

# The Catholic Record.

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

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

REV. GEORGE R. NORTHGRAVES,  
Author of "Mistakes of Modern Infidels,"  
THOMAS COFFEY.

Publisher and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY,  
Messrs. LUK, KING, JOHN NICH, P.  
NEVEY 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, space measurement.  
Approved and recommended by the Arch-  
bishops 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, 12, 1893.

## PERSISTENT MISREPRESENTATION.

In order to prejudice the case of the Catholics of Manitoba in their demand for a just settlement of the school question, whereby parents will be enabled to educate their children according to their conscientious convictions, the *Mail* persists in misrepresenting the position taken by the Holy Father, Pope Leo XIII., and Mgr. Satolli, his representative in the United States, on the school question.

A recent issue of that journal has the following:

"While Mgr. Satolli is expounding the policy of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States in harmony with the idea of national schools, the hierarchy in Canada is still seeking to denationalize the schools of Manitoba. The attitude of the Canadian bishops is a pretension that they are more Catholic than the Pope, under whose instructions Mgr. Satolli is acting."

The letter of the Pope to the American bishops should be sufficient to enlighten the *Mail* as to the sentiments of the Holy Father regarding Catholic schools. Neither the Pope nor his ablegate has uttered one word by which it is to be supposed that they discountenance Catholic education, or prefer secular to Catholic schools.

The Pope in his letter strongly exhorts the Bishops to establish efficient Catholic schools throughout their respective dioceses, and to induce Catholics to send their children to them. He desires, indeed, that there should be such an agreement between the Church and the State, that religious education may be secured in the schools, and to this extent he favors a national system of education; but where there is no such agreement, he by all means desires that Catholic schools be established and supported. Parents who do not send their children to Catholic schools are solemnly told that they are obliged to make adequate provision for the religious instruction of their children.

Certainly there is nothing in all this to justify the statement that the Bishops of Canada, in insisting upon their rights and the right of parents to educate Catholic children as they should be educated, are in opposition to the policy of the Holy See.

It will be noticed that the Pope's letter is intended directly for the United States and not for Canada, though, of course, the ethical principles on which it is based are universal. The application is different, however, according to the difference of circumstances. We have in Canada, or at least in Ontario and Quebec, precisely the circumstances which the Pope desires to see also in the United States, the agreement between Church and State whereby the liberty of Catholic parents is assured, and justice done to them by a State recognition of their rights. Does the Holy Father desire to see this condition of affairs abolished? If we are to believe the *Mail*, he does so, but this is in direct contradiction to his words. When we desire to see the Catholics of Manitoba enjoy the same rights which they had till the passage of the Greenway laws, we are in perfect accord with the principles laid down by the Holy See. This is clear from the words of the Baltimore decrees, which are confirmed, and approved anew by the latest utterances of the Holy Father:

"All Catholic parents are bound to send their children to parochial schools, unless, either at home or in other Catholic schools, the Christian education of the same is sufficiently and evidently provided for; or, unless, for sufficient reasons, approved by the Bishop, and with laudable precautions and remedies for the preservation of faith and morals, they are permitted to send them to other schools."

Speaking of the propositions laid down by the American Archbishops at their meeting in New York in November last, Archbishop Ryan of Philadelphia in a recent interview thus interpreted the directions given by the Pope and Mgr. Satolli:

"Parochial schools are the rule. Plans of various kinds are tolerated

exceptions where the rule cannot be carried out."

This has reference to the Faribault and other compromises which may be made with school authorities, permitting religious instruction out of school hours.

His Grace continues:  
"No one universal plan can be adopted because of the variety of dispositions of school boards towards Catholics. The only reasonable universal system would be the denominational one, such as it exists in Canada, England, Ireland, and other countries."

Where in all this is there any diversity between the Pope and the Bishops, whether of Canada or of the United States? The incompatibility lies altogether in the *Mail's* sanctum. But we presume that journal will continue as it has done hitherto to maintain that such diversity exists.

## NOVELTIES FOR AN ORANGE AUDIENCE.

From the Boston *Republic* we learn that the Orangemen of New York held a picnic on the 12th of July at which the usual balderdash was uttered regarding the establishment of civil and religious liberty in England by King William III., the Prince of Orange and patron saint of the Orange organization.

Of course, every one at all acquainted with the facts of the case is aware that the dethronement of James II. and the calling in of William were the result of James' efforts to restore to Catholics some of their rights as citizens, of which they were deprived by the most cruel penal laws which ever disgraced the statute books of any country in the world. The champion of religious and civil liberty was therefore not William III., but the unfortunate James, notwithstanding that he was imprudent in the measures he adopted with the object of establishing true liberty of conscience. But with the Orangemen the meaning of civil and religious liberty is that they should enjoy ascendancy, and Catholics be persecuted.

But one of the speakers, the well-known Rev. Madison C. Peters, unexpectedly to the assembled picnicers told some wholesome truths which took his hearers quite by surprise. He said, "Protestants are not free from bigotry."

It was a genuine surprise to the Orangemen to hear that it is bigotry in them to refuse to recognize that Catholics have any rights which ought to be acknowledged. They have been wont to treat Catholics after the fashion displayed by the Belfast brethren after the second reading of the Home Rule Bill, or as the A. P. A. would treat them. It must have been very unpalatable to them to hear that such conduct comes from bigotry.

The following testimony to the efficient work which is being done by the Catholic Church in the United States must have been also very distasteful to his intensely anti-Catholic audience:

"The one great lesson of the Catholic Church for us is organization. Organization explains the success of the Church; and if Protestantism expects ever to keep pace with the growth of the population in New York, and not fall back 40 per cent. every decade as it has been doing, it must copy the Catholics in their organization and in individual devotion to the cause."

It appears, therefore, to Dr. Peters that Protestants have not the intensity of devotion of Catholics in general. And why is this the case? May it not be because Protestantism consists purely in negation, and that it casts doubt upon articles of Christian faith which have been revealed to man on purpose that our devotional feeling may be intensified and thus the tie between God and man may become closer?

Between the dogmas of religion there is a close connection, so that if one be denied the door is opened to the rejection of all Christianity, and so Protestants, by the rejection of doctrines which are calculated to increase our love for God, have come to be extremely careless in God's service at all. Who can be devout to our Lord who despises His blessed Mother, or His dearest friends, His saints? Who can believe the possibility of Christ's incarnation, who has been taught to believe that Christ's presence on earth is impossible under the Eucharistic veils?

A curious statement of principle is then made by Mr. Peters, namely: "Our duty is to be Americans, even before we are Christians."

Commenting on this the *Republic* shows that Orangemen cannot be either Americans or Christians; and it therefore draws the conclusion that this was the "unkindest cut of all."

They cannot be Americans, because the loyalty of Orangeism is essentially to the Queen of Great Britain; neither can they be Christians, for the followers of Christ must put into practice the charity and brotherly love which their divine Master inculcated. Orangeism is totally at variance with these practices because it inculcates hatred for all Catholics.

But there is something else remarkable in this doctrine. We cannot call it altogether a novel doctrine, for it was the pagan notion that our duties are primarily to the State. It was chiefly because the worship of false Gods was a State religion that the first Christians were persecuted—that the cry was raised, "the Christians to the lions" ("Christians ad leones").

According to Dr. Peters the first duty of man is to his fellow-man; his secondary duty is to God. It is to preserve the proper relations between man and man that the State exists, but Christianity exists that we may know and serve God. This exaltation of the State above religion is a proclamation of the apotheosis of man. It is the religion of Ingersollism and of Paganism; but the Catholic Church preserves intact the principle laid down by our Saviour: "Render therefore to Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God the things that are God's." To adore God is the first commandment and the principal one of the decalogue. We must be just and charitable towards all men, and obedient to the civil law because this is the will of God. Hence our Divine Lord instructs us to "seek first the kingdom of God and His justice and all these things," that is to say, all earthly needs, "shall be added unto you."

But it is the tendency of modern Protestantism to elevate man at the expense of God. This theory of man first and God second has been often implied in the attacks made upon earnest Catholics for being Catholics first and all things; but we have not before seen it so plainly advocated, except by Infidels, who, however, leave out the duty to God altogether; and it surprises us somewhat to find it thus openly propounded by a clergyman. We say by all means, "Be Christians and Catholics first, and secondly be patriots, because love of country and respect for law are Christian duties." Still we respect Dr. Peters for his plain talk to an audience of fanatics. May it do them good.

## ASPIRATIONS AFTER UNITY.

Dr. Perrowne, the Anglican Bishop of Worcester, does not adopt the views which are generally current among the Church of England clergy and Episcopate in reference to the question of Christian unity. He has several times expressed himself as desirous of extending the right hand of fellowship to Presbyterians, Methodists and other non-Conformists, and of admitting them to all the privileges of a branch of the Church without requiring them to adopt episcopacy as essential to its organization, and he has recently written a letter which has been published, and in which he urges his views more explicitly than ever.

He deplores the "unhappy divisions" which exist between the different denominations of Christians and hopes to see that unity restored for which Christ prayed.

The wish is commendable, certainly, but it may well be asked whether a unity as Dr. Perrowne imagines to be sufficient.

The High Churchmen, and others besides, maintain that the unity desired by Christ is something very different from the rope of sand whereby Dr. Perrowne would join together such jarring bodies as Arminians and Calvinists, Paedobaptists and anti-Paedobaptists, Prelatists and Independents.

If all the diversities of these shades of religious belief can be united into one harmonious Christianity, or can constitute the "faith once delivered to the saints," where are we to draw the line? What is to prevent the extension of this union to Swedenborgians, Unitarians, Quakers, and even Deists, Jews, Mahometans and Buddhists?

If Christian charity requires that the differences between Episcopalians and Presbyterians should be ignored, and that both should be recognized as equally belonging to the Church of Christ, it must be because Christianity has no distinctive doctrines; and there is no valid reason for drawing the line anywhere.

Dr. Perrowne laments that "so many good men" talk of union as if "involving a sacrifice of principle." He adds, "They cannot understand any reunion of Christendom except on

the basis of Episcopacy. They would treat non-Conformists exactly as the Church of Rome treats the Church of England. 'Submit,' they say, 'to our Church polity, and then we shall be reunited.' This he calls following in 'the footsteps of Laud' and of the 'Oxford school,' that is to say, of the modern Ritualistic party.

The doctor appears to be of the opinion that the mere statement of the case in this form settles the matter: that it is in fact a subject of individual sentiment. He overlooks, as if it were of no importance, the fact that the Christian hierarchy is of divine, and not human, institution. Christ Himself selected His apostles to do His work, and prayed for them that they might be sanctified in truth, that the world might believe in Him; and He declares that His Father had given Him a mission, in consequence of which He had also commissioned His apostles to do His work after Him, thus:

"Sanctify them in truth, as thou hast sent me into the world, I also have sent them into the world. And for them do I sanctify myself: that they also may be sanctified in truth. And not for them only do I pray, but for them also who through their word shall believe in me: that they all may be one as thou, Father, in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us: that the world may believe that thou hast sent me. And the glory which thou hast given me, I have given to them, that they may be one as we also are one. I in them, and thou in me; that they may be made perfect in one; and the world may know that thou hast sent me, and hast loved them as thou hast also loved me." (St. John xvii., 17-23.)

There could not be a more explicit condemnation than this of Dr. Perrowne's theory, both in regard to the definite and true doctrine which the Christian Church must teach, and in regard to the ministry, which must be sent by Christ.

The ministry of the Church is of divine institution, and therefore it cannot be undertaken by men on their own authority. Now there is nothing more certain than that the first Presbyterian ministers never had any sort of ordination whatsoever, or Apostolic succession, except the few who were apostate priests; and this is virtually acknowledged by the Presbyterian formularies of faith, which, while recognizing the necessity of ordination by divine institution, make an exception for the period of trial through which the Church had passed in its infancy.

The Christian priesthood or ministry, equally with that of the Old Law, is an honor which "no man taketh to himself but he that is called by God as Aaron was" (Heb. v., 4.) The administration of the sacraments and the preaching of God's word are among the duties which were committed to the Apostles, and which cannot be fulfilled except by a lawfully instituted ministry. Another important duty belongs exclusively to the priesthood—the duty of offering up sacrifice to God: "For every high priest taken from among men is ordained for men in the things that appertain to God, that He may offer up gifts and sacrifices for sins . . . and therefore he ought, as for the people, so also for himself to offer for sins." (Heb. v., 1, 3.)

In condemning Core, Dathan, and Abiron (Num. xvi) for unlawfully taking upon themselves the office of the priesthood, Almighty God condemned equally the unlawful, self-constituted ministries which have arisen under Protestantism.

We have hitherto spoken especially of the Presbyterian ministry, because it is confessedly non-Apostolic. But the Anglican ministry is in reality equally so, though the majority of Anglicans claim to possess apostolicity of ordination. We do not propose to enter here into an examination of this claim; but we shall only remark that even if there were a validly ordained priesthood and Episcopacy in the Anglican Church, nevertheless the Church itself has the authority of regulating the right of jurisdiction; and as this right was expressly taken from Anglicanism as a sect wandering from the faith, that right cannot be claimed either by Anglicanism, or any other sect which has departed from the centre of Catholic unity.

This continual talk about aspiration after unity is an acknowledgment that Christ intended His Church to be one. This fact by itself is a condemnation of all sects which have departed from the unity of the Catholic Church, and likewise of the first principle of Protestantism, which is necessarily destructive of unity—private judgment. The only means by which unity can be restored is by a return to the one fold over which Christ presides as the one shepherd ruling the whole Church.

## A. P. A. STATISTICIANS.

The A. P. A. of Louisville, Ky., have issued broadcast some leaflets for the purpose of propagating their vile conspiracy against truth, charity and justice. Among these there is one which professes to give a number of hard "facts" concerning the position assumed by Catholics in the United States. Knowing, as our readers do, the tactics always pursued by the violent enemies of the Catholic Church, and knowing especially that this association has from the beginning used falsehood and fraud without stint in furtherance of its vile ends, it will reasonably be supposed that these so-called facts are mere fabrications; and indeed this is actually how the case stands. In this the A. P. A. is exactly what the P. P. A. has been in Canada, an association of slanderers.

Among the statements of this leaflet is one to the effect that nearly all the desertions from the American army during the civil war were of Irishmen, the object being, of course, to bring odium upon Catholics, as it is well known that the vast majority of the Irish population are Catholics.

If all this were true it would be a most surprising and astounding fact, for the gallantry and bravery of Irishmen are proverbial wherever they have taken part in the battles of the world. It is attested also by general experience that no class of the people of the United States are more attached to the Government of that country than the Irish; and this attachment arises in great measure from the fact that they fled to seek their fortune in a free country where all men had equal opportunity with their neighbors of other nationalities to rise from mediocrity, or even poverty, to prosperity and affluence. Of this opportunity the Irish availed themselves, and in proportion to their numbers, none have been more successful than the Irish and their American-born descendants.

The Irish fled from a misrule which had impoverished them, and found in the United States a welcome whereby they were recognized as citizens and equals of the native population, and they are to-day prosperous and contented with their adopted country.

The A. P. A. leaflet referred to above states that the following statistics were received from the Pensions Department at Washington:

Total number of troops who fought during the civil war.	per cent. of desertions.
Natives of the United States 1,225,207	5
Germans 186,817	10
Irishmen 141,251	22
British (other than Irish) 99,040	7
Other foreigners 48,410	7

On these figures the leaflet remarks: "In other words, of the 144,000 Irishmen that enlisted, 104,000 deserted; and we are informed that most of these desertions occurred after the recognition of the Confederacy by the Pope. It is also a fact that of the 5 per cent. of native Americans rated as deserters, 45 per cent. were Roman Catholics."

Old Euclid used often a method of establishing mathematical truths, which is known as "*reductio ad absurdum*," or proof by showing that the contradictory propositions led to nonsensical conclusions. If all false statistics had this inherent inconsistency it would be very easy to refute them after Euclid's plan; but usually those who dabble in statistics have some knowledge of the powers of figures and avoid such palpable absurdities. Not so with our A. P. A. statisticians. They show the most gross ignorance of the figures they use, and leave it in our power to conclude that the Pension Office never furnished such figures at all.

Let us look for a moment at the figures given. These A. P. A. arithmeticians estimate the 72 per cent. of Irishmen on the number of Irish enlistments, and by using round numbers make a deplorable exhibit of Irish cowardice and disloyalty. Well: estimating the desertions of others on the same basis we obtain this result: Americans (native) 81,263; Germans, 18,682; Irish, 103,839; other British, 6,303; other foreigners, 3,389; or a total of 213,476. Now it will be remarked that the pretended Pension Office statistics make the Irish desertions not 72 per cent. of the number enlisted, but 72 per cent. of the total desertions. This would give the Irish desertions at 153,702, instead of 104,000, as stated by the A. P. A.; and this number is 9,481 larger than the whole number of Irish said to have enlisted! Is it not clear from intrinsic evidence that the figures do not come from the Pension Office, but from the cranium of some unmitigated donkey?

But this matter has been settled beyond cavil. The calumny contained in the above figures was first published by a New York Englishman who pretended that they were taken from the

New York *Sun*. The *Sun* denied ever having published them, and no copy of the *Sun* containing them could be discovered. But the Boston *Pilot*, under the belief that they were actually the statements of the New York *Sun*, made enquiries at the Pension Office and received therefrom an official reply stating that no such figures had ever been issued from that office, and that it was impossible that they should have been so issued, as there were no data in that office or in the War Department from which they could be inferred.

In some respects the figures were certainly inaccurate, as for example, over 2,500,000 men enlisted in the Federal army, instead of 2,128,200 as stated by the slanderer who published the cable; and no record whatsoever was kept either in Washington or elsewhere of the places of nativity of the soldiers enlisting, or of deserters. It was therefore absolutely impossible to give any figures on the subject.

The army authorities were anxious for able-bodied men, but it did not concern them to know where they were born if they were willing to serve the country; hence they made no record whatsoever of this item of intelligence.

Of course it follows from this that the figures given above are entirely worthless. It is a pity that the correct figures cannot be set down in refutation of these imaginary ones. From the general experience of those who knew anything of the personality of the United States army, it may be inferred that the Irish, and the Catholic element generally, was much higher than their proportion of the population; and the present constitution of the Grand Army of the Republic bears this out, but no accurate statistics can be given on the subject.

In regard to the statement of the leaflet that most of the Irish desertions occurred after the recognition of the Southern Confederacy by the Pope, it is worthy of remark that the Pope never made such recognition; though he more than once expressed his sorrow that the fratricidal civil war was being carried on.

Another statement of the leaflet is to the effect that George Washington said: "If the United States ever lose their liberty it will be through the Romish priesthood."

George Washington was certainly a great man; but even if he had said such a thing, it would not be necessarily a correct forecast, as he was not a divinely inspired prophet; and certainly there was never any solid reason for such a statement being made by him or any one else. In fact he never said anything of the kind, though he several times expressed his admiration at the noble conduct of those Catholics who had aided in the great struggle, especially of those who had borne arms on the field of battle.

The saying here attributed to Washington, however, was not made by him at all. With the addition of the word "not," and another change, it becomes a well-known saying of General Lafayette:

"If the United States ever lose their liberty, it will not be through the Catholic priesthood."

Lafayette was too much of a scholar and a gentleman to use such a word as "Romish" in describing the Catholic Church.

We have thought it worth while to make these remarks on this Louisville A. P. A. leaflet, chiefly because the P. P. A. of this Province make use of precisely the same tactics of calumny as their brethren of the United States, and habitually reproduce their lies, as they have already done, both in regard to these calumnies and to the bogus encyclical of Pope Leo XIII. commanding that the Government of the United States should be overthrown by a general rising of the Catholics which should take place next month.

Another calumny of the leaflet is that Catholics owe allegiance to some foreign prince or ecclesiastical power, on account of which it is declared to be a principle of the A. P. A. that

"It is in our opinion unsafe to appoint or elect to civil, political, or military office, men who owe supreme allegiance to any foreign king, potentate, or ecclesiastical power."

This is a favorite saying with fanatics on this side of the line as well as with their brethren of the United States, and it was particularly insisted on by the defunct Equal Rights association, which for this pretended reason demanded that Catholics alone should be deprived of all civil rights.

Catholics owe no allegiance in temporal affairs to any power except the Government of the country. In spiritual matters we maintain that God made His Church independent of the civil power. But Catholics are not

alone in this view. If question directly, all Christians say the same. We have nothing to apologize for in

## THE ASSUMPTION OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN.

On Tuesday, the 15th of the month, the Church celebrated the Assumption of the Virgin.

The mystery of the Assumption of the ever Blessed Mother of heaven is not an article of faith, as the Church has defined it, yet it is attested by so universally received by the Doctors of the Church that most rash to call it into question. The great St. John Damascene on the sleep of Mary, says:

"To-day the sacred living God who created the world, being made living in the temple of the Lord made with hands, and David rejoices, and the angelic choirs join, the Archangel Gabriel, the Virgin Mary, the Principality of To-day heaven receives Paradise of the new Adam, our condemnation was blotted out, which was planted the tree of life, which was clothed with no earthly affection, perfected in heavenly life, how could she taste whom true life flowed to yields to the law made whom she gave birth, and the old Adam shed old sentence; for even he the life itself refused not but as Mother of the living, worthily taken to Him could death devour her, conceived the Son of God, birth to Him, while contented to God? A corruption invaded that body life itself was begotten direct, plain and to heaven is prepared, the way and the 'Where I am there' shall be; and where reason, should not His with Him."

St. Gregory of Tours says: "The Lord committed the most sacred body of the Mother of God to the bosom of a virgin, where now, having been united to her soul, and her chosen ones, she enjoys of eternity, which was to be her portion."

The tradition is, that the Blessed Virgin died and after three days was taken up to heaven by ministering angels, and she enjoys in body the heavenly presence of her Lord.

St. John Damascene on the particulars of this the Blessed Virgin.

In the same sermon he has already quoted this the history of this mystery. "We have received tradition that at the time of the death of the blessed Virgin, the Apostles were travelling in the world of the living, but in a moment of time raised on high and carried to Jerusalem, where a vision appeared to them and angelic powers were heard she (Mary) surrounded by hands of God. Her ineffable means had to God, as the angels and Apostles singing of hymns, and the angels were continuing successive days. After days the singing of Thomas, the only one who had been absent, desired to pay homage which had received God. Apostles opened the were now unable to find it was not in the tomb remained in which wrapped. They found odor coming from the they then closed. As mysterious miracle the conclusion that He pleased to take flesh Mary, and to become a Word, and the Lord of also preserved incorrupt of His mother in giving had now been pleased pure body from corrupt and had honored her (to heaven) before her general resurrection."

St. Timothy, the Ephesus, was present and also Dionysius the himself says in his concerning the blessed was also present.

St. John then quotes Denis which refer to with fewer details than himself.

This testimony of miraculous Assumption