

**Published Weekly at 48 and 49 Richmond street, London, Ontario.**  
Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

**EDITORS:**  
REV. GEORGE R. NORTHGRAVES,  
Author of "Mistakes of Modern Infidels."  
THOMAS COFFEY.  
Publisher and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY,  
Messrs. Luke King, John Nigh, P. Neven and M. C. O'Donnell are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transact all other business for the CATHOLIC RECORD.  
Rates of Advertising—Ten cents per line each insertion, agents measurement.  
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.  
Arrears must be paid in full before the paper can be stopped.

London, Saturday, August 26, 1893.

MR. J. S. EWART, Q. C., ON THE SCHOOL QUESTION.

J. S. Ewart, Q. C., who was counsel for His Grace Archbishop Tache, in the Manitoba school case, has a masterly article in the *Canadian Magazine* for July on the question in debate.

He commences by pointing out many opinions which have been held by eminent men in all ages, but which were afterwards proven to be wrong, some of which were thought to be certain, being accepted on account of the authority of those who propounded them, and most of which would be now at least tolerated by the public on the principle that "no one nowadays thinks of interfering with opinions."

Hereupon he shows that it is a mistake to suppose that this principle is universally acted upon, and that the spread of education itself has not made men tolerant of the opinions which run counter to their own. An utterance of a well-known Presbyterian divine is adduced as an example to the effect that,

"It should be made an unpleasant thing for a man to call himself an infidel."

From this and other circumstances he infers that "Cocksure and its brood 'with fierce emphasis' are still dragging the world."

He desires that this spirit will "burn itself out;" but he has little hope that it will do so before several centuries more shall have passed. Asperities have indeed been rubbed down, and men are not burning or jailing one another just now as they did in rougher times, yet the "old intolerant spirit is still alive manifesting itself and dominating as far as it can, in strict conformity with the softened manners of the times."

We cannot, indeed, agree with Mr. Ewart in the inference which might be drawn from his expression that "human thought is, even at the best of it, upon social and religious questions, far from being infallible." We must remember that on many religious questions human thought has been directed and enlightened by revelation, and to the extent in which it has been so enlightened the conclusions are infallible. Nevertheless we appreciate and admire the tolerant spirit with which Mr. Ewart writes, and we must be tolerant of the opinions of others who disagree with us, even if we are absolutely certain of the truth. We may use persuasion and argument to convince them, but we are not authorized even to propagate the gospel of Christianity by the force of fire and sword. For still greater reason should we not force our crude opinions upon our fellow-men.

Mr. Ewart enumerates a number of men's pet theories such as Imperial Federation, Militarism, Sabatarianism, the abolition of alcoholism, all of which have strong arguments to support them; but he points out that there are also strong arguments in favor of the opposing views, and he makes a strong appeal that those who embrace contrary opinions on these matters should have liberty. So also in the matter of religious belief the fullest liberty should be accorded. It is indeed a necessity that this should be the case in a community such as we have in Canada where there is so much diversity of belief.

Applying these principles to the question of Education Mr. Ewart says:

"What does the principle of liberty require? This, and nothing more, that parents should not be required to subscribe to the school rates, and at the same time have their children taught some 'ism' that they abhor; and on the other hand, that where the parents of all the children in any school desire that an 'ism' should be taught, taught it ought to be. And I shall add that when I speak of unanimity I mean practical unanimity, and not such as would make it necessary to include all mere eccentric or isolated opinion of every ordinary or extraordinary sort. We can never expect to have theoretical perfection in the application of even undoubted doctrines to all possible conditions and contingencies."

In the community are many people who desire to have par-

ticular isms taught in the schools. Liberty requires that children should not be taught 'isms to which their parents are opposed. But at the same time liberty does not require that children should be allowed to grow up entirely illiterate. Liberty further requires that where the parents of the children of any one school desire that a particular 'ism should be taught, taught it ought to be. And it further requires that in arranging the schools reasonable facilities ought, if possible, to be given for the combination of such children in separate schools. It would be the antipodes of liberty that such combination should be prevented in cases in which it did not materially interfere with the efficiency of other schools."

In the case of Ontario, Mr. Ewart draws from his contention the following practical conclusions, the substance of which cannot be reasonably impeached:

"In that case, what does the principle of liberty require? Merely this, that opportunity should be given for the combination of Roman Catholics in certain of the schools, if that can be done without disturbing unduly the efficiency of the other schools. They desire that an 'ism' should be taught to their children. By all means let it be so if it costs nothing or very little to other people. Liberty to them and all others should be accorded, even at some expense to the community, for one of the objects of our institutions is to afford as much individual liberty as possible. The opportunities they desire may, without loss to the community, be given to them in two sets of cases: 1, where the population is dense, and yet mixed. In these cases there will be room for two sets of schools. 2, in districts where the population is sparse, but entirely Roman Catholic. Against the propriety of granting facilities for separate schools in these cases, there can be nothing said without intolerance and the breach of the most cherished principles of liberty."

Mr. Ewart speaks, of course, as a Protestant, who has not himself the conviction that Catholic teaching is based upon the divine command of Christ to His apostles to teach His truth to all nations. We maintain that the divine commission makes it obligatory on pastors and parents to co-operate in affording a religious education to the rising generation. The principles of liberty laid down by Mr. Ewart make it incumbent on the majority to leave us free to do so whenever and wherever we are conscious that we can do it without interfering with the liberty of our Protestant neighbors to do likewise, if they will.

Applying these same principles to the case of the Catholics of Manitoba, Mr. Ewart quotes the Rev. Dr. Bryce, a prominent Presbyterian clergyman who is bitterly opposed to Catholic education. The doctor said recently:

"Out of seven hundred and nineteen districts in Manitoba, when the Act of 1890 was passed, ninety-one were Catholic. Of these, all but a very small percentage are in localities almost entirely French."

The fact is that in four only of these ninety-one districts is the population considerably mixed of Protestants and Catholics. Why, then, should Catholics be debarred from teaching religion to their children, if the just requirements of the State, that the children shall be fairly educated in secular branches, be observed?

Only intolerance can throw an obstacle in the way; and this is what the Greenway legislation has done.

Mr. Ewart remarks that large numbers of really believing Protestants in Manitoba would be glad to accord liberty to the Catholics if they could but get a little of it for themselves. He attributes the persecution to which the Manitoba Catholics have been subjected mainly to the intolerance of those who most loudly proclaim their love of universal toleration—those who "deem religion not to be of the highest importance," that is, those who either avow that they are sceptics, or are really dominated by scepticism, though they repudiate it in public.

It is a fact that sceptics are generally intolerant of religion, just as "Rousseau required all his citizens to be tolerant, having first directed to be exiled or executed all who would not subscribe and live up to his profession of faith."

It will be readily understood from this that the Manitoba Catholics who are now struggling for the maintenance of their schools are the true friends of liberty, while those who have imposed upon them the Greenway restrictions are really intolerant and intolerant oppressors, notwithstanding their professions that they are the friends of freedom, civil and religious.

Luther's mother was born a Catholic, lived and died a Catholic; so also did the mother of Melancthon, Luther's most intimate friend. And now it is said that the last lineal descendant of Luther has returned to the Catholic Church.

#### OLD OR NEW.

The *Church Chronicle* of Hamilton renews the oft-explored theory that the Church of England of today is one with the Church of England of pre-Reformation days. It asserts that—

"The Church of England was always known as the Catholic Church—that is, it was a portion of the entire Catholic Church of Christendom; but there was never a Roman Catholic Church in England until the reign of Elizabeth, when the Pope of Rome commanded his sympathizers to separate and form a schism. The Pope never exercised supremacy in England before the Reformation. He only exercised spiritual jurisdiction, with the consent of the crown. No new Church was founded in England at the Reformation. There was, therefore, no transfer of Church property from the Roman Church of England at that period; because there has never been a Roman Church of England."

Every reader of history, even to the most cursory degree, knows the absurdity of these claims, which we have from time to time refuted at some length, making it unnecessary to enter upon a full exposition of the state of the case at present.

It is a matter well known to all readers that towards the close of the second century the British Church was established in England by missionaries from Pope Eleutherius, and that the claim of ecclesiastical jurisdiction was frequently made by their successors as being derived in this way from the Pope. All this we are told by Bede.

Afterwards the British Church was in communion with the universal Church, which, it is universally acknowledged, submitted to and recognized the authority of the See of Rome. This recognition was made at the Councils of Arles, Sardica and Rimini, as usual British Bishops being among those present.

It is also well known that St. Augustine established the Church among the Saxon conquerors of Britain under authority from Pope St. Gregory the Great.

Council after council of the old Church of England declared its firm adherence to the Roman Pontiff as the centre of Catholic unity. In this sense, that the Church of England adhered to and was part of the Catholic Church, that is, the universal Church, it was Catholic also; but the universal Church recognized the Pope's supremacy.

It is true that sometimes the English monarchs endeavored to lessen the influence, and defied the authority of, the Pope, but the Church at all times resisted these royal encroachments; and it was for this resistance that St. Thomas of Canterbury became a martyr.

As one of many examples of the authority exercised by the Popes we may here mention the single fact that the preamble of the Acts of the Council of Cloveshoe declares that it was held (A. D. 747) by command of Pope Zachary "in the exercise of his apostolic authority," to correct the corrupt practices of the age.

This Council declared also that having consulted the homilies of Blessed Gregory, and the canonical decrees of the Holy Fathers, they had resolved "that Bishops should not exercise any secular office, but should confine themselves to their pastoral duties, instructing and correcting by words and works the people committed to their charge." (First Canon of Cloveshoe.) This is the language of a Council which some modern Anglicans pretend declared itself independent of the Pope.

So much for the *Chronicle's* pretence that the Pope's authority was exercised only through consent of the kings. It is something novel in the history of Christianity that "Apostolic authority" should need the king's sanction before it could be lawfully exercised.

The *Chronicle* further tells us, "Henry VIII. was a Roman Catholic who merely quarrelled with the Pope about his divorce and repudiated his supremacy as a political ruler," and "The real Reformation was made by the Church itself, and chiefly during the reign of Queen Elizabeth." He infers that "the Church of England was never a creature of Parliament, for it existed before there was a Parliament."

Good! but cannot the reader see that it was the Church of England in communion with the Holy and Apostolic See of Rome which existed before there was a Parliament? The modern Church of England was a new creation. It had a new and unheard-of head, new doctrines, a new worship, a new and bogus episcopate and ministry—everything new. It was no longer the old Church which was adorned by a Venerable Bede, a St.

Anselm, a Lanfranc, but an entirely new creation—differing from the Church of St. Augustine in everything which is essential to the Church of Christ. We are told it was not made by Henry VIII. Our contemporary desires to throw off the paternity of the Blue Beard King. But Henry VIII. was the prime cause of the new creation, which was afterwards remodelled by Edward VI. and Elizabeth. The Royal Supremacy, the chief feature of the Church of England, was entirely Henry VIII.'s idea. It was a feat which alone sufficed to make the new Church a new thing, for it was alien to the very nature of the Church of Christ and a complete change of its fundamental character.

As regards the taking of Church property by the new Church of England it was simply a wholesale robbery effected by the might of the secular arm.

#### RE-UNION CONFERENCE.

Last summer a number of gentlemen, lay and clerical, but chiefly clerical, held a convention at Grindelwald, Switzerland, under the name of a "Re-union Conference" for the purpose of taking steps for the re-union of Christendom.

The meeting, of course, had no result from a religious point of view, for, in the first place, the sharers in it had no representative character, not being delegated by their respective sects. The opinions expressed were simply individual opinions; and it is not difficult to find individuals of almost any imaginable shade of doctrine. Thus there is nothing surprising in the fact that having agreed to meet for the purpose of furthering a union, all the talk should have been in the direction of union. There were Anglicans, and even some American Episcopalians, present, who assured the convention that they were willing to throw Episcopalism overboard if thereby a union could be effected. They declared that an Episcopate is not essential to religion, though they were perfectly aware that their Church maintains its necessity and will not allow any one to exercise ministerial functions without having Episcopal ordination.

On the other hand, several of those who belong to non-Episcopal bodies declared that they had no objection to appoint Bishops if by so doing they would facilitate the desired union. There was no disposition to recognize that Anglican or American Bishops have any real character which makes them higher than other ministers, so they could see no incongruity in the creation of an Episcopal order. Bishops may thus be made simply by calling their ministers by this name; yet they would not so demean themselves or their denomination as to acknowledge any superiority of order in the Anglican Episcopate. Hence the proposal that they should nominate certain prominent clergymen of their respective denominations who would be made Bishops by the laying on of hands of the Anglican Bishops, and should in turn lay hands on their own ministers, to make them real priests according to the Anglican conception, was received with great disfavor. This would be an acknowledgment that they have never had a validly constituted ministry among them, and such an acknowledgment they would never make. Bishops by appointment, however, they were quite willing to make, as this would not imply so humiliating a confession.

On the matter of doctrine there was more prospect of a compromise, as it was generally agreed that there could be no practical basis except that every one should be allowed to believe as much or as little as he pleased.

This year a similar conference has just taken place at Lucerne. We are not yet aware what conclusion has been arrived at, but we presume that, at least, the self-constituted delegates will have a happy time in congratulating each other, and in scaling the Swiss mountains.

It is a noticeable fact that in all such gatherings for the re-union of Christendom, any idea of having the Catholic Church taken into the general plan of re-union is scouted as impracticable. It will be a strange re-union of Christendom without the great majority of Christians. It will be like the play of Hamlet with Hamlet left out. Of course, the reason for this is that the Catholic Church, holding that she teaches and has always taught the truth of God, cannot compromise her doctrines. This firmness is regarded as something which makes Catholicism worthy only of reprobation.

Indeed one of the participants in the

re-union declared that "English Protestants must wake up to the necessity of finally abandoning the hope of effecting unity on Papal principles; yet the same gentleman said that he 'entertains the hope that the Divine Spirit may convince them all of the beauty of courtesy and mutual concession—and indeed of the absolute necessity of these conditions.'"

In this spirit he makes the suggestion whether "hypothetically or somehow, all ministers in charge of congregations ought not to place themselves on a brotherly footing of equality in that matter." (He here speaks of Episcopal ordination.)

On that matter the Church of England has already pronounced very explicitly that it will not fraternize with any denomination whose clergy shall not have such ordination. However, we presume that the Church would not find it very difficult to recede from its present position in this regard. The articles of belief have already undergone several important changes; and what is to prevent them from being changed again?

Yet we are not of opinion that any serious result will come out of the Lucerne Conference.

#### HERESY IN MISSIONARIES.

A new heresy case, or rather the revival of a case of some years' standing, is troubling the Board of Foreign Missions of Massachusetts.

A clerical student named Mr. Noyes was desirous of being sent to Japan as a missionary, but doubts were cast upon his orthodoxy, and when questioned by the Board it was discovered that he does not believe that the heathen who have not heard the gospel will be damned.

The Board informed Mr. Noyes that they believe that unless the heathen hear of the Saviour and accept the gospel they must perish eternally; and that it is for this reason they equip and send out missionaries at great cost of time and labor to convert them. They asked Mr. Noyes what benefit his preaching would be if his views are correct, as the heathen will be, or may be, saved without his preaching. They inform him also that it is with great difficulty that they raise money enough to support their missions, and the money is given on account of the general belief of contributors that the heathen must know Christianity in order that they may be saved. If, therefore, they once proclaim that this knowledge is not necessary their task of collecting money for missions will be rendered much more difficult. They add that there is no good reason for sending the Bible to people whom God will save even though they do not read and learn His word. They, therefore, rejected Mr. Noyes' application.

It appears not to strike the gentlemen who constitute the Mission Board, that it is worth while to preach the truth to the heathen, for truth's sake, and because Christianity affords means of grace which will increase the opportunities leading to salvation, even though it were strictly true that salvation were absolutely possible for them.

The Board accepts without question the Calvinistic doctrine that the heathen who know nothing of God's attributes of mercy will be condemned to all the horrors of everlasting fire. They are, according to this doctrine, responsible for an ignorance which they could by no means avoid.

On the other hand, a Boston Church furnished Mr. Noyes with the necessary equipment, and sent him out for a year on the mission he desired to undertake, and a movement was begun to change the complexion of the Board so that Mr. Noyes' services might be accepted.

As usual, there are on the Board two parties, one of which is in favor of Mr. Noyes' views, so that the change of a few votes would be enough to sustain him. But so far the "orthodox" view has prevailed, and a few days ago, the question being again before them, Mr. Noyes' offer was again rejected. It is believed, however, that the Boston Church which sent him on his mission will continue to uphold him until his supporters may be able to control the Mission Board. For the present, however, the Calvinistic view is predominant, and an effort is being made to bring the managing elders of the Boston Church to trial on a charge of favoring heresy, and probably even of being actually heretical in belief.

The whole question is being keenly discussed, and it will depend upon the majority vote of a confessedly fallible tribunal, whether or not those who

have favored Mr. Noyes' mission are to be found guilty or not guilty. It would be interesting to know what kind of Christians the heathen converts are who are taught the diversities of doctrine which their missionaries bring to them, calling them Christian truths.

#### A CASE IN POINT.

One of the most virulent among the opponents of Home Rule for Ireland is the Duke of Devonshire, and he exhibits the keenest possible interest in Irish affairs, always to discover some pretext for the denial of Ireland's just demands. *Reynold's London News*, paper in a recent issue gives some interesting facts which throw light upon the substantial reasons which the Duke has for his determined opposition to the cause of Ireland, and it is clear from them that he is not animated by pure patriotism, nor even by political considerations.

From certain Irish estates which were in former days confiscated from Catholic Irishmen he derives £30,000 yearly in rents. Of this territory 42,000 acres were confiscated from the Earl of Desmond because the latter espoused the cause of the Irish people. This, and thousands of acres of bog and mountain, were given to Sir Walter Raleigh in the reign of Queen Elizabeth; and, when in prison, Sir Walter sold the whole property to one Richard Boyle for £5,000.

Boyle was an ex-clerk to an English Judge, and a notorious swindler, having been convicted of forgery and horse-stealing, and he succeeded in evading payment of any more than £500; however, he was afterwards made Earl of Cork by James I. and received a patent of right over all the land thus acquired.

One of Boyle's children afterwards married into an English noble family, from which the Duke of Devonshire derives the property by descent; and the present Duke is landlord over all the estates which were thus confiscated.

Many English lords and nobles who are extensive Irish landlords hold their property by similar tenure, and they not unnaturally imagine that when an Irish parliament will sit in Dublin their titles to their immense holdings will be enquired into; and, not unnaturally, they fear, not indeed total confiscation, but such legislation as will transfer to the Irish people some right to the soil which in past ages belonged to their ancestors. Facts like these should be sufficient to show that the great English lords, who are at the same time Irish landlords, are not so much in dread that the Empire will be dismembered by the passage of a Home Rule Bill as that they will themselves lose some of their incomes by the measure. They are fighting for the retention of their unjustly acquired sources of revenue; and they are supported by English landlords through fear that a precedent may be made the result of which will be the cutting down of their own incomes; for many of their titles would as little stand the test of investigation as that of the Earl of Devonshire.

Pure patriotism has little to do with the opposition which the Lords are showing to Irish Home Rule. The true motive of it is selfishness, with probably a touch of fellow feeling for those of their own rank whose incomes they do not wish to see cut down.

A rigorous investigation into the claims of many of the nobility would undoubtedly show that their titles are founded upon injustices equally glaring with that of the Duke of Devonshire, though as some palliation it may be said that the present generation is not responsible for them, and that it would be too revolutionary a remedy to confiscate now all the estates which arise out of unjust confiscations or other misdeeds which were perpetrated centuries ago, or even some few generations since.

To this we answer that the Irish Nationalists have not, and never had, any thought of remedying the grievances of Ireland by such a measure. Yet it is a fact that the people of Ireland, the poorest of all civilized countries in the world, have been impoverished by just these causes, and that it would be too revolutionary a remedy to be attributed directly to these sources arises out of causes which are of more recent date, absentee landlordism, exorbitant rents, increased charges on account of improvements made by the tenantry themselves, neglect of legislation for the benefit of Ireland by the Westminster Parliament, which either was too much occupied with legislating for Imperial and English interests to pay attention to the needs Ireland or was

disinclined to take the trouble of considering the necessities of the case should be otherwise.

It could scarcely be the case should be otherwise, but whose interests are different from those of Ireland? It is hardly to be expected to have interests much at heart, they must necessarily conflict with those of England to time, just as those of our country will frequently run other sectional interests. land was inevitably the result. Home Rule is the only way in which all equity bound to apply in spite of the protestation from interested Lords in Chamber.

We have said that the Duke does not ask the British grant redress by revolution, but an Irish Parliament easily find means to do the duty of every Government though often neglected influence, to govern for the best of the whole people.

Without dispossessing proprietors of Ireland, the whole population will be by the recognizing of the people to the soil and to improvements of making. Facilities must be made to small farmers to become, and other measures to secure the welfare of residents in preference absentee landlords. This has been created by law will thus be corrected rapidly enough to give

It will not be denied that it will diminish the claims of the present holders; but it is necessary should be done for the whole people. Beside

in reality, nothing different principle in vogue different in the world, taxation of the most valuable properties for welfare. The largest burden of good government falls upon those who can afford it, and who do benefit from a proper of the laws, because the Government for pro law are the greater in the amount of wealth be protected. In this principle is all that able, on account of the the claim on which so aristocracy hold their

#### A PARENTAL

We have had occasion to see the parents of their children. Negligent, fathers and mothers in and example, a love for its goods into their children never yet gave pure, women to the Church what we need at the

We have no use for whose brains have been sensational newspaper them of "liberal" views they have the privilege their opinion on matters and forget thereby that not their but God's, have no rights but to protect it. We need careful parents have silence and retirement virtues of the Mother men who have been upon their spiritual representatives and world the only sermon to—the sermon of a life.

Parents are guilty breach of their duty, in doing often irreflexively their children, when exercise a careful reading of the book that have no right, but to exist, are in the hands and daughters; and anxiety. "It does they say; and yet it that bad books have women. Yes, old and a woman, sheltered of a brothel, and degraded and changed self that even his recognize him, over the book that include "would do them no will they come to obligations? It may some, this outcry