

## The Catholic Record.

Published weekly at 44 and 466 Richmond street, London, Ontario.

Price of Subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

REV. GEORGE R. NORTHGRAVES.

REV. WILLIAM FLANNERY.

THOMAS COFFEY.

Patrons and Proprietors—THOMAS COFFEY.

Meers, Luke King, John Nigh, P. J. 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.

Approved by the Archbishop of Toronto

and the Bishop of London, and recom-

ended by the Archbishop of St. Boniface

and the Bishops of Hamilton, Kingston,

and Peterborough, and leading Catholic

Clergymen throughout the Dominion.

Correspondence intended for publication,

should be directed to the proprietor, and

must reach London not later than Tuesday

morning.

Advance must be paid in full before the

paper can be stopped.

Persons writing for a change of address

should invariably send us the name of their

former post office.

THE CATHOLIC RECORD.

London, Sat., May 16th, 1891.

THE IRRECONCILABLES.

We deem it proper to refer once more to

the little diary made by the anti-Catholic

party in the Ontario Legislature immedi-

ately before adjournment. Mr. Meredith

said:

"The Roman Catholic Bishops of the

neighboring provinces have contended that

they had a right to usurp the control of

the educational system, to the exclusion

of all others of a different faith."

As the orator did not quote from any

pastoral letter or circular issued by any of

the Bishops of Quebec on the subject of

education we must not attach unlimited

credit to every statement he made on the

subject. But there is one thing certain

about Separate school education in that

Province: It is that the Protestant Bishops

and ministers have the education of the

Protestant youth exclusively in their own

hands. There is a Protestant Board in the

very Council of Education, and the acting

superintendent of all the Protestant

Separate schools in Lower Canada is a

Protestant minister of the Anglican persua-

sion. In fact, as the Hon. Mr. Colby said

from his place in the House of Commons:

"We Protestants in Quebec are allowed

to manage our schools, colleges and acade-

mies, without let or hindrance on the

part of the Catholic government. What-

ever we suggest is permitted; whatever

we ask for is granted. We are left to

ourselves to decide what is best for the

Protestant education of our Protestant

children."

There is no man found either in or out

of the Quebec Legislature to act the part of

Mr. Meredith in calling the attention of the

country to the interference of Protestant

ministers or Bishops in the management of

schools or in their selection of text-books

salable for the education of Protestant

children. It is reserved for the Conserva-

tive Protestants of Ontario to institute a

persecution of these paring minis-

ters against the rights or privileges of the

clergy to look into or suggest anything in

the education of youth.

The British North America Act may

not have provided for the interference of

Bishops in school matters, but the common

consent of nations with any claim to Chris-

tianity has always favored, and demanded

even, the attention of the clergy to school

matters and the vigilant superintendence

of priests and Bishops over academies and

universities. Because the Act does not

empower the Bishops to take into their

own hands the education of Catholic chil-

dren, therefore Mr. Meredith thinks they

should not be allowed to go near the

schools or ask what books are placed in

the hands of the children. If the State

undertook to recommend books of an

immoral or atheistic tendency would it

not be the duty of the Bishops to inter-

fere? Would not the parents, the rate-

payors and trustees all expect that the

Bishops would sound the alarm and openly

warn all children against attendance

at such schools? But it may be said in a

Christian country like Canada such a state

of things as introducing atheistic or im-

moral books into schools would be an

utter impossibility. All we have to say

in reply to this assertion is that what

happened in other Christian countries may

occur in Canada. In France, Italy and

other nations, where the education of

the youth was taken out of the hands of

the Jesuit Fathers and of other teaching

orders, both infidelity and immorality

were taught and practised; and although

neither is permitted, so far, in Canada,

the negation of all religion in schools

must necessarily lead to the negation of

all morality. If will be always necessary

that religion and education go hand in

hand in the training of our youth, no

matter what the British North America

Act or Mr. Wm. R. Meredith may opine

or say to the contrary.

"While we must take care not to hurt

the feelings of any child," said Mr. Mer-

edith, "we must insist that the State, not

the Church, has the right to control the

education of a child, no matter what his

religious opinions were."

Yet Mr. Meredith pretends to be a

practical Christian, and as such no doubt

must have read the words of command

given to the Church by God Himself,

"Go and teach all nations." How can the

Church teach any nation where Mr.

Meredith's principles are upheld and en-

forced? How would Mr. Meredith feel

if his own children were taken out of his

hands by an infidel government (the

State) and given over to the tender

mercies of a Tom Payne or a Pro-

fessor Tyndall? Would he still persist

in saying that the State has the sole

right to control the education of his

children no matter what the opinions

of Mr. Meredith were; would Mr.

Meredith consent to have his children

brought up infidels or freethinkers? To

what other conclusion may his principles

lead? If the State has the sole control

of the education of youth neither he nor

any other Christian parent could con-

sistently object. But there are no Tom

Paynes or Tyndalls in Canada. Possibly

there are not many, but we know there

are some professors in our Public schools

as much opposed to Anglicanism or

Catholicity as Tom Payne or other un-

believers could be to Christianity.

Let us suppose the possibility of Mr.

Meredith assuming the reins of power,

would not Mr. James L. Hughes be called

to the Ministry of Education? And how

could any Catholic parent entrust the

education of his children to the State when

the State were composed of Messrs. Wm.

R. Meredith, James L. Hughes, Rev. Dr.

Wild and a few other characters notorious

for their bigotry and their hatred of the

Catholic name and instincts.

We are very much gratified to see the

name of our old-time friend, Solomon

White, M. P. P., on every division list

in favor of Catholic rights and immunities

in Separate school legislation. Mr. White

has been always on the Conservative side

of the House, and an upholder of Mr. W.

R. Meredith's leadership; but when the

French language was proscribed and when

attempts were made to prevent priests or

Bishops from looking into their own Catho-

lic Separate schools and examining the

books placed in the hands of Catholic

children, Mr. White spoke against such

dastardly attempts at persecution, and

voiced against his own leader. We are glad

to be able to congratulate North Essex

in having for representative a Catholic

who, on principle, stands on the

Tory side of the House, but who can

rise superior to party and cast

an independent vote on every occasion

when French nationality or Catholic faith

and practice are assailed. We wish we

could say as much of the *soi-disant* Catho-

lic member for Kent.

THE HERESY TRIALS.

In the present disposition of Protestant-

ism to close its eyes to differences of faith,

or rather of opinion, it could scarcely be

expected that prosecutions for heresy

would be of frequent occurrence. No

one imagines that at the present time the

sects are less tolerant of unbelief in doctri-

nal matters than they have hitherto

been. Among Protestants, who have been

most rigid in their adherence to their

humanly-made standards, we have wit-

nessed, recently, many instances wherein

the greatest latitude of belief has been

allowed; as in the cases of Dr. Dods, of

Edinburgh, and Dr. Briggs, of New York,

both of whom maintained in public pro-

positions which must end in the denial of

all Christianity. Yet there is a large

party in the respective Churches who sus-

tain openly both of these men, and they

are placed in positions in the theological

institutions of their Churches wherein

they do most harm by propagating their

doctrines among the rising generation of

ministers.

If at the present time open infidelity is

so prevalent, it needs not the gift of prop-

hecy to be able to foretell that under

such auspices there will in a few years be

little, if any, difference between Bob

Loge and so-called "Orthodox" or

"Evangelical" Presbyterians.

Those Protestants who have still some

faith in Christian doctrine within them

do not conceal their alarm at this condi-

tion of affairs. A number of the ablest

Presbyterian divines in America, aware

that the very existence of their Church is

threatened, are devoting themselves just

now to the task of refuting Dr. Briggs.

One of these, Dr. Green, of the Princeton

Theological Institute, complains that the

"extreme partisan attitude so unwisely

taken by Dr. Briggs at this juncture allows

no discretion."

Dr. Green seems not so much scandal-

ized that such opinions should be held

in the Church as that Dr. Briggs has

forced on the discussion as to the

inerrancy of Holy Scripture; and,

certainly, the latter by his defiant atti-

tude leaves to the Church no alterna-

tive except to approve or condemn.

Dr. Green continues:

"It compels the Church *nolens volens*

to face the alternative of endorsing or

refusing to endorse the sentiments of

his inaugural. To take no action is to

endorse and quietly to suffer these

sentiments to become the ruling policy

in the seminaries of the Church for all

time to come. And to do this is to

change its base completely, to permit

its doctrinal standards to fall into con-

tempt and to give up its cardinal tenet

of the supreme authority of the re-

vealed Word of God."

authority of Scripture. Take away its

reliability as a truthful record of

miraculous events, and it will be of no

more authority than the Hindoo *Vedas*, or

the *Zend Avesta* of Zoroaster.

So great is the alarm created by the

position that it has been decided to bring