

The Catholic Record.

"Christianus mihi nomen est Catholicus vero Cognomen."—(Christian is my Name, but Catholic my Surname).—St. Paclan, 4th Century.

VOLUME XXVII.

LONDON, ONTARIO, SATURDAY, APRIL 22, 1905

1383

The Catholic Record.

LONDON, SATURDAY, APR. 22, 1905.

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION.

Mr. J. S. Willison is a journalist of repute. He is, so his friends assure us, adverse to the methods of reckless assertion and of personalities, and has spoken in no uncertain tones of the responsibility of the man who reflects and moulds public opinion. So the gentleman stands for fair play, and frank discussion of every question pertaining to the common weal, on its own merits. We do not, however, think that his admirers will recognize in the editor who is now battling against the rights of the minority the gentleman of lofty ideals, who is opposed to anything worthy of a lover of truth and justice. We do not question his sincerity for a moment. Nor do we wish to express our astonishment at a journalist of undoubted ability demeaning himself like the small bigots who infest Toronto. We make no comment on his fighting under the banners of Colonel Sam Hughes and Dr. Sprule, save that it is a rather curious occupation for a gentleman of academic tastes and sensitive conscience. We hope merely, when he has time to think, that he may begin to understand that educational theories, even when manufactured by the Toronto News, are not necessarily to be accepted by all Canadians, and that Mr. Willison takes himself altogether too seriously as a political mentor when he undertakes to dictate to us as to how our children must be educated.

During the debate on the Education Act, 1902, in the British Parliament, Sir Wm. Anson, Conservative member for Oxford University, said: "But I do feel that religious teaching is a matter of the gravest importance to the country not only because of its effect on character, but on the ground of justice to the parents. It appears to me that if the State takes a child from the parent during its best waking hours, and takes over education to be administered by itself, the parent may justly demand that during some portion of that time the child should receive the religious teaching which the parent desires in order to bring him up in the religious faith of the parent. I understand the scheme of the Bill is that every child will get the religious teaching the parent desires, if there are enough parents to justify the building of a school."

MR. WILLISON'S THREAT.

Said Mr. Willison recently: "What has to be done is to remember the supporters of the bills at the next election. Many no doubt will forget. I will not forget." From this we infer that the gentleman was in angry mood, and the judicial temper on which his friends set store was not in working order. It seems to us that he overestimates his power. He may have influence with those who believe that Catholics are either fools or serfs, to be jeered at by the bigots, and to be bullied and coerced by the Orangemen, but we feel sure that the constituents of the gentlemen who support Sir Wilfrid Laurier will not be frightened at the threat of Mr. Willison. It is idle to tell us that we must walk in the path traced out by him. That path may suit him and his friends; it does not suit us. It is a loss of time to assure us that a system of national schools is the one best suited to this country. An education, says Dr. Schaff, which ignores religion altogether, would raise a heartless and infidel generation of intellectual animals and would prove a curse rather than a blessing. And what befits the citizens of any country is consideration for the rights of others—a respect for the consciences of those who believe that a man need not be a traitor to his God to be a good citizen. Mr. Willison and his friends stand upon a platform of their own making. Sir Wilfrid Laurier may say in the words of another great statesman: "I mean to stand upon the constitution. I need no other platform. I mean to do this with absolute disregard of personal consequences. No man can suffer too much, and no man can fall too soon, if he suffers or if he falls in defence of the constitution of his country."

WHO ARE RESPONSIBLE?

Our friends the editors tell us that "sectarian" agitation has not been fomented by Protestant ministers or religious associations. Of course not. Their protests against the school clauses have been couched in dignified language, and the editors have discussed them in such a manner as to wound no susceptibilities. They have not raved about clerical influence and an aggressive and intolerant hierarchy attacking

the personal and social liberty of Canadians. They have not called upon Protestants to face us to swallow the equal rights dose compounded by a certain class of politicians and by not a few preachers. No word have they said about chaining the Provinces to a system of "sectarian" education and handicapping the future of their youth. So the Catholic is also responsible for any unpleasantness. He objects, indeed, to robbery; but it seems that he ought to divest himself of his constitutional clothing and hand it smilingly to the gentlemen who are mindful of our welfare. And the discomfort therefrom would be more than compensated by the peace that would brood over the sanctuaries of religious weeklies.

SUNDAY SCHOOLS INSUFFICIENT.

We do not believe that the editors of the non-Catholic weeklies have any authority to speak for the majority of Protestant ministers of this country. For we have reason to know they are heartily ashamed of the mass of bigotry that is being carried into Protestant homes at the present time. These editors speak for themselves and the persons, who, whenever and wherever there is any question pertaining to Catholics, part company with reason, and, to quote Carlyle, live as persons immersed in the filth of a cess-pool eagerly endeavoring to add to its foulness by their personal contributions. And the wonder is that this unlovely sight should be possible in a free country. There is absolutely no excuse for it. No right of any Protestant is imperilled by the proposed legislation. No Protestant conscience is outraged by it. He has the schools which accord with his conscientious convictions. He has the right to see that his children shall be instructed in his own belief. The opinion that religious instruction may be safely left to the Sunday school is entirely irrelevant to the matter. Still we may say here that this opinion is not maintained by all Protestants. The Biblical World, a non-Catholic publication, said in October, 1902, that the primary mission of teaching religion and morality is not being adequately performed through the Sunday-school and the home. It has been so assumed, but each passing year shows more clearly that this is not the case. Further, there is growing judgment of Christian people that adequate instruction and morality cannot be given in the Sunday school and home alone.

TOLERATION AND JUSTICE vs. DISSENSION AND TYRANNY.

With every right safeguarded, with the separate schools under Government control, and the conscientious claims of both Protestant and Catholic allowed, sane preachers are in that state of unrest which is conducive to harangues against the Church. "By no manner of means," says Newman, "give her fair play: you dare not. The dazzling brightness of her glance, the sanctity beaming from her countenance, the melody of her voice, the grace of her movements, will be too much for you. Blacken her, make her Cinderella in the ashes; do not hear a word she says. Do not look on her but daub her in your own way: keep up the good old signpost representation of her. She shall be red or black; she shall be always absurd, always imbecile, always malicious, always tyrannical."

So cry aloud many of the present day scribes. It is terrible and intolerable, this school clause! And when we venture to ask the why of all this, we are treated to denunciatory orations that have seen service on countless platforms. But is it really terrible and intolerable to plead that we have a conscience; that we believe that the welfare of every Catholic child depends upon his being well grounded in his religion and in the morality based on religion, and that rights which are ours by every consideration of liberty and equity should not be filched from us? If our friends are so sure of their position why do we find members of Parliament who owe no allegiance to the Church, supporting the school clauses of the Autonomy Bill? Why do they not perceive that the legislation is a measure repugnant to the mass of the people and out of harmony with the spirit of the age? How is it that men like Hon. Mr. Fielding and Mr. Monk, who are a fair counterpoise to the fighting parsons, refuse to be browbeaten by the Ontario bigots, and prefer a policy of toleration and justice to that of dissension and tyranny? How is it, again, that members representing constituencies large

ly Protestant have declared themselves in favour of the Autonomy Bill? Are all these men pledged to Rome and working for the triumph of the "Romish" hierarchy as one editor who forgets that the name "Romish" is no longer applied to the Roman Catholic Church by any scholar or gentleman" puts it. These men, however, are not intimidated by senseless agitation and prejudice-stained protests, because they believe with every fair-minded Canadian that the policy of Sir Wilfrid Laurier is the one consistent with justice, and the only one calculated to protect us from fanatical aggression.

These ministers, then, who are trying to drive public men into their own particular enclosures should make up to a sense of their powerlessness. Here, to quote Newman again, they have been ringing the changes on their poor half-dozed notes all about the "Popish aggression," "insolent and insolent," "insidious and insolent," "insolent and atrocious," "subtle and unholly," "malignant," "mad," "frightful," "meretricious." And to no purpose. But they can still speak their piece to Dr. Sprule and Colonel Sam Hughes when he is not gunning for Catholics.

THE ULSTER OF CANADA.

According to the latest news, the people of Canada live in Ontario. They are tolerant and democratic and ready to enlighten the others who are allowed to exist in other parts of the country. The people of Canada are therefore surprised at the "sorry spectacle" of the ex-Cabinet minister falling into line with the Liberal leader. They grieve that the passing of the Autonomy Bill will be victory for the "Romish" hierarchy. Poor old hierarchy! They murmur plaintively that the school clauses do not carry with them the strong, healthy sentiment of the free electors of Canada. It seems to be a bad case of nervous prostration due to overwork. If this people of Canada must go to other climes in quest of health they may be able to get, on the strength of their fancy and imagination, employment as a Washington correspondent of a New York daily paper. But we fear that to Ontario may be applied the words of Earl Spencer, who, in speaking of religious toleration in Ireland, had the following to say: "I have had some experience in Ireland. I don't know of any specific instance where there has been religious intolerance on the part of the Roman Catholics against their Protestant fellow-countrymen. But religious intolerance has been shown, and where? It has been shown in Ulster, where more than half the population belong to the Protestant faith. I believe the Protestants have been the chief cause of keeping up the animosity."

Does Ontario court the honour of being the Ulster of Canada?

A QUESTION OF INITIATION.

Some years ago, in one of the British Colonies, a general census was organized. Among the items of information to be collected was the religious denomination of each inhabitant. One of the men appointed to collect statistics wrote to the Department having the matter in charge, and asked how he should deal with families of divided religion. The children of a mixed marriage, for instance, are not always of one religion. The Department replied that the enumerator should place each child in the category of the minister who baptized such child. Leaving aside the question whether this is a good rule in civil administration, we may ask the further question whether it is good theology. The idea which underlies it is that when a child is baptized such child is thereby made a member of the church in which the minister holds office. Is this the truth? The notion is common enough. Protestants, for instance, often speak of the "Church of our Baptism." Indeed, the tendency to make Baptism a badge of division, instead of a sign and seal of unity, seems to be inherent in what St. Paul calls the natural man. Writing to the Corinthians he thanks God that he has baptized very few of them himself, having left that part of his ministry to others. The reason he gives implies that some of the Corinthian Christians would have made such baptism an occasion of division by regarding it as an initiation into the Church of Paul instead of into the Church of Christ. As might be expected from this occurrence, St. Paul lays down principles which serve as a safe guide for all time. These principles are chiefly two. First, that there is but one Lord and one Faith, so there is but one Baptism (Ephesians iv. 4). Second, that "by one Spirit are we all baptized into one Body" (1 Cor. xii. 13). By "one Body," as he goes on to explain, he means the Church of Christ. The application of these principles is plain enough. There is but one Church of Christ. Baptism, whenever it is real Baptism, is always initiated into the true Church. There is but one Baptism. There is

not an Anglican Baptism and a Methodist Baptism and a Baptist Baptism, etc., any more than there is a Paul Baptism and an Apollo Baptism, as those Corinthians imagined. There is but one, the Christian Baptism. When it is not that, it is nothing but an outward form of ceremony, and without any initiative or other effect, as far as the Church is concerned. Some would, perhaps, infer from this that Baptism, as administered outside the Church, is not a valid sacrament. This is, in fact the inference which many Catholics drew, away back in the third century. Many, led away by heresy, had left the Church, formed themselves into separate bodies, and continued to baptize as before. Not a few Catholics then taught that such baptism was invalid, and that converts from those separated bodies should be baptized again. Pope St. Stephen I., who was elected in 253, condemned this teaching. St. Augustine explains the Catholic doctrine very clearly. The Church, he says, is a sheepfold. We are Christ's flock. As the shepherd knows his sheep by the mark upon them, so Christ knows the members of His Church by the baptismal mark. Now, the servant employed by the shepherd may be an unfaithful servant or even a robber; but the mark made by him is the shepherd's mark, and must be respected as such, because it is his. Similarly, the minister of Baptism may be unfaithful, may even be a heretic; but it is Christ's Baptism, and marks the baptized person as belonging to His flock. It is, in truth, Christ Himself that baptizes, using the ministry of men; and when it is done in the way He directed it to be done, it is He, by the Spirit He sent to dwell in His Church, that gives to Baptism its efficacy as a sacrament. As He used the touch of His hand, or even the touch of clay from the roadside, to give sight to the blind and hearing to the deaf, so now He uses Sacraments to cure sick souls, and, in the case of Baptism He willed that the inward effect would always go with the outward administration, who ever the minister might be. The administration may be unlawful, but it is valid whenever the simple conditions of valid administration are fulfilled. A child baptized by a Presbyterian or other minister may be as validly baptized as if His Holiness the Pope had administered the sacrament.

How this doctrine stands related to the question of initiation will be the subject of a second article. Meanwhile we may remark, by the way, for the benefit of those who need it, that the actual practice of the Church in administering conditional Baptism to converts is nowise inconsistent with the doctrine stated above. The Church acts in this matter in the same way with regard both to Protestant ministers and Catholic laymen. It happens to every parish priest to be told sometimes, when a child is brought to him for Baptism, that private Baptism has already been administered, because the child was in danger of death. Then the priest makes enquiries for the purpose of ascertaining whether the conditions of valid administration were fulfilled. If they were, he simply adds the prayers and blessing appointed by the Church, but does not baptize. If he has any doubt about it, he baptizes conditionally. What he does is well expressed in following words from the Anglican book of Common Prayer which also shows that conditional Baptism is well known to Protestants: "But if they which bring the Infant to the Church do make such uncertain answers to the Priest's questions as that it cannot appear that the child was baptized with water in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, (which are the essential parts of Baptism), then let the Priest baptize it in the form before appointed for Public Baptism of infants; saying that at the dipping of the child in the Font he shall use this form of words:—If thou art not already baptized, N, I baptize thee in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost."

The same rule applies to converts. It is simply a case of doubt as to whether they were ever properly baptized. A whole series of facts come to our knowledge regarding the careless way in which ministers sprinkled water over batches of many children at a time and the consequent doubt was inevitable. If, in a given case, the priest knows that the minister was careful about the administration of Baptism, the convert is admitted without conditional Baptism. In the case of ministers we have a general doubt, each case must be investigated. But the principle is the same in both cases. We think, however, that ministers are more careful now-a-days than they were formerly.—The Casket.

CITADEL OF SOCIALISM.

FATHER KRESS CARRIES THE BATTLE INTO THE ENEMY'S COUNTRY, MILWAUKEE, WHERE THERE ARE NINE SOCIALIST ALDERMEN. Rev. W. S. Kress, of the Cleveland Apostolate Band, has carried the battle against Socialism into the enemy's country, Milwaukee, where the Socialist party polled 19,000 votes in the last election, and where there are nine Socialist aldermen. Writing of his work in the columns of the Catholic Universe, Father Kress shows that in their encounters with him the comrades have employed the usual tactics. He says: "Most Rev. S. G. Messmer, Archbishop of Milwaukee, is making a valiant fight against Socialism in the State of Wisconsin. When he was transferred from Green Bay a short time ago he found

that a considerable number of Catholics had been drawn unwittingly into the Socialist movement in Milwaukee. He is trying to get these out of the party and to keep others from joining. In some respects Milwaukee has become the chief centre of Socialist agitation in America. The City Council has nine Socialist Aldermen and the two Socialist parties polled about 19,000 votes at the last election. The comrades fondly expect that the first representative in our national Congress will come from Milwaukee.

The Archbishop, Rev. Dr. Heiter, of Buffalo, and Father Sherman, the Jesuit, have spoken against Socialism on various occasions. The undersigned was also invited to take part in the campaign. A series of four lectures, with question box adjunct, were given in St. Joseph's and St. Patrick's churches. The congregations were large and consisted almost solidly of men. Toward the close of the first week the mercury kept falling until it reached 17 degrees below zero, but the Milwaukee Socialists began to get warm, grew hot and, and in the end, boiled over. Attacks were made upon the Catholic Church through the six daily papers. I exchanged compliments with every correspondent who knew enough to keep within the bounds of decency. As the Catholic Church was not on trial, I made the various writers discuss Socialism; but they employed the usual tactics, dodged, denied and lied. A former Congressional minister, Rev. Carl D. Thompson, now State organizer for the Social Democratic party in Wisconsin, challenged me to discuss socialism with him either on the platform or in the press. As the challenged party I chose the latter. An evening paper, the Journal, was kind enough to offer the requisite space. The controversy ran along for ten numbers, but it was impossible to hold Mr. Thompson to a straightforward discussion. As I have not heard from him for a week I fear our controversy, from which I expected greater results, has come to a premature end.

The same newspaper gave a verbatim report of every lecture. Other papers gave good exposure, while the German Herald gave a half page each day to lectures and questions.

The German and English Socialist weeklies make frenzied attacks upon the Church. Victor L. Berger, Czar of the Social phalanx, wound up an intemperate article with the threat: "If the capitalist Jesuits and the Jesuitic capitalists will persist in the way they have started, we shall have a repetition of the French Revolution on a thousand-fold greater scale and make it more thorough work next time." The Social-Democratic Herald grew indignant at the charge that many Socialist leaders advocate a lax family relation; yet the most prominent place in the same issue was given to a contribution criticizing my lectures, wherein the sentiment was expressed: "Love can and should be the only bond of marriage." This is to be the historic development, the same writer maintained, of the present family relation. The statement that Socialism is hostile to Christianity was also combated by the Herald though it is running Engels' "Socialism from Utopia to Science" in serial form to instruct its readers in Socialist philosophy—the philosophy that holds man to be a more brute animal, without a soul or future existence. The vicious attacks, the bald calumnies, the profound hatred shown in the various communications could have but one effect upon any Socialist who was Catholic in more than name, namely, to drive him out of the ranks of his false friends.

THE D'YOUVILLE READING CIRCLE.

It is idle to attempt a description of the charm of Mr. Watters' lectures. One must hear them to understand it. His sense of never being disappointed. A very large number were present at "On the Heights" on March 27th. The lecture is based on the story of the same name which is Auerback's masterpiece.

Countess Irma, the heroine, had fallen chiefly from intellectual pride. From her life long atonement and expiations, Mr. Watters drew his lessons. "The journey up the heights of the intellectual and spiritual life is toilsome, long, and often weary. It must be made alone or not at all. But the reward, when the top is reached, is exceeding great. Such was Irma's experience, as it must be the experience of every traveller on a like journey.

Mr. Watters in cutting terms, described the modern social gatherings with their meaningless chatter and too little attention to higher things, intellectual and spiritual. "The nobility of work and perseverance was beautifully depicted. The lecturer insisted upon the sacred duty one owes oneself of caring for the health. "Good health has much to do with religion," said the speaker. Irma learned, from her own sad experience, the beauty, the sanctity and the inviolability of order. True freedom is on the heights attained by hard and persevering effort along right lines. Atonement is a hard word, but it is the only way to peace and tranquility of conscience.

Mr. Watters insisted on the value of thinking habit, in preference to the reading habit of which many thoughtless people boast. The lecturer congratulated the Reading Circle on its efforts along these lines.

Father Kirwin of the University, in his expression of appreciation at the close, classed Mr. Watters with Goldsmith, in that "what he touched he did but adorn."

Mrs. Davis and Mr. Jarman sang as a duet, at the opening, that most appropriate hymn "My Faith looks up to Thee."

There was an interesting regular meeting on Tuesday. Quotations were made from the most serious writers of the present day on the school and the home question. The war drags on, though earnest efforts have been made to arrange a peace.

A dark war cloud seems to hang over the south-east corner of Europe. "Julia," Katherine Tyan Hinkson's latest book, was reviewed by Miss McMahon. Mrs. Hinkson is very popular with the circle, and it is hoped to soon have her complete works in the Library.

Such reliable authorities as the Dolphin and the Catholic World speak highly of "The Divine Light," a new novel by May Sinclair. A more comprehensive note on this book will be made later.

Rev. Father McSorley has a timely and beautiful paper in the Catholic World called "The Son of Man."

In the same magazine is a paper by Father McMillan, C. S. P., on "Religious Knowledge and the United States Schools." Father McMillan is superintendent of St. Paul's Sunday school in New York, where two thousand children are in attendance.

Mr. A. A. McGinley in the Dolphin writes a clever account of the recent meeting in Boston of the Religious Educational Association.

The Oxford study for the remainder of the term is to consist of character sketches. Those chosen for Tuesday were Hurrell, Proude and John Keble. John Keble is the author of "The Christian Year," from which a selection was read.

John Henry Newman's Letters and Correspondence" give us an insight into the personal character of these men. The volumes are in the Library, and it would be well to look into them between meetings.

A woman, Louise Imogen Guiney, has written "The Life and Times, Hurrell Froode." A review of the book was read.

While no women were directly connected with the Oxford controversy there are several whose names are indirectly associated with it. These will be considered at the next meeting.

Selections from the fifth book of The Light of Asia were read. A pleasant letter from a valued member, Mr. Shannon, was read. Though living now at Saskatoon, Mr. Shannon has not forgotten Ottawa.

At the next meeting, on April 18th, attention will be called to the I. C. T. S., and our connection therewith. B. DOWDALL.

CATHOLIC NOTES.

His Grace, Archbishop Bruchesi, of Montreal, recently celebrated the eighth anniversary of his consecration. The consecration of Bishop Alcega Racicot, of Montreal, will take place at the Cathedral of St. James on Wednesday, May 3.

The Rev. Francis Jagor, O. M. I., one of the German missionaries in South West Africa, was put to death on March 2nd by the natives, who are still in revolt against the German authorities. R. I. P.

The Rev. Navier Sutton, C. P., whose time and labors for several years past have been devoted to missions to non-Catholics, in which field he has achieved signal success, will sail April 29 on the Lombardia for Naples, going thence to Rome.

The new Earl of Kenmare is descended from a convert on both sides, his mother having been a daughter of Lord Charles Thynne, who began his ecclesiastical career as a Canon of Canterbury and ended it as a Catholic priest.—Antigonish Casket.

Monsignor Tonti, Papal Nuncio at Rio Janeiro, who last year successfully arbitrated a territorial dispute between Brazil and Bolivia, has now been invited to act as third member of an arbitration board to settle a dispute between Brazil and Peru.—The Casket.

Dr. Albert F. Zahm, of the Catholic University of America, has received from the Carnegie Institution an award of \$1,000 for the current year, to be expended in researches on atmospheric resistance. This award was made in recognition of his previous experiments at the university, and more particularly in recognition of his discovery of the laws of atmospheric friction, announced in the National Academy of Sciences last April.

Ven. Mother Barat.

All the friends of the Sacred Heart as well as all the friends of Christian education will rejoice over the approaching beatification of the Foundress of the Society of the Sacred Heart. Towards the beginning of February the decree proclaiming the heroic of Mother Barat's virtues was published in Rome and the beatification will follow naturally during the course of the year. Mother Barat wished that all her schools should bear the name of the Sacred Heart; and each one of these well known houses of higher education and of formation in Christian virtue is called Academy of the Sacred Heart; or simply the Sacred Heart by the nuns themselves and their pupils. Who can count the army which has gone out from these schools with love of the Sacred Heart practically undying in each breast?—Messenger of the Sacred Heart.

Every married man should have his life insured.