

The Catholic Record. Published weekly at 494 and 496 Richmond Street, London, Ontario.

REV. GEORGE R. NORTHGRAVES, Author of "Mistakes of Modern Infidels." THOMAS COFFEY, Publisher and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY, MESSRS. LURE KING, JOHN NIGH, P. J. NEVIN and WM. A. NEVIN, are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transact all other business for the CATHOLIC RECORD.

London, Saturday, June 13, 1896.

DIVERS SCHOOL MATTERS.

"J.O.," Peterborough, desires to know through the columns of the CATHOLIC RECORD: (1) How many Protestant Separate schools are in Ontario, and where are they? (2) Are there any High Catholic Separate schools in the Province, and if not, why?

In connection with this second query he also asks whether the law would recognize a High School if established by Catholics, and would Catholic rate-payers be exempt from taxation for the Public High school in such a case?

(3) Is it true that near Montreal Protestants were obliged to pay taxes to Catholic schools, because the Catholics "caused a parish to be split in such a manner as to bring them against their will into a Catholic school district, the notices whereby the change was effected having been posted on the Catholic church gates, where Protestants would not see them, on which account they knew nothing of the proposed change until it was effected, and therefore they could not take any steps to prevent it?"

1. There are ten Protestant Separate schools in the Province, viz., in Anderton, Bromley, Cambridge, Marlboro, Osgoode, Puslinch, Rama, L'Original, and Penetanguishene. It has been stated in the papers that another is to be or has been established in Essex county, but it has not been mentioned yet in the educational reports.

2. There is no provision in the law recognizing Catholic High schools, and there is, therefore, no exemption from taxation for Public High schools. There is in several of the cities an effort made to have a department in connection with the Separate schools in which the High school standard of education is attempted to be reached, but there is no Government grant in such a case, except such as is given to Separate schools when these High Schools are conducted under the Separate school law. There are also Catholic colleges and academies without any Government aid.

3. The third question is put by our correspondent by occasion of a statement made to him by a Protestant friend, who, we presume, intended to give the impression that Protestants are harshly dealt with by the Catholics of Quebec. For some time past the Montreal Witness has been making much capital out of this subject, and the Presbytery of Montreal and Ottawa have made serious complaint concerning it as a terrible grievance. It deserves, therefore, to be treated somewhat fully.

At St. Gregoire Thaumaturge, near Montreal, a new school district was formed in the usual manner, as the law directs. Notices were put up in public places, as the law requires, and it is said that one of the notices was placed on the gate of the Catholic church, which is certainly a public place, yet Protestants had no need of going into the church in order to see it. But as three notices are required, there must have been two at least put up in other public places where Protestants could read them, if it was against their consciences to read the one on the church gate.

The new school district was established by Catholics in the same sense in which we may say that nearly every school district in Ontario has been established by Protestants. It could not be otherwise where almost the whole population belongs to one religious creed, as is the case in St. Gregoire, nearly all the people being Catholics. Surely our Protestant friends could scarcely expect that the very small minority should have the full control of such a matter.

It appears that by the forming of the new school district, some Protestants were cut off from the school district to which they formerly belonged, and in which there was a Protestant school to which they sent their children. The same thing might occur in Ontario, and we have no doubt that it has occurred in some cases, by the cutting off

of Catholic ratepayers from a Catholic school, thus putting them into the position of non-residents, and depriving them of the rights of residents in regard to the Catholic schools.

But the Protestants to whom we refer had the remedy for all this provided by the Quebec school law in a manner in which the Ontario school laws make no such provision in favor of Catholics. Not only may Protestants in Quebec send their children to the Protestant school in another school district, but the 22nd and 23d sections of the Education Act empower Protestants to establish a section of their own, and to form its limits independently of the Public school commissioners.

We must say we cannot see how they were very seriously aggrieved in being taxed for Public school purposes, whereas it is admitted that they did not take the necessary steps required by law that they might constitute themselves Separate or Dissident school supporters. Certainly in Ontario if Catholics in any locality were to neglect taking the steps necessary to make themselves Separate school supporters they would be taxed for the Public schools. We have known hundreds of instances of this, and we know, too, that three general elections were held in the Province of Ontario at which it was the main purpose of the Ontario Conservatives under the leadership of Mr. Meredith to make it as difficult as possible for Catholics to be Separate School supporters.

There has never been such an issue at the polls in the Province of Quebec, and it was testified recently by the Hon. Mr. Morris, the representative in the Government of the Quebec Protestant minority, that he always found his colleagues ready to remedy any just demand of that minority. The Hon. Mr. Joly, who was also the representative of the Protestant minority when a Reform Government was in power, has also frequently given similar testimony; but it can scarcely be called a grievance if either through contempt or gross ignorance of the law the Protestants of St. Gregoire endured the consequences of the course they thought proper to pursue.

We must now add that the Quebec Government has dealt most liberally with the Protestants in this case, by administering the law in their favor by a liberal interpretation, by remitting their Public school tax; and there is no Catholic Orange Grand Lodge to pass resolutions to threaten the Government with annihilation unless it treat the Protestants harshly, as the Orange Grand Lodge of Canada did only a few days ago at Collingwood in regard to the Catholic minority in Manitoba.

ARCHBISHOP MACHRAY AND THE MANITOBA SCHOOLS.

Dr. Machray, the Anglican Archbishop of Rupert's Land, and Primate of Canada, was interviewed in Montreal a few days ago on the school question of Manitoba.

The Montreal correspondent of the Toronto Mail and Empire gives his opinion on the subject. The Archbishop admits that there is religious teaching in the Public schools of the province, but of the most meagre kind, consisting of the opening of the schools with prayer and the reading of some verses of scripture without comment. His Lordship appears not to be aware of the fact that the Greenway laws prescribe that there shall be comment on the ethics of scripture, and this comment will necessarily be of a distinctively Protestant character. But he is of opinion that the amount of religious instruction should be increased and not diminished, for he says:

"Certainly we of the Church of England would never agree to any attempted settlement of this school question by means of the secularization of the schools themselves, for even although we have so little time given to religious exercises at present, still God is able to make even that a great blessing if He so wills."

The Archbishop says also: "I am strongly in favor of Separate schools, but in theory only, for I am afraid that our scattered population would make such a school system altogether impracticable. What we do need, however, is some definite religious teaching of a non-sectarian nature in our schools."

It is very evident that there can be no definite religious teaching without being distinctively denominational, and therefore Dr. Machray's ideal cannot be thought of as a solution of the trouble; but as he is in favor of Separate schools, theoretically at least, there ought to be no opposition from the Church of England against the demands of Catholics, who are ready to put the theory into practical operation. It appears, therefore, that the Mani-

toba question is not solely a question affecting Catholics, but Protestants themselves are in favor of exactly the solution which Catholics demand, only many of them wish to deprive Catholics of the right to solve the matter in the way they would wish to solve it for themselves, if they could manage to support a Protestant system of Separate schools to their own liking.

The Archbishop declares that in his opinion "The friends of remedial legislation feel satisfied that whichever party succeeds to power, there will be some moderation of the Public school laws."

Certainly such is our conviction. We do not imagine for a moment that the resolutions of the Grand Orange Lodge at Collingwood, or of the Grand Lodge of True Blues at Cobourg will dictate the kind of education with which all the people of Canada must be content. It is a loss of time and energy for the lodges to pass such resolutions, backed up with firebrand oratory.

CHRISTIAN REUNION.

Amid the troubles to which Armenia has been subjected by the oppression of the Turk, it might reasonably be supposed that the people of that suffering country would not have the time to consider maturely the question of religious unity, yet the London Universe asserts that a union has been effected between the Catholic and the Armenian National Churches.

The Armenian National Church is usually called the Gregorian Church, from an Archbishop Gregory who preached the faith and established schools in Armenia in the fifth century. It was about this period that the Euty-chian heresy arose, which denied the Divinity of our Lord, and maintained His solely human nature. In this the Euty-chians somewhat resembled the Unitarians of the present day, though they did not go so far as to reject the other doctrines held by all Christians, and they retained the forms of worship which were used in the Catholic Church.

The heresy of Euty-ches was not embraced by the Armenians, but they incorporated into their professions of belief the Euty-chian phraseology and maintained that in Christ there is only one nature. The Armenian or Gregorian Church was therefore regarded as heretical by the generality of Greeks as well as by Catholics, but their retention of the Catholic faith on nearly all other points made the separation between them and the Catholic Church much narrower than that between Catholics and modern Protestants. The Gregorian Church believes in Transubstantiation and seven sacraments, and offers prayers to the saints asking their intercession, and prays for the dead. The Sacrifice of the Mass is offered by them, and they have retained a real priesthood and episcopate by regular succession and ordination, notwithstanding their schism. In fact their separation from Catholicism has been more a matter of sentiment and politics than of doctrine, as far as the people generally understood the matter.

The Armenians celebrate Mass in the old Armenian language, and there have been two occasions when they returned to the Catholic faith, though they soon relapsed therefrom owing to political complications. There has always been, however, a Catholic as well as a Schismatical Church in Armenia and throughout Turkey and Persia where the Gregorian Armenians are found.

There are about three million Gregorian Armenians in Turkey and Persia, and we may hope that the union announced by the Universe is a reality, and that it will be more permanent than were those which took place in former times.

The Holy Father, Pope Leo XIII., has made great efforts toward a reunion of the Oriental Churches with the Catholic Church, the differences in faith being very slight, and not being any very great obstacle to such reunion, because the points of difference are not such as are generally understood. This fact makes the possibility of general union come the more within the range of probability, and in fact, not only in Armenia, but in Egypt, Persia, Bulgaria, and even Russia, the movement for a reunion of the Eastern and Western Churches is gaining in strength the more the matter is considered, and it is even probable that before long the world will be startled by the magnitude of the reunion which may soon take place, even though Anglicans should hold themselves aloof from the offers which the Holy Father has made to them especially.

A reunion such as this has none of the absurd features of such corporate

reunions as have been proposed so frequently within the last few years to take place between the different Protestant bodies, whereby all or nearly all differences of doctrine were to be compromised by ignoring them. A reunion with the Catholic Church implies an acceptance of her doctrine in full—but with the Oriental Churches not a great deal is given up by accepting a reunion on such terms, as they have preserved nearly all the Catholic doctrines which existed when their schisms were effected. Concessions, however, will be made to the repentant prodigals in matters of discipline which regard local autonomy, and even their ancient liturgies will be allowed, so far as they have not been corrupted for the maintenance of erroneous doctrines.

A BIGOTED AGITATION.

Mr. Sellar, proprietor and editor of the Huntingdon (Que.), Gleaner, has a characteristic letter in the Globe of Saturday in reference to the Protestant schools of Quebec. Mr. Sellar has for years been engaged in croaking against the Catholics of Quebec as being intolerant and desirous of crushing the Protestant minority, a matter which the public well know to be an untruth. He gives a piece of pretended history of the effort made by Sir George Cartier to grant additional guarantees to the Quebec Protestants before the passing of the Confederation Act, so that the Protestants of that Province might be even more secure than they now are in their educational privileges, and he states that Sir George Cartier's proposed bill was defeated by the machinations of the Catholic hierarchy, who, at a meeting at St. John's, determined it should not be passed. Mr. Sellar has a microscopic eye for machinations of the hierarchy. The bill in question failed, not because of machinations of the hierarchy, but because representative Catholics of Ontario insisted that Ontario Catholics should have similar legislation in their favor, if the bill were to be passed, on the principle of equal rights. The bill failed because Ontario Protestants, with Mr. George Brown in front, would not listen to such a proposition. But it must be borne in mind that as soon as Confederation was accomplished, one of the first acts passed by the Catholic Legislature of Quebec was to place the Protestants of the province in a better position than ever in regard to their schools, and the people of Quebec made no difficulty in the matter, offering no opposition. It was not until many years later that Sir Oliver Mowat introduced into the Ontario Legislature measures to amend the Ontario Separate School Acts, and to make them more just. Since that time there have been thirteen or fourteen years of turmoil owing to the efforts of the Opposition, under Mr. Meredith's leadership, to destroy these amendments, but in Quebec the whole energies of successive governments have been directed towards making the Protestant Separate School Acts satisfactory. Mr. Sellar is one of that class of persons who believe that equal rights means Protestant ascendancy.

BROAD CHRISTIANITY.

The question of the baptism of polygamists in heathen and Mahometan lands is being vigorously discussed by Presbyterian journals. Not long ago it was agitated among the Methodists, and practically if not authoritatively settled, inasmuch as though there was no decision of the General Conference on the subject, the missionaries were allowed to follow what practice they thought best under the circumstances in which they found themselves, and there is now no difficulty made about receiving a polygamist into the Church while retaining his plurality of wives. Some of the Presbyterian organs are opposed to such an anomaly, but the majority appear to be in favor of it, and as laxity in moral principles is sure to spread in the present broadening of views among Protestant sects generally, the time appears to be near at hand when there will be no difficulty whatsoever in recognizing polygamy as a regular institution in these denominations.

Anglicanism had the same difficulty over forty years ago, when Bishop Colenso of Natal in South Africa settled it, as far as his own diocese was concerned, by taking polygamists into full communion. This created a great sensation in the Anglican community, and the Bishop was severely censured for his course; but with the modern theory of independent National and Colonial Churches in full blast, it was found impossible to control the Bishop in his course, and he

continued to put his own ideas of Christian ethics into practical operation.

Many of our readers will remember that soon after the period we have indicated the same Bishop published books attacking the veracity and inspiration of Holy Scripture, and maintaining that the Scriptures are inspired only in the same sense in which the Hindoo sacred books and the Koran may be regarded as inspired, that is, that they contain many noble thoughts, mixed up with gross historical and moral absurdities.

At that time it was next to impossible to find any but avowed Rationalists to approve of Bishop Colenso's vagaries, which were admitted to be totally subversive of Christian faith and morals; but the times have changed, and now there are many Presbyterian organs in both the United States and Canada which favor the baptism of polygamists; the chief reason for which seems to be that if the greatest latitude be not allowed for the retention of their old customs by converts from heathendom, there will not be converts enough to make a good showing in the annual missionary reports, and the public will stop the supplies for missions which produce little or no fruit.

It may be said that this laxity is to be allowed only to those in foreign lands, and that it will not be granted to Christians at home; but if Christian morality permits polygamy to foreign Christians, on what principle can it be prohibited to those of England and America? And why should not the Mormons be recognized as a branch of Protestant Christianity, even while adhering to polygamy?

There is little doubt that once the practice is regarded as permissible to converts from heathenism and Mahometanism, the members of the Churches which allow it in such cases will soon claim the same rights and liberties in this country. What is there now to prevent Buddhists and Moslems from being recognized as exemplary Christians? What need is there of sending missionaries to them at all?

WHENCE THE JURISDICTION?

What is the real Protestant theory in regard to ecclesiastical jurisdiction in foreign countries? If we regard the action of the various Protestant bodies, the answer to this query must remain a puzzle of the first order. We know that the Church of England has it as a fixed principle that a foreign prelate cannot have any jurisdiction, spiritual or temporal, within British dominions; and all the clergy, from Bishops to deacons, take oath that "no foreign prince, prelate or potentate hath or ought to have any such jurisdiction within this realm." Yet, notwithstanding this oath, the Church of England has kept up the force of having a Bishop of Jerusalem in Asia, where there are already no fewer than three patriarchs, one of the Oriental schismatical Church, and two of the Eastern and Western Catholic rites respectively.

There is certainly no authority for the pretence of appointing a Protestant Bishop of Jerusalem, and on the principle that no foreigner ought to have ecclesiastical jurisdiction in any country, such an appointment is an absurdity of the first order, unless it can be shown that scripture gives special prerogatives to England to rule the ecclesiastical world, which it would be difficult to do. Surely if England is to be specially protected against the ecclesiastical domination of foreigners, foreign countries ought to be equally protected against the ecclesiastical usurpations of England, and of the Archbishop of Canterbury.

But now the Methodist general conference, sitting at Cleveland, Ohio, has had before it the question of appointing Bishops for foreign lands. The conference has had some missionary Bishops, the principal one being Bishop Taylor, whose diocese comprised nearly all Africa. The question of appointing missionary Bishops of three continents was before the conference last week, and excited considerable commotion. The episcopacy committee reported in favor of three missionary Bishops for Asia, South America and Africa, but there was considerable opposition to so wide a claim to ecclesiastical jurisdiction, but the right to exercise such jurisdiction was practically affirmed, though not all the continents are to be thus provided for. It was decided for the present only to appoint a Bishop of Africa, leaving in abeyance the question of Asia and South America.

Dr. Leonard, one of the speakers, wished to induce the Conference to add a Bishop for the little diocese of Asia,

but he was over-ruled, and he said that the neglect to provide such an official was "the most stupendous mistake ever made by a general Conference."

We do not suppose that it is a very serious matter whether the Methodists appoint Bishops for all these places or not, for every one knows that the appointees have no real authority, as they are admittedly outside the Apostolic succession of Bishops, but it is interesting to know that the Conference of the United States has risen as a Church so high in its own estimation that it can now coolly claim to have jurisdiction over the whole world.

It is a matter for curious speculation to ascertain how the Methodists have acquired such jurisdiction, whereas the Anglican Church, from which Methodism springs, practically declares that the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the Bishops of one country can never extend to another. Surely the Methodists cannot have a more extensive jurisdiction than the Anglicans, from whom they are an offshoot.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

The following telegraphic correspondence has taken place within the last three days, and is published in all the journals of Cape Breton and Nova Scotia:

"To the Most Rev. James V. Cleary, Archbishop of Kingston: Is the Canadian Freeman your Grace's official organ? It is circulated here as such. Colin Chisholm, P. P."

"To the Rev. Colin Chisholm, P. P., Port Hood, Cape Breton: That miserable rag has never been my organ. I have always refused to recognize it as Catholic. It is now decidedly anti-Catholic, the extremely ignorant manager expecting a beggarly situation should Laurier win. James Vincent Cleary, Archbishop of Kingston."

The Toronto Globe takes a peculiar method of replying to our article calling attention to its inconsistency in censuring the hierarchy of Quebec for issuing a pastoral letter setting forth the duty of Catholics in the present political contest—while having no word of blame for the number of Protestant (lay and clerical) organizations which call upon their members to vote against Remedial legislation for the Catholics of Manitoba. Our contemporary states that these delinquents stand upon an entirely different footing, because Catholics are expected to obey the commands of their Bishops, while Protestants may do as they please, no matter what may be the resolutions passed by any particular Church or society to which they belong. So far as the Orange association is concerned the Globe overlooks the fact that the members of that body take an obligation to obey the commands of the Grand Lodge. But this, however, is not the point. If there is, as the Globe claims (but which we deny), on the part of the Catholic hierarchy of Quebec an intention to coerce their people to vote one way or another, is not the same purpose quite evident in the resolutions passed in the different Protestant bodies to which we refer? The question of obedience in either the one case or the other does not weaken the force of our argument.

IN THE present political contest the Globe has taken a strange course. During the past twelve years it has fought nobly for the maintenance of Catholic educational rights in Ontario. Why, then, does it now turn its back upon the Catholics in Manitoba, who are battling for precisely the same rights? If the Conservative party were successful in the Ontario local elections,—if they imposed disabilities on Catholics in regard to the education of their children—if the Catholics applied to the Dominion Government for redress,—if that body declared the Catholics had a grievance, and if it passed a Remedial Bill giving Catholics the rights of which they had been unjustly deprived, would our contemporary call it coercion and an unjust interference with provincial rights?

BUT while the Globe is deserving of censure for its course, what should we say of the Conservative press of Ontario? True, the editors of the newspapers of that party do not condemn the Remedial Bill introduced by Sir Charles Tupper, but, with very few exceptions, they have not the courage to say a word in its favor. They have studiously given it the cold shoulder from the beginning.

The clerical firebrands are abroad once more. Rev. W. McDonough, who some time since, when in Strathroy, sent a number of the "Letters of Junius" to the press and signed his own name to them, assumed the furious role at the Methodist Conference recently held in Stratford, and declared there should be no Separate schools in Manitoba. Separate schools there will be, nevertheless, and that at

no distant protesting Mr. McDonough.

We published a school desecration. John S. E. man. He Wade, who months, had this matter of Mr. Gre being tinged his purposes a prejudiced testant pub low-citizen reply have Wade. T pen of the piece of s those who will not sa

"KIT," ment "of pire of last of John Bo a magnific velled in I

"You ask heard of Joh of a Boston a hero, a man who knew I courage, his of honor, personal be ness. He w mopa, but a his hair, a He was a L boy? They him to deat commuted I and sent him the assistan bless her!— An Americ stars and st ed him in man, and A great lig man closed "There w his—

"I trace ar Hindu a Large as m by. Large in "What a All his wor

The C are deter to the A. publican It is state have been to Mr. Q past week Catholic country a swer to th your elec you, in th make an man Cath ious beli suggesti it will c perhaps elections matter d the cler from lay ated with Louis, a organiz have a Republic take pla election ber.

The tended ing up striction shown b the Min Charitie pretext not to munity of crim ulation native fewer t born, 1,744 million childre counted ber of l as the very s prison popula found greatl native voters, foreig of fore would South propo large.

Rev. Christ the ap outsp There Mr. C