

The Catholic Record.

Published Weekly at 64 and 66 Richmond Street, London, Ontario.

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

REV. GEORGE B. NORTEGRAVES, Editor.

REV. WILLIAM PLANNERY, THOMAS COFFEY, Publishers and Proprietors.

MESSRS. LUKK KING, JOHN NICH and P. J. NEVEX are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transact all other business for the CATHOLIC RECORD.

Agent for Alexandria, Glenora and Lochiel.—Mr. Donald A. McDonald.

Rates of Advertising—Ten cents per line each insertion.

Approved by the Archbishop of Toronto, and recommended by the Archbishops of St. Boniface, Ottawa, Kingston, and the Bishops of Hamilton and Peterboro, and leading Catholic Clergymen 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.

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

Persons wishing for a change of address should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Catholic Record.

London, Sat., April 5th, 1890.

THE DIVIDED HOUSE.

Canon Carran, of Hamilton, presided in St. Thomas' Church on Sunday, 16th inst., from the text: "Christ is the head of the Church. He is the Saviour of His body." (Eph. v. 23) He took the occasion to say that "the Church of Rome with its papal doctrine and saint worship is a false teacher, and that the only real foundation for the Church of God is the Rock of Ages, even Christ."

The Rev. Canon is certainly not lacking in effrontery, when he, a dignitary of a church which teaches, or at least allows to be taught, as her doctrine every error which lies between the dearest infidelity and the most extreme Ritualism, can presume to point out errors in the teaching of the Catholic Church.

It is well known that the Church of England clergy promulgate at least four decidedly distinct sets or systems of doctrine, High and Low, Broad and Erastian, and these are all inculcated under the name of that Parliamentary institution; and there is plenty of room for other sects, if Parliament permit them; and why should it not? Parliament itself is an agglomeration of men holding every shade of religious belief, and why should it not protect every shade of belief in the Church of its own making? In fact under these four party names there is not a heresy or false teaching which has ever been invented which has not been propagated with impunity.

It is not long since a Bishop rebuked one of his clergymen for sitting in silence as chairman of a meeting, at which the populace applauded the indecent allusions which a notorious itinerant lecturer made against the Blessed Virgin Mother of God. These allusions have been solemnly endorsed by the Baptist clergy of Canada, but we are not surprised at this, nor do we refer to the fact for the purpose of holding the Church of England responsible for all the vagaries of the Baptists; but Rev. Canon Carran might well rebuke such false teachings as these, instead of pouring out his denunciations constantly against the supposed errors of "the Church of Rome," as he is wont to do. That it is not indignation against any erroneous teaching of the Catholic Church which induces Low Church orators like Canon Carran to declaim against her, is evident from the fact that they are at this moment engaged in devising some method of union with Baptists, Methodists, Presbyterians, and all such as are willing to join in, while each sect is supposed to retain the liberty of adhering to its own peculiar "false teaching." We believe the Canon himself is a prominent figure in these efforts to bring about such a union of false teachings; but whether this be so or not matters little. His Church is certainly committed to the principle that it ought to be consummated.

But we need not go beyond the Rev. Canon's own city in order to discover some "false teachings" which are not the teachings of Rome. So intense are the dissensions of his own Church in Hamilton itself, that the High and Low factions have established permanent associations for the purpose of preventing each other from teaching their distinctive doctrines. We shall not attempt to decide whether the High or Low doctrines are the bona fide doctrines of the Church; but one thing is certain, that the two parties contradict each other very noisily, to the great scandal of the Christian community. There are certainly false teachings with three out of these four parties; yet the Church is practically engaged in promulgating them all with about equal vigor and zeal. Would it not be a fair field for the Canon if he would devote some of his energies toward eliminating false teachings from his own Church, before declaring so dogmatically that by reason of false teaching the one, Catholic and apostolic Church is not built upon "the Rock of Ages, even Christ?"

The Canon is only rash enough to mention two doctrines of the Catholic Church to which he objects—"the papal doctrine and saint worship."

In regard to what he calls "the papal

doctrine," Barrow's work against the Pope's Supremacy in the Church admits that some species of supremacy was undoubtedly accorded by Christ to St. Peter. This work is the favorite repository from which Anglicans draw their arguments against "the papal doctrine." Now, if Christ conferred upon St. Peter any supremacy at all, he certainly conferred a supremacy of jurisdiction, when he gave him the "keys of the kingdom of heaven," and when he constituted him "the Rock" on which He built His Church. (St. Matt. xvi, 18, 19.) He also constituted him the Supreme Pastor of His Church, and its chief doctrinal teacher, when He ordered him: "feed my lambs; feed my sheep." (St. John, xxi, 15, 17.) Such is exactly the Papal doctrine which the Catholic Church teaches, and it is the doctrine of all antiquity which never ceased to teach the supreme authority of the Pope, St. Peter's successor.

The Church of England, however, has also a "Papal doctrine," but with this difference, that it has no foundation either in Scripture or the teachings of the ancient Church. The Anglicans give to the king or queen the authority which belongs only to St. Peter and his successors. We need not go beyond the Book of Common Prayer to find a false doctrine on the subject of the Headship of the Church:

"Being by God's Ordinance . . . Supreme Governor of the Church within these our Dominions. . . . We have thought fit to make this Declaration following: that the Articles of the Church of England do contain the true Doctrine of the Church of England agreeable to God's word; which we do therefore ratify and confirm, requiring all our loving subjects to continue in the uniform profession thereof, and prohibiting the least difference from the said Articles." Such is the Decree of His Majesty.

Is there any further evidence needed of the blasphemy, absurdity and falsehood of this doctrine than the fact that the same royal authority has given its sanction to a widely different creed, which is declared to be ratified and approved for Scotland, and to be there the only true faith to which all His Majesty's subjects must conform? The Rev. Canon talks of a false papal doctrine in "the Church of Rome." If we are to look for a "false papal doctrine," we shall very easily find it in the pages of the Church of England's Book of Common Prayer. Moreover, that only doctrine which was to be held as true in Scotland was not acknowledged by the King, the Head of the Anglican Church, until the determined Scots wrung its recognition by the power of their brawny arms.

As regards the other doctrine to which Canon Carran objects, and which he calls "saint worship," he must know that Catholics do not worship Saints. We honor them as God's faithful friends and servants, as the Apostle St. Paul commands: "But glory and honor and peace to every one that worketh good." (Rom. ii, 10.) But here again we have only to appeal to the practice of the Canon's own Church. Did not the Bishop of Chichester declare the Blessed Virgin worthy of honor when he rebuked his rector who listened to Justin D. Fulton's coarse jokes without declaring any disapprobation of them? And did not the Bishop of Prince Edward Island approve of the advice given by another rector to one of his penitents to honor and invoke the same Virgin Mother of God? Perhaps Canon Carran disapproves of the course taken by these Bishops; but that only shows that the Church of England is without any positive doctrine. It shows that her clergy teach doctrines according to each one's fancy, and that the Church is but a "house divided against itself." There is every prospect that the prophecy made by Christ will soon be fulfilled in her regard: "Every house divided against itself shall not stand." (St. Matt. xii, 25.)

THE DUAL LANGUAGE QUESTION.

The Montreal Witness has certainly never been friendly either to the religion or the race of the people of Quebec, yet it will not take part in the fanatical effort to deprive them of the French language. It points out that the position of the people of Quebec is very different from that of the population of Alsace and Lorraine. The people of these Rhine Provinces were conquered by a monarchy which dared not give them the right of self government, but French Canada insisted on and obtained those rights in full from the British Government. It believes that, if the language question be left to solve itself, English would in time become the predominant language throughout the Dominion, but that this result will not be obtained by raising race animosities. While we do not agree with our Montreal contemporary in the statement that the Catholic Church threatens to destroy civil liberty in the Dominion, we gladly insert in our columns the following very sensible observations which it makes upon the right of the people of Quebec to retain the French language:

"The Province of Quebec is not, like Alsace and Lorraine, a recent addition

to Canada, but contains its original population—a population which has been able to assert and maintain its claims to certain privileges which now belong to it, not only by treaty and Act of Parliament, but, what is far more important, by historical usage. In this point no comparison can be made between the French in Canada and the Germans and other people mentioned by our correspondent. Promising that every Frenchman in Canada is a born British subject, and born to the fullest equality with Her Majesty's English subjects, and that he is under no disabilities of any sort resulting from the conquest as often appealed to; promising, also, that Canada, as a self-governing country, has an equal right to choose for herself in that language her public affairs shall be carried on as though she had been independent for half a century, let us English consider for ourselves how we should feel if we were the minority, not only in Canada, but in the Empire in which we were born. Would we or would we not acquiesce in efforts to secure the official replacement of our language by one in which our children would learn only the traditions of another people, and in whose literature even the religion of our fathers held a discredited place? The first law of Christianity is to do to others as we would in righteousness wish them to do to us. While, therefore, we, as a nation, as any, long for the day when all Canada shall be one people, speaking one language and that language the English, we cannot but sympathize with the desire of the French to obtain an equal standing for their own. Where it is really necessary for convenience sake to abolish either language, it is likely that, if race feelings were not excited, it would quietly take place, with the full consent of both peoples, as has been done, without raising any excitement, in many municipalities in Quebec. A public and general movement to awaken race feeling against one of the languages of the country is, we are afraid, not only morally but politically the worst way to bring about the end aimed at. It is from our point of view a great pity that the righteous indignation raised against an ecclesiastical assault on our civil liberty should less itself in a much less noble attack upon a language which, but for such efforts to kill it, must in process of time die a natural death."

A NO-POPERY LECTURER.

Mr. Jas. L. Hughes, the Inspector of Public Schools for the city of Toronto, recently delivered a lecture at Newtown-Robinson, entitled "The Jesuit Plot Against our Public Schools." But so far from his having established any such plot, he simply shows that he is himself engaged in a plot to destroy the Catholic Separate schools of the Province.

Catholics, whether Jesuits or laics, have nothing to say against the Public school system, as far as its use by Protestants is concerned. The Protestants do not wish for religious teaching in their schools, and we have no desire at all to force them to this respect. Mr. Hughes says: "The Jesuits have control at Rome, and are determined to destroy the life of our Public Schools."

Such a statement should not be made without some evidence of its truth, but he brings forward not a particle of proof to sustain his proposition. It is simply a palpable falsehood. The plotters are not the Jesuits; they are Messrs. Hughes and those who with him proclaim that the Separate schools ought to be abolished.

The following reasons are advanced by Mr. Hughes why Separate schools should be abolished. He says:

"1. They constitute a union between State and Church."

This is a false representation of the matter. The State is not asked by Catholics to impart religious instruction in the Separate schools. We ask only that we shall have full liberty to give our children such an education, and we claim that we have an inalienable right to do so. The Government aid to Catholic schools is not given on account of the religious teaching, but solely for the purpose of aiding them in giving secular instruction, so that there is no force in the objection that in supporting Separate schools there is a connection kept between Church and State. It would be an injustice to refuse the same aid to Separate schools which is given to the Public schools for purposes of secular education. It would be an undue interference with the parental right to unite religious with secular instruction.

Mr. Hughes' second objection is simply a falsehood. He says:

"The Separate schools teach treasonable doctrines." There is no foundation for such a statement, and it shows the badness of his cause when he is obliged to sustain it by making such reckless assertions.

He says, thirdly: "They are maintained by order of the Pope." Catholics undoubtedly respect the Pope's decrees in matters of morality; but if we educate our children in morality we are not to be deprived of our rights merely because the head of the Church tells us our duty in conscience.

Mr. Hughes says, fourthly: "They are maintained for the hierarchy, not for the people." The Catholic people of Ontario have repeatedly declared their adhesion to Separate schools. It is a deliberate untruth to assert that they are at variance with the clergy on this point, and they are as ready as ever to maintain their rights as they have been in the past.

As a fifth objection to Separate schools, Mr. Hughes states that "Roman Catholic education has failed everywhere." This is another falsehood. Even in Ontario, notwithstanding that the school laws favor the Public schools, the Catholic schools have frequently proved their efficiency

when Separate school pupils have met the Public school pupils in competition; and recently, in New York city, at the public competition for West Point cadets, the Public school pupils were completely routed. Not only did the Catholic boys from the parochial schools gain all the prizes, but they had the fifth, sixth, seventh, eighth and ninth places, as well as the positions which secured the prizes. It is, we presume, owing to the fact that the Christian Brothers who teach the New York parochial schools are more devoted to their work than are the lay teachers of the Public schools that their great success was achieved. At all events it demonstrates that the boasts we have heard reiterated so frequently that the Public schools are necessarily more efficient than Catholic schools are but empty vapors.

Mr. Hughes makes a sixth complaint against Separate schools—that "they enslave the human mind." This is quite on a par with his other assertions. Religious teaching inculcates obedience to the law of God, but we should bear in mind that true liberty is subservient to God's law. St. Paul says: "The truth shall make you free." The freedom which is based upon the truth of religion, and on submission to the law of God, is the only freedom which is worth enjoying.

Mr. Hughes finished his lecture by repeating a cock-and-a-bull story about a Catholic taxpayer near Toronto who refused to pay his taxes until the Hon. G. W. Ross gave orders that the tax should be paid to the Separate school. Possibly this may have been the case; but we may be sure that Mr. Ross would not have given this order if he had not been satisfied that the tax was legally imposed, and was rightfully due; and if so, why should it not be paid?

Mr. Hughes is paid by the Toronto School Board to inspect the Public schools of the city, and he will do well to attend to his own business. It is not part of his duty to go around the country abusing Catholics and trying to excite dissension. We think that the School Board of Toronto would act wisely if they would insist on his paying more attention to his own duties, instead of allowing him to interfere so officiously with matters which do not concern him or them.

A FANATIC ON FEMALE FRANCHISE.

Ex Bishop Carman, who has gained so much notoriety for the noisiness of his fanaticism, has been uttering another of his frothy delirances in the "Jubilee Methodist Church," Toronto. His subject was: "Worth and Work of Women." In the course of his lecture he said:

"He would stand up for the right of women to vote but for one consideration, and that is there are so many people who are under the power of anti Christ in this country. If women had votes there would be a large herding and driving to the polls in flocks and crowds by the power that has handled so many voters on the other side."

Aye! there's the rub. If the franchise be extended to women, Catholic women will have votes as well as Protestants, and they will be just as likely to record them, so this blatant champion of "Equal Rights" will not join the Women's Rights crusade! He would do so if only Catholic women could be kept from the polls. This is just the spirit of nearly all, if not all, the Equal Rights: Rights for Protestants, wrongs for Catholics.

His reference to herding and driving the women to the polls in flocks and crowds is to what recently occurred in Boston, but he is evidently ignorant of the facts. It was the parsons, not the priests, who brought the herds and flocks to the polls. It is still a matter of futurity for the Catholic women to go to the polls to undo the injustice which has been done to the Catholic population of that city. But we have no doubt that the Catholics of Boston will take the proper steps to turn the tables before long.

Appropos to this subject it may be well to remark that, notwithstanding the successful effort of the Boston bigots to drive Catholics from the School Board of the city, they have not been successful in restoring the lying Swinton's history as the school text-book.

It will be remembered that it was the teaching of Swinton's Outlines in the school which raised the whole commotion. It states that an Indulgence in the Catholic Church is a license to commit sin on payment of a certain sum of money to the Church or priest. The bigots were crazed when the School Board resolved to prohibit the history as a text-book, and in order to have it restored preached their artifice, which resulted in the registration of twenty thousand women, chiefly Protestants, as voters, and a thoroughly Protestant School Board was elected. The new Committee on School Books report that:

"In their opinion there is no text-book in modern and medieval history written which would satisfy the just demands of all parties interested in that particular branch of study, and recommend an order to drop all text books in modern and medieval history."

Thus it appears that after all the fuss even Protestant Boston has no confidence in the fanatics. It is probable, too, that the consciousness that Catholics have the

remedy in their own hands has something to do with their decision.

Ex-Bishop Carman might do well to profit by the lesson which might be learned from the whole transaction. His fanaticism will not increase the respect of his own friends for him.

A LESSON FROM VATERLAND.

The result of the German elections is very likely to bring much good to the cause of religion throughout the German Empire. In fact a change of policy towards the Catholic Church has already been manifested, both in the permission extended to the religious orders to establish missions in the African and other colonies, and in the appointment of a Bishop as one of the delegates to the Labor Congress. The last act was done for the express purpose of conciliating Pope Leo XIII, and when the appointment was made, the Emperor took care to inform the Holy Father that this was done in order to recognize the influence which the Catholic Church can exercise in the settlement of the great social questions of the day.

The Emperor likewise expressed the hope that his Holiness would co-operate with the Government in settling these questions in such a way as to do the greatest possible good to the population of the Empire. In this the Holy Father answered most graciously and promised his co-operation.

Among the religious orders which are allowed to do missionary work in the colonies, even the Jesuits are included, though on account of their very great devotedness to the cause of religion, the Falk laws, known as the Kultur Kampf, were specially directed against them, and the laws against them are still rigidly enforced in the Imperial domain. An example of the working of these laws recently occurred in Posen, where two Jesuit Fathers were engaged in preaching a mission to the people, but were taken from their work by the police and sent over the frontier. The new developments indicate that an end may soon be put to such harsh administration of laws, which have been to a great extent already repealed.

The main objects of the Catholic party in the Reichstag, or German Parliament, are to secure full freedom of Catholic education and the liberty of the Church; and though the recent elections have completely changed the relative numbers of the various parties into which the Reichstag is divided, the Catholic party, instead of losing several seats, as was at first reported, has made a positive gain of eleven. In 1887, though more votes were polled in favor of the party than this year, the Catholic party only secured 101 seats, whereas they hold now 112. To these may be added the 16 Poles and 11 Alsations, who almost invariably vote with the Catholic party proper, and thus we find a compact body of 139 members who follow the leadership of Herr Windthorst.

The combination by which the Government has hitherto been supported, and which heretofore relentlessly persecuted the Church has been completely broken up. It comprised the Conservatives, National Liberals, and Imperialists. These hold now respectively 72, 44, and 21 seats, a total of 137, to which number they have dwindled from 214, which they held since 1887. These constituted what was called the Cartel group, and as the total number of seats in the Reichstag is 397, the Cartels, from being a fair majority, are reduced to a hopeless minority.

The Catholic party, though always opposed to the Cartel combination on the question of Government interference with the liberty of the Church, otherwise sustained the general policy of the Government. They were determined, however, if possible, to break up the hostile combination, and the result is apparent in the return of a strengthened opposition, which consisted formerly of only 55 members, but which now numbers 127. It is evident that if the Government wish to have a working majority, they must appeal to the Catholic group; as the Socialists and Radicals who constitute the opposition may be regarded as irreconcilable.

The support of the Catholic party in the House cannot be expected and will not be obtained unless the Government manifests a much greater spirit of toleration than they have yet shown, and it may reasonably be expected that this is what they will do.

The proportion of Catholics in the Empire is 36 2-3 per cent., the Catholic population being 16,000,000, and the non-Catholic 28,000,000. The majority have succeeded in carrying out their policy of persecution for nearly eleven years, but they seem to have reached the extreme length of their tether, and a new era for the Church must now begin.

A useful lesson may be learned by the Catholics of Canada from these events, in view of the anti Catholic crusade which is being carried on by a fanatical contingent here. The Catholics of Canada are more numerous in proportion to the non-Catholic population

than are the Catholics of Germany by 10 per cent. This gives us here an advantage of 20 per cent. over our German co-religionists. Yet by firmness and conciliation the policy of persecution has partially succeeded in Germany for only a decade. Must we not also be firm in our adherence to principle? And may we not be confident that even though fanaticism should succeed for a while, right and justice will ultimately prevail? The example of our co-religionists in Germany should be an encouragement to us here not to flinch in the contest upon which we have been forced to enter. If persecution has succeeded in Germany only for a decade, we may even hope that its back-bone will be broken in Canada almost before it has the opportunity to exist.

It is a curious fact that the Catholics have almost exactly, in the Reichstag, a representation equal to the proportion which they bear to the population. They have 35 per cent. of the members, with 36 2-3 per cent. of the population. In Canada our representation in Parliament is far below that which our numbers would justify; but even this fact enables us to secure many Protestant members, especially in Quebec, but many in Ontario also, who will never consent to the persecuting measures on which the fanatics have set their hearts.

It is further worthy of remark that the Socialists in Vaterland polled 1,341,587 votes and secured 37 seats, as against 11 seats which they held in the previous Reichstag. It is from the Socialistic element that the Government have most to fear, but it is confidently stated that not more than ten or twelve per cent. of those who voted for the Socialistic candidates were real Socialists, so that this party has not the strength in the country which their success at the polls would seem to indicate. The support which these candidates received was therefore simply an indication of the general dissatisfaction caused by the policy of the Government. Should they adopt a more tolerant policy, it may reasonably be expected that their hands will be strengthened greatly when a new appeal will be made to the people.

BALFOUR'S LAND PURCHASE BILL.

Ten years ago Mr. Parnell enunciated at public meetings in Ireland and in the United States the advisability, in fact the necessity, of buying out the rich landlords of Ireland and distributing the holdings to tenants or granting a fee simple deed of their farms to the present occupiers. For daring to proclaim such a new and startling policy Mr. Parnell was publicly denounced as a Revolutionist and Socialist. It was represented, even in Rome, that the Irish people were being imposed on by a scheming anarchist without faith or principle, who was plotting the despoilment of property owners and the spiritual enslavement of the Irish people to condemned principles.

It was in vain that Mr. Parnell in his public speeches instanced France, Prussia and even Russia in proof of the soundness of his doctrine, that the first law of a nation, as of an individual, is self-preservation. It is quite true that ownership to property justly acquired is a sacred right, and must not be interfered with, and that every law both civil and canonical guarantees protection to the rightful owner. But protection may be granted in the way of compensation for necessary losses incurred by the proprietor for the public good. Thus a railroad company, before undertaking construction of a new line of railway, must first obtain from the Government or ruling powers authority to enter upon the estate of any private citizen, and, by offering a fair compensation, compel the surrender of such land as is required for the proper construction of the contemplated road. The railway is looked upon as necessary to the general good of the nation, and private ownership is made to yield to the requirements of trade and commerce, which benefit the whole country. The British Government could well understand reasoning of this kind when the prosperity of England and the advantage of railroad companies were concerned, but how could such principles be right when applied to the condition of Ireland? Was are the people of Ireland compared with our own great English aristocracy, who own one-half of Ireland? Must our great lords and dukes, who manage extensive estates in Ireland through the tyranny of agents, bailiffs and emergency men—must those titled land owners be compelled to give up their lands to prevent periodical starvation, and save the lives of millions? A thousand times no. Perish the thought, Davitt, Parnell and Biggar, who say that private ownership, with fair and proper compensation, should be compelled to yield to the public good, are revolutionists when they maintain that landlords who reside in England should give up their deer parks and extensive grazing pastures in Ireland to feed and enrich its inhabitants and save thousands from idleness and starvation, they are socialists, and must be de-

nounced to infidelity by a change Lord Salt Both the other E men, hav and ten years right. The ten years national n been prev principles the Irish utes inflic masses of and heart laws, the people, t unselfish the heartl God's poe or sheltt barrow me have venge and civil: grace had ten years and all them in it is to be Purchase styled, w this day, tion is in and Balfo to encour English n perpetrati such mo We opinu Balfour h have wait and forma as conten Bill. To from th not to years ago that peas necessary of Irelan contend they don that no se by Englis made acc Home R ment of Gladston Rule B lated and erment last gene Purchase small ma will rem details ar and its c removed ment of sitting in lege Gre DALTON A The Fr amused of thy's spe gnage, v Mons. T of the Fr the title of or incor in Quebec "I anglican thy unde the lib are "the E Whereas speak F claims." "Deputy role occ St. J word L gata," o sub min Paris h "the Ho M. P. P to the whers s Minlate Mr. warns agalst French their o themse speak r wher m neither says av we ha McCa "Avoild enemy his frt all cit enemy Mr. and no —a pl the al House Ladies James will