. A happy man, a man really contented with his own lot and with the present situation, is rarer than a white swallow."

THE GLASGOW BANK TRIAL.

It is with peculiar satisfaction and even pride, that people living under the aegis of the British constitution often descend upon the glorious privileges accorded to British subjects all the world over. Under the serious conviction that they enjoy more freedom than any other people on the face of the earth, they loudly proclaim that "British Justice" is something sacred and inviolable. In the rank, the opulence, the learning and long-tried honor of the men who constitute what is known as the English Bench, the subjects of Great Britain imagine that they have a sufficient guarantee that justice will always be administered impartially. But is this the case? We are sorry to say that it is not. In the application of the law, Great Britain may be said to be as punctilious as any other nation, but in the rendering of justice there are too many evidences of the vagaries of the judiciary. Our readers have already heard about the Glasgow Bank failure, and the awful amount of misery it entailed upon those who were the victims of fraud, theft and embezzlement to such an enormous extent; but will surely surprise them to hear that the perpetrators of this huge Scotch swindle have been almost allowed to go Scot-

free. A cablegram dated Edinburgh, Feb. 1st, says:

"The Directors of the Glasgow Bank, Stronach and Potter, convicted of fraud, theft and embezzlement, were sentenced to 18 months' imprisonment. Five other Directors, convicted of uttering false abstracts of balance sheets, were sentenced to eight months' imprisonment. The sentence created considerable surprise on account of its leniency.

The presiding Judge said he considered the circumstance that the prisoners had not falsified the accounts for their personal benefit, but in the mistaken idea that it was for the public good."

We often heard that a man could commit almost any crime in the United States—especially in the way of swindling—with impunity, if he only had enough of money. It appears however that Great Britain bids fair to outrival the United States in the art of swindling, and that the judiciary of that country are determined to prove to the world that they can be as lenient in their treatment of "smart men" as their counterparts on this side of the Atlantic. The presiding judge considered that the swindlers only made a mistake, hence the leniency of the sentence. A case once came under our notice not a hundred miles from London, in which the presiding judge acted in a manner so similar—though on a minor scale—that we feel almost warranted in assuming that there must be a special act of extenuation in the British code for bankers. In the case to which we refer a bank clerk was found guilty of stealing something like \$1,400 from his employers, but the judge considered that the fact of his being respectfully connected, &c., was a sufficiently extenuating circumstance, so he only sentenced him to six months in the Central Prison. He was allowed, however, to rusticate in the county jail for the greater part of the time, under the plea that there was no room for him at the Central Prison. At the same court, but not by the same judge, a poor woman who picked up fifty cents in the house of a swindler for whom she had been doing some work, was sentenced to two years in the penitentiary; and neither her poverty, nor the fact that the money had been actually placed in her way for the purpose of tempting her, were taken into consideration as extenuating circumstances. This is nothing of course in magnitude compared with the case of the Glasgow Bank directors, but there is an amount of sameness about it which forcibly illustrates the fact that justice can be sometimes most outrageously caricatured. It has been reported that Potter was so hypocritically sanctimonious that he would not rest the Monday morning papers because the type had been set up on Sunday. Perhaps the learned judge considered this pious observance of the Sabbath sufficiently extenuating for the condoning of his crimes.

ROOM YET FOR IMPROVEMENT.

Some time ago one of the Toronto dailies, in an article meant to be kindly, upon the recent Encyclical, used the following sentence: "We cannot help suggesting that it would be an improvement, if, instead of one encyclical addressed to the faithful in all quarters of the world, there were two or three, with such variations as might be suitable to the different tastes, surroundings and proclivities of different peoples."

Now whether we call this the very sublimity of innocent candor, or give it a very different name, it gives us occasion to say a word upon the changed tone of the press in the discussion of these matters. One does not need a grey head to remember the time when the secular papers—notably the author of the above extract—thought they did their duty to themselves and the public by ignoring the Pope altogether, or when they mentioned him at all, by covering him with ridicule and abuse, and by being careful, even in the latter case, to give only such portions of his utterances as the funny man of the press-room could most easily distort into farce and nonsense.

What a change since these days! Now not merely is the Pope not ignored, but there has grown up a spirit of ostentatious attention to all that he says and does; and though there is yet a deal of misunderstanding, a deal of perversion, and not a little of downright plain lying; still, on the whole, we think the change is for the better. For if it has failed to bring the newspaper accounts of Papal sayings and doings up to the level of our reasonable expectations, it has at least, in great part, done away with the tantalizing, distressing uncertainty in which, as in a bottomless bog, the average un-Catholic found himself with regard to the question, Who, or rather, what is the Pope?

We write what deliberately, because, with out wishing to say anything extravagant at all, anxious indeed to keep far within the truth, we are quite satisfied that thirty-four years ago a great many otherwise hard-headed men, and all the young folks outside of the Church, had very hazy notions as to whether the Pope was a man, or a wild beast, or a power, or a set of doctrines, or a country, or a symbol, or what not. The average mind would have expressed itself thus if it had reflected, "How can the Pope be a man and be guilty of all the wickedness father and mother, and all the neighbors, say he is;

"and then the minister, I remember, proved very clearly that he was—I forget now which it was, but either the horn of a beast, or the beast itself; a strange kind of animal with ten horns, common enough, they say, in the East, but not found in Canada. And then again, you don't forget the Rev. Rawkin Simper, (he took the minister's place here last vacation, and, shabby enough, tried to supplant him), well he showed from some part of the Bible that the Pope sat upon seven hills, and each hill was a mountain. Surely no man could do that."

This is not an unfair presentation of men's thoughts a few years ago upon this interesting question. It would not be true, or near the truth now, except in very rare cases; and in consequence we are persuaded the old no-Popery cry can never be made so effective for harm as it used to be. People, it is notorious, are easily frightened in the dark; the least noise, a black stump, an innocent cow chewing her cud by the quite wayside; indeed almost anything is quite enough to throw them into a scare because the darkness has predisposed them to it. So in the ignorance or moral darkness of the ordinary un-Catholic; the most silly story was quite sufficient, indeed nothing could be too little, provided the Pope's name was mentioned at all, to set their nerves a-shivering, and drive them to the doing and doing and saying of things which neither fanaticism nor bigotry, nor indeed anything else but downright vulgar fear, could account for. The papers therefore have done us a service by qualifying their ignorance. We don't think they meant it, or foresaw it even; still the good work is, in a sense, done, the darkness is broken in upon, is disappearing, and with it the frightful nightmare, in the paroxysms of which the poor dupes of the traditional lying about the Pope used to shriek and scream in a manner that was very painful, and do things that made them positively dangerous.

Now that they know at least that the Pope is a man, a very good-looking, venerable man, with a taste for poetry, and very distinguished abilities both in science and literature, they may hate him indeed, as of old—we are afraid they do—may, they may fear him too, but their fear will have a rational, intelligent element in it. It will be the fear sensible men entertain of an opponent who is both very able and very strongly entrenched, not the wild panic of the no-Popery times, when even the hardest-headed ran mad, and the kindest did most cruel things.

If this view be correct, as we think it is, we can afford to be grateful to the writers that, willingly or not, have helped to do us such a service. It is a great gain to find such a change effected, and we hereby thank the papers for the part they have taken in the work; and in the warmth of our feelings we are going a little further—perhaps an extravagant length. We are going to ask that since they find it worth their while to allude often to the Pope and his doings, they would go one step further and know enough on such matters to enable them to keep clear of writing silliness. We don't expect anything like technical knowledge; that would be too much, but as the art critic ought to know at least what art is, and the author of the agricultural column be able, if appealed to, to tell the difference between a hedge and a stump-fence, so the writer on Roman affairs ought to acquaint himself with the meaning at least of the terms used in Roman documents. This is not setting up a high standard, surely, though we cannot help saying that even with such a standard it would go hard with an innocent and diverting friend who speaks about local encyclicals.

WHAT DID THE WORLD GAIN BY THE REFORMATION?

If the student of history looks to the Reformation for anything of consistency he will be sorely disappointed. In nothing was it consistent with itself. As a theological movement it was inconsistent. The doctrine of justification by faith alone, called in the barbarous Latin of the period *solifidianism*, was the earliest, as it was without doubt the most prominent article of its creed. In support of this Luther bellowed in bad Latin and worse theology until his friends were ashamed of his ignorance, his enemies taken aback by his temerity, and himself black in the face. Even Melancthon (Schwartzler), who even in his early youth was deemed competent to criticize Erasmus himself—even Melancthon, with all his learning and calm critical acumen, looked upon this doctrine, long after it had been purged from Luther's insane ravings, as the turning point of the whole dispute. And how did the Reformation leave this doctrine? In such a state that Barnet (a Protestant witness of no mean authority) was able to say "that after it had been purged from the Antinomian extravagance of Luther there was found, if not an absolute verbal, yet rather a subtle and by no means practical difference between them—solves and the Church of Rome." Surely this is "much fuss and little feathers," and is hardly worth dignifying with the preten-

tious title of a Reformation." In the quadrangular duel on the Real Presence between the Lutherans, the Helvetic Reformers, the Church of England, and what they are pleased to style the Church of Rome, the dispute was as much mixed up as in the triangular duel in Captain Marryat's "Midshipman Easy," in which Midshipman Easy complained that he was firing at a man that had never offended him, and a man was firing at him whom he had never offended. Be that as it may, until the Reformers themselves (who as a Protestant writer says, "bewildered themselves and strove to perplex their antagonists with incompatible and unintelligible propositions"), had made up their minds on the subject, it was unnecessary for the Church of Rome to trouble herself about them. Certain it is, a set of jarring disputants on a vital point of this kind can never, without the utmost stretch of the proprieties, be deemed a consistent theological movement, much less a Reformation.

It may be said, and as a fact, is often said, that the essential principle of Protestantism is something different from all this—that the Reformation was in fact a struggle for freedom from all authority in religious belief, or in other words, was a struggle for that which goes by the name of the right of private judgment. But it is precisely here that the Reformation most fails as a consistent movement. The private judgment fought for by the Reformers was only a bogus private judgment—the right for them to judge for themselves, but not for anybody else to do the same. The Reformation was in fact only a change of masters, and such masters! A change from the decrees of the Universal Church to those of the Confession of Augsburg or Zurich! The only private judgment allowed was as against the Catholic Church. Private judgment against the Augsburg or Zurich confessions was as much deemed heresy by the Reformers as their detection had been deemed heresy by the Catholic Church. A Protestant might of course become an Anabaptist or an Arian; but he was nevertheless deemed a heretic in doing so, and that by the very men who had belloved the loudest for private judgment as against the Church of Rome. Private judgment, if it means anything, means the right of all to judge for themselves. Now if all had a right to judge for themselves, whence these denunciations even against the Catholic Church. If private judgment was to be the order of the day, the Catholic Church had a right to it as much as any one else. She was the part of a very large part of the all, and she could not consistently be excluded from that right of all by those who considered it a right of all. Every denunciation then uttered against the Catholic Church (and their name is "legion") was a proof of the bogus nature of that private judgment which was to be substituted for the divinely guaranteed infallibility of the Universal Church, and to be deemed a Reformation.

But the Reformation not only denied the right of private judgment to Catholics—it denied it also to its own followers. Protestantism, however, much its name may imply the contrary, is a positive creed: more distinctly positive, perhaps, in the Lutheran than in the Swiss Churches, but in each assuming a determined and dogmatic character. The Confession of Augsburg was the first step made in the direction of a common dogma, and in the Confession of Augsburg "Catholic infallibility" was replaced, as a Protestant writer admits, "by a not less uncompromising and intolerant dogmatism, availing itself like the other of the secular power, and arrogating to itself, like the other, the assistance of the spirit of God." If this was the case, where was the Reformation? Granted the intolerance of Catholic infallibility, this substitution of Lutheran and Calvinistic infallibility and dogmatism is surely, as far as the world is concerned, very much like the substitution of King Hog for King Stork. Where then this great Reformation of which some boast so loudly? Where that consistency which men have a right to exact from a great religious revolution? Where the sense of so much fuss for so little feathers? SACERDOS.

(To be continued.)

R. C. SEPARATE SCHOOLS.

Catholic ratepayers residing in municipalities where Separate Schools are established should not neglect having their names placed on the list of Separate School supporters on or before the 1st day of March, in order that their taxes may be applied to the support of said schools. This is a duty that Catholic taxpayers should take pleasure in discharging. In Ontario, as our readers are aware, we have the educating of our children in our own hands; we are empowered by the law to establish Separate Schools to the support of which every Catholic ratepayer may have his school-tax applied providing he reside within three miles of a separate school house, and complies with the requirements of the School Act relating to notification of Clerk of Municipality &c. [See extract a below.]

Our Separate Schools receive too, a share of the Government Grant in common with Public Schools, said government grant being based on the average daily attendance in all Separate and Public Schools alike. This should be considered one of the many

reasons why Catholic parents should see that their children are regular in their attendance at our schools. Separate School Trustee Boards are elected in the same manner as those of Public Schools; have the same duties to perform, and nearly the same powers. A part of the duty of Separate School Boards is to guard against financial loss to the schools by neglecting to have the roll of Separate School supporters properly attended to; they should during the month of February in each year revise their roll of supporters, see that there are no omissions, that the names of all Catholic taxpayers within their jurisdiction are legally enrolled, and that said roll is transmitted to the Clerk of the Municipality on or before the time specified in the act for such. [See extract b.]

Separate School Teachers (excepting those belonging to Religious Communities) receive their certificates of qualification from the same Board of Examiners as Public School Teachers, and Separate Schools are subject to the same inspection as Public Schools. [See extract c.] The Sisters of Religious Communities at present teaching in nearly all our Separate Schools in the cities and towns of Ontario, are ladies of considerable experience in teaching, and have proved themselves at least equal to any other lady teachers in the Province in teaching successfully the various branches forming the Public School course, and far superior to all others in imparting that higher knowledge, that religious training in harmony with the teachings of Our Holy Mother Church which all Catholics worthy of the name prize above everything else. The most momentous trust that can be placed in one's hands is certainly the care and education of youth; yet how limited is the preparation of many for that noble work. Catholic parents—how careful you should be in selecting those in whose hands you place the moulding of your dear child's mind! Are there any better adapted for such trust than those good ladies of our Religious Communities? The opponents of our Schools, of everything Catholic, when they fail to find any other cause of attack, call in question the qualification of those teachers, but to such we might say, the Catholic Separate School supporters are satisfied with, yes, are proud to have such teachers, and "it is none of your business," however, said teachers are qualified as teachers by the "highest tribunal in the land—the Legislature." [See extract d.] While the Catholics of Ontario are very grateful for the rights which they enjoy in the shape of Separate Schools, for which our Bishops and Priests fought nobly, and while in this very important matter, the educational training of our youth, we are in advance of those countries that boast so much of "Civil and Religious Liberty," (an expression, which in the words of Rev. Father Stafford, is a farce, a humbug, a delusion, a fraud and a snare—in any country in which true freedom of education does not exist) still our Separate School Act of Ontario, in its present state is far from being perfect; in it are many defects, which if remedied would greatly improve the Separate while at the same time would not in the least impair the Public Schools. It is our intention on a future occasion to point out these defects in order that our readers may thoroughly understand the difficulties with which our Separate Schools have to contend, and with the hope that ere long said difficulties may be

Extracts from the Ontario Separate School Act.

(A.) "Every person paying rates, whether as proprietor or tenant, who, by himself or his agent, on or before the first day of March in any year, gives or who, on or before the first day of March of the present year, has given to the Clerk of the Municipality notice in writing that he is a Roman Catholic, and a supporter of a separate school situated in the said municipality, or in a municipality contiguous thereto, shall be exempt from the payment of all rates imposed for the support of public schools, and shall be entitled also to a share of the public grants, investments and allotments for public school purposes now made or hereafter to be made by the province or municipal authorities, according to the average number of pupils attending such school during the twelve next preceding months, or during the number of months which may have elapsed from the establishment of a new separate school, as compared with the average number of pupils attending school in the same city, town, village or township." "It shall be the duty of the trustees of every separate school to transmit to the clerk of the municipality, or clerks of the municipalities, on or before the first day of June in each year, a correct list of the names and residences of all persons supporting the separate schools under this management; and every ratepayer whose name shall not appear on such list shall be rated for the support of public schools."

(B.) "Every separate school shall be entitled to a share in the fund annually granted by the legislature of this province for the support of public schools, and shall be entitled also to a share of the public grants, investments and allotments for public school purposes now made or hereafter to be made by the province or municipal authorities, according to the average number of pupils attending such school during the twelve next preceding months, or during the number of months which may have elapsed from the establishment of a new separate school, as compared with the average number of pupils attending school in the same city, town, village or township." "It shall be the duty of the trustees of every separate school to transmit to the clerk of the municipality, or clerks of the municipalities, on or before the first day of June in each year, a correct list of the names and residences of all persons supporting the separate schools under this management; and every ratepayer whose name shall not appear on such list shall be rated for the support of public schools."

(C.) "The teachers of separate schools under this Act shall be subject to the same examinations, and receive their certificates of qualification in the same manner as public school teachers generally." (D.) "Every priest, minister, ecclesiastic, or person forming part of a religious community instituted for educational purposes, and every person of the female sex, being a member of any religious community, shall be in every case exempt from undergoing an examination before any of the said boards," and are qualified to be teachers in R. C. separate schools."

Additional Extract—"The R. C. Separate Schools (with their registers) shall be subject to such inspection as may be directed from time to time by the Minister of Education, and shall be subject also to such regulations as may be imposed from time to time by the Education Department." "The Minister of Education, all judges, members of the legislature, the heads of the municipal bodies in their respective localities, the inspectors of public schools, and clergymen of the R. C. Church, shall be visitors of separate schools."

"Under the B. N. America Act, local legislators may legislate in regard to separate schools, provided that the legislation is not such as prejudicially affects the rights or privileges heretofore possessed by such schools."

One of the dangers of the popular amusement of coasting was set forth in the person of a Halifax boy, who was recently fatally injured by running into a lamp post.