

**THE CATHOLIC RECORD,**  
Published every Friday morning at 388 Richmond Street, opposite City Hall, London, Ont.

Annual subscription ..... \$2.00  
Semi-annual ..... 1.00

**RATES FOR ADVERTISEMENTS.**

Ten cents per line for first, and five cents per line for each subsequent insertion. Advertisements measured in non-padded type 12 lines to an inch. Contract advertisements for three, six or twelve months, special terms. All advertisements should be handed in not later than Thursday morning. Returns to agents, twelve and a half per cent. on remittances, or one free copy to the getter up of each club of ten.

We solicit and shall at all times be pleased to receive contributions on subjects of interest to our readers and Catholics generally, which will be inserted, when not in conflict with our own views as to their conformity in this respect.

All communications should be addressed to the undersigned, accompanied by the full name and address of the writer, not necessarily for publication, but as a guarantee of good faith.

**WALTER LOCKE,**  
PUBLISHER.  
388 Richmond Street, London, Ont.

**The Catholic Record**  
LONDON, FRIDAY, NOV. 22, 1878.

LOCAL history is sometimes quite as interesting and curious when brought before our notice, as that which relates to the great empires of the earth. In fact it teaches lessons which thoughtful people ought not, nay, cannot overlook. It often shows how the most persistent hobbies of different bodies or societies of men are in a few years frustrated or completely overturned. Such an instance presents itself at the Catholic Parish of Bidulph.

The first Catholic who went to reside there was taken by some half dozen Orangemen and carried away to be drowned, so fearful were they, that if they allowed even one "papist" to occupy land in their district would follow; but he, however escaped. As might be supposed this was an Irishman, and as he and his forefathers had learned how to battle persecution in another land, he determined to stay, and stay he did; and the result is that there are more Catholics in Bidulph to-day than there are Orangemen. Here the visitor will see a sample of the undying energy and persistent faith of the Irish Catholic. They who kept the faith alive in England until it has at last lapsed into a grand reality again, have here erected a fine church, attached to which is a burial ground kept in splendid order and does credit to the pastor. They have also three or four "separate" schools in working order in the parish; and last, but by no means the least, a magnificent two-story residence for the priest, which would grace any city in Canada, and which ought rather to be termed a palace. With such splendid results as Bidulph places before our eyes, achieved in a single generation or lifetime, any observant or thoughtful mind can easily trace the source of this success to the unconquerable vitality of the One True Church.

We are pleased to state that the Catholic ladies of Ingersoll are now zealously engaged in preparing for a Bazaar and grand drawing of prizes which is to come off on the 12th, 13th and 14th of December. It is hoped that the Catholic people in different parts of the Diocese will avail themselves of this opportunity to help their fellow Catholics of Ingersoll, to bring to a successful completion a work which their pastor the Rev. Father Boubat has devotedly undertaken for the benefit of his people and to the honor of the Sacred Heart of Jesus. Our friends of Ingersoll deserve assistance at the hands of the Catholic body, so much the more as they have themselves subscribed most handsomely towards the erection of this noble edifice. Twelve thousand dollars from a congregation by no means large or wealthy evinces a spirit of religion and of generosity which deserves to be encouraged. With our heart we say to the readers of the CATHOLIC RECORD: Of the generosity of your Catholic heart contribute to this good work. Every Catholic should hold it as dear to his heart to have his share in the lasting prayer and offering to the Sacred Heart of Jesus, which this Church shall be for ages.

**LORD O'HAGAN ON EDUCATION.**

Lord O'Hagan, ex-Lord Chancellor of Ireland, spoke at the prize distribution at St. Francis Xavier's College, Liverpool, lately. He said that in Ireland they had lost a multitude of schools which in old times instructed the people in classical literature and general knowledge, while the middle-class schools which existed in former days, through the operation of the great State system, had been more or less abolished. This a great evil existed in Ireland—a want of intermediate education. In reference to that defect, though he was not associated with that Government, he could promise them that if their measure was a fair and honest one there would not be any party feeling about it and all honest men in Ireland would give them their support. In competitive examinations in the Civil Service the Irish had more than their place. The English Catholics had been deprived of those endowments which their fathers gave for the

purpose of education, and which were enjoyed by others. He hoped the Catholics would follow the example of the good old people and make the endowments over again, for it was difficult to say that a college such as that could be absolutely what it ought to be without endowments. It was by education that the Catholics in England might rise to their proper level. There was in the world a flood of dismal and desolating doctrine which sought to make a negation of the human conscience and to drag the Almighty Himself from His throne. There was a prevalence of infidel opinions such as never was exhibited before, and the time had come when there would be a death-struggle between the truths of Christianity and the falsehoods of Atheism, and he believed that in this struggle the Catholic Church must be the victor. If religion was to be maintained in this country without a vigorous and conscientiously-maintained system of positive dogma, it would be impossible to encounter materialistic influences. It was the duty of Catholics to avail themselves to the fullest extent of institutions such as that which guarded the faith of the child and secured its progress. His Lordship also referred to the high position taken in the rolls of the London University by Stoneyhurst, which was foremost among schools.

**CATHOLIC REPRESENTATION.**

We have lately heard many complaints of the injustice to which Catholics—especially the English-speaking Catholics of the Dominion—are being subjected by both political parties. The *Irish Canadian*, after fighting a hard battle for Sir John Macdonald, begins to fear that that right hon. gentleman fails to appreciate the signal service thus rendered. The *Montreal Post* and *True Witness* are of the same opinion. We do not pretend to be capable of giving advice on political questions, but we feel satisfied that no Government, Conservative or Reform, can ignore the rights of Catholics with impunity; therefore we fancy it would be just as well to allow Sir John sufficient time to get his house in order before condemning him. It is not half so easy to form a Ministry as it is to write a two-column article upon how it should be constituted. We consider the present Cabinet to be merely an impromptu one, susceptible of changes, and therefore not to be too severely criticized until it assumes a more definite aspect.

The Opposition papers re-echo the complaints of the *Canadian* and *Post*, and the Ministerial organs ridicule their pretensions. The *Free Press* lately took occasion to refer to the editor of the *Irish Canadian* in a manner far from complimentary. With this, we have nothing to do, but the *Free Press* treats the subject of Catholic representation so cavalierly that we feel called upon to make a few remarks.

When Mr. Mackenzie was in office the *Globe* and Mr. Dymond scouted the idea of Catholic representation either in Parliament or in the Cabinet; when some member complained once that the Catholics of Ontario had not one representative in the House of Commons, Mr. Dymond rose to his feet and declared that they had eighty-eight. Now, the *Free Press* argues in a similar strain and makes out a schedule in order to show how absurd is the claim for Catholic representation in the Cabinet of Sir John. The *Free Press* argues that if Catholics claim a certain number of seats in the Cabinet, every Protestant sect would be entitled to make a similar demand. This is more buncombe. Protestantism is Protestantism no matter what denominational name you call it by, and its most ardent devotees never question what sect an aspirant for Parliamentary honors belongs to so long as they know that he is a sound Protestant, or even a Free-thinker, or a Jew, or anything except a Papist. It is quite unnecessary for the various Protestant sects to clamor for representation, because they have already got it. There is not a Protestant denomination of any importance in Canada that has not a representative in Parliament.

The *Free Press* thinks "ability, fitness and a quarter of a century's experience," should overrule all other considerations. Does the *Free Press* imagine that the Catholics of Canada are so devoid of common sense, or so palpably ignorant as to expect that a mere nonentity should be elected to Parliament or be taken into the Cabinet simply because he was a Catholic?

When a Catholic is put forward care is taken that he is no mere figure head. Are not Dr. Bergin and Mr. Costigan as well qualified as certain members of the present Cabinet? If Catholic feeling is not to be considered in Ontario, we would like to know why Protestant feeling has to be considered in Quebec? Now if it is wrong for Catholics to ask that they be represented in the councils of State on denominational principles, whose fault is it? Catholics have brains and ambition and patriotism as well as Protestants. In many of the walks of life there is a fair field and no favor for them in Canada, but when they attempt to enter the political arena, or aspire to a position that would entitle them to a voice in the

government of the country which they love as well as other people, they find that they are under a ban. When this ban is removed, and when Protestants of every denomination have cast aside all prejudice against their Catholic fellow citizens, it will be time for the *Free Press* to say that Cabinets should be formed without regard to religious feeling.

The *Free Press* thinks also that "deference to local interest and Provincial prejudice should not be tolerated any longer than is necessary to educate the people up to the adoption of broader views." Very likely the views of the *Free Press* will become so expansive after a while that it may commence educating the people to do away with the local Parliaments.

**IDEAS OF A UNIVERSAL CHURCH.**

Our excellent contemporary of Stratroy, the *Western Dispatch*, publishes a lecture by the Rev. S. Beswick, of the new Jerusalem church, which for broadness, charity, speculation and chimera, outrivals anything of the kind that has ever come under our notice. With great ability the rev. lecturer maintains that there is as much difference between sectarian churches and the Church Universal, as "there was between the Church of Christ and 'the Jewish Church,'" of course his idea of a Universal Church, and the Church of Christ differs from ours, but he has unwittingly committed himself in several parts of his lecture, to a belief in sound Roman Catholic doctrine. This we will endeavor to show further on.

The rev. lecturer believes there is a new Universal Church coming into existence and he asks:

"Why should not Christian churches, entertaining different views of religious truth, still regard and treat each other as brethren, and thus be united in spirit? Unity of spirit with diversity of belief—unity with variety—this is the order of heaven, and of creation on earth. Let me expand this idea. The most perfect unity is compatible with the greatest variety. The whole created universe is a unit. Look at the sky at night. You see innumerable stars, differing in magnitude and glory, and at different distances from each other. The planets have each their circles and limits, threading their ways around the sun with a velocity peculiar to each. Look at the earth by day. You see it everywhere diversified with hill and dale, mountain and valley, rock and stream, river and lake and sea, etc., etc."

Why those Christian Churches cannot be united is because it is practically impossible. Supposing that all the different Protestant sects agreed upon a basis of union, they would simply form an unwieldy mass which—like a body without a head—would be impotent. When any body of men form themselves into an association the first thing done is to elect a head, or centre of authority whom each individual member must respect and obey. How would it be possible for the different religious sects to elect such a head? It might be said Christ is the head of all churches. But then, He not being present in the flesh, nor any person who would dare to say that he was His vicegerent on earth, and could speak with authority, it would only be natural to suppose that each sect would try to establish its right to preponderate. One would say that Martin Luther preached and practised what Christ taught on earth, another would answer that Calvin had just as much authority as Luther; a third would aver that Huss had more authority than either of them; while a fourth would maintain that if ever a man had a divine mission that man was John Wesley; and a fifth would extinguish the whole of them by extolling the virtues of Knox; and so on *ad infinitum*.

That "the most perfect unity is compatible with the greatest variety" in inanimate nature may be true. But it must be borne in mind that this perfect unity is due to the controlling influence exerted by one great Power. In speaking of animated nature the rev. gentleman seems to have been so absorbed in poetic illusions as to have lost sight of actual realities. Referring to birds he says: "Every bird has a feather different from every other 'in the flock.'" Now we always believed in the good old adage that "birds of a feather flock together," and although we have no pretensions to being an authority on ornithology we feel safe in saying that in a flock of a hundred crows there are ninety-nine that are so nearly alike, that it would be impossible to distinguish one from the other, either by plumage, voice or natural instincts. Further, we know that in the great diversity of the feathered tribe there is anything but a general unity. There is very little amity between the hawk and the lark, or between the eagle and the goose. And it is an absolute fact that each species, and even each sub-division of species, keep entirely to themselves and have nothing in common with others, except that they are all birds.

The rev. gentleman also uses the fishes of the sea as an illustration of "unity with diversity." In the sea, as upon land, there is no such thing as a general unity. On the contrary, there is a continual warfare going on in the tremendous depths of the ocean.

and this war is said to be an absolute necessity, for it is estimated that, if fish were allowed to go on multiplying without interruption that the sea would have become impassable many years ago. Buffon estimated that the produce of two herings in twenty years would amount to a mass of fish as large as this globe.

The rev. gentleman believes that all men must love one another before this Universal Church can be established. This is the doctrine we have been taught from our youth, and we have been taught it by a Church which has been established for eighteen hundred and seventy-eight years, and which has spread throughout all ages and nations, and which, we have the solemn assurance of Christ Himself, will last until the end of time.

It seems strange that the rev. gentleman holding such good doctrine, should have to beat about the bush for chickadees, and plunge into the sea for perriwinkles, to illustrate his idea of a Universal Church. Again, he says: "Pure and undefiled religion is to 'visit the fatherless and the widow; it is less 'intellectual than practical.'" "The real orthodox man is he who acts most Christ-like, who goes about doing good." If the Rev. Mr. Beswick would only open his eyes and look in earnest for this Church of which he dreams, instead of indulging in chimerical speculations, he would very soon discover that it was already a stern reality, and quite in accordance with his views of what a Universal Church should be. He would find it to be a religion that visited the fatherless, aided the weak, and comforted the distressed; a religion whose ministers, or votaries, feared neither war, nor pestilence, nor death, when called to the post of duty; a religion so Christ-like in its attributes that all who believe in it are willing to sacrifice their very lives if necessary, rather than deny Him who founded it upon the rock of eternal salvation. He would find it so universal that it embraces the whole world in its fold, and at the same time he would see such an illustration of unity with diversity as he has not yet dreamt of. Let him picture to himself an immense temple in which are Europeans, Americans, Asiatics, Africans, Australians, New Zealanders and people from the remotest parts of the earth assembled for the purpose of adoring and worshipping the same God, and he will have some idea of the compatibility of unity with diversity. He has read in Scripture how Peter addressed the multitude and they all understood him as speaking in their own tongue. Here, he will see this verified. In this temple which we have asked him to picture, he can behold a priest offering up the Sacrifice of the Mass in a universal tongue which all seem to understand. He will see in every act of devotion they perform a universal similitude. The white man and the negro, the Mongolian and Circassian, the Indian and the Esquimaux all worshipping at the same altar, after the same manner, and with the same faith. Outside of the Catholic Church this unity with diversity cannot be found, and it is about as idle for Rev. Mr. Beswick to dream of it, as it would be for us to live in expectation of the day when men will so love one another, that even politicians will sink all minor differences and Sir John embrace the Hon. Geo. Brown.

**IS HELL ETERNAL?**

It is not a little astonishing that men professing to be Christians should for a moment have any doubt on this subject. That the Atheists of the last century should deny it we can understand. Denying a personal God, they were only logical in denying sin as an offence against God and hell as its punishment. But that any one acknowledging a God should deny the eternity of hell is past comprehension. And it is all the more so in Protestants, whom we have not as yet heard denying an eternal heaven. If heaven as a reward for a good life is eternal, why may not hell as a punishment for sin be eternal also? If the recompense of the saints is eternal, the punishment of the reprobate ought also to be so too. Justice includes both reward and punishment. The justice of God is equally manifest in the reward of virtue and the punishment of vice. Do these men complain of the eternity of heaven? But if the rewards of a good life or the effects of reconciliation are eternal without offering violence to the attributes of a divine rewarder why cannot the punishment of a bad life followed by a final impotence be eternal likewise without offering violence to our idea of a first avenger? To be logical these men must reject heaven as well as hell.

But a momentary sin, you object, may suffer an eternal punishment.

But the momentary conversion followed by an eternal reward is due to the miracle of Calvary applied to the soul.

Exactly; just as a momentary sin followed by an eternal woe is due to the rejection of this miracle of Calvary.

But as a matter of fact no sin is momentary. As the theologians express it, the will of sin is eternal—a murder may be committed in its execution the intention of the murder may have been momentary; a blow may have been given in a moment of anger; but all this is not the sin. The sin is the choice of the will electing to deal a murderous blow and thereby reject God for all eternity. How then can such a choice be called momentary? Even in the moment of choosing, it was an eternal choice.

But by the very terms of our proposition your objection is impossible.

Hell is a place of eternal punishment for the unpunished sinner. However a momentary sin unpunished is a continual sin, and therefore your objection falls to the ground. The only case in which your objection will hold good is, we think, an impossible one; viz, that an hypocrite truly just should die in his life. This we think is an impossible case. When God strikes man down in the act of sin, we suspect it is our consideration for *future sin* as much as in consequence of the then present sin. A return to first principles will make it plain that these things are not so. The greatness of a crime is the measure of its punishment. Now a sin may be great *objectively* as well as *subjectively*. Not to speak too much according to the schools—a sin against God is infinite as for as the person offended is concerned. It deserves then an infinite punishment. But this punishment cannot be infinite as far as the pain is concerned because all human pain must of necessity be finite. It remains therefore only that these finite pains shall be infinite in duration. But this is—hell.

25. "The duration of a crime is the measure of the duration of its punishment." If then the sin of the damned never ends (it must be always borne in mind that the impenitent sinner is always borne in mind that the punishment likewise shall never end. But in the case of those who die in despair or final impenitence, what is then to make the crime cease? Is there to efface it—to reform our manners?—to render the soul pure? Once the soul crosses that precise line which divided time from eternity, the thoughts, habits, the feelings she brings with her are eternalized with her and she stands in an immutable before her God either in holiness or iniquity as the case may be. Since then the crime will be eternal, the punishment also must be so too. But this is—hell.

32. It is repugnant to right reason to suppose that an infinitely just God can condone the sinners. But once in hell what is there to change the sinner, to a saint? The length of the punishment cannot do it, because it is already deservedly eternal and eternity never ends. Another redemption cannot do it, because even if the damned were capable of redemption as a matter of fact no divine Son has being the unpunished sinner to heaven would be to frustrate exactly all these people wish in his favour. Where would be the use in admitting him to heaven? He would not be happy there. As he would find nothing there to gratify his passions he would only serve to disturb others without being happy himself. Heaven would still be a hell to him. Would our friends bring him out of the frying-pan into the fire? And would they have God as foolish as themselves? SACERDOS.

jection falls to the ground. The only case in which your objection will hold good is, we think, an impossible one; viz, that an hypocrite truly just should die in his life. This we think is an impossible case. When God strikes man down in the act of sin, we suspect it is our consideration for future sin as much as in consequence of the then present sin. A return to first principles will make it plain that these things are not so. The greatness of a crime is the measure of its punishment. Now a sin may be great objectively as well as subjectively. Not to speak too much according to the schools—a sin against God is infinite as for as the person offended is concerned. It deserves then an infinite punishment. But this punishment cannot be infinite as far as the pain is concerned because all human pain must of necessity be finite. It remains therefore only that these finite pains shall be infinite in duration. But this is—hell.

25. "The duration of a crime is the measure of the duration of its punishment." If then the sin of the damned never ends (it must be always borne in mind that the impenitent sinner is always borne in mind that the punishment likewise shall never end. But in the case of those who die in despair or final impenitence, what is then to make the crime cease? Is there to efface it—to reform our manners?—to render the soul pure? Once the soul crosses that precise line which divided time from eternity, the thoughts, habits, the feelings she brings with her are eternalized with her and she stands in an immutable before her God either in holiness or iniquity as the case may be. Since then the crime will be eternal, the punishment also must be so too. But this is—hell.

32. It is repugnant to right reason to suppose that an infinitely just God can condone the sinners. But once in hell what is there to change the sinner, to a saint? The length of the punishment cannot do it, because it is already deservedly eternal and eternity never ends. Another redemption cannot do it, because even if the damned were capable of redemption as a matter of fact no divine Son has being the unpunished sinner to heaven would be to frustrate exactly all these people wish in his favour. Where would be the use in admitting him to heaven? He would not be happy there. As he would find nothing there to gratify his passions he would only serve to disturb others without being happy himself. Heaven would still be a hell to him. Would our friends bring him out of the frying-pan into the fire? And would they have God as foolish as themselves? SACERDOS.

**VISIT TO THE HOUSE OF PROVIDENCE, TORONTO.**

(Special Correspondence of the Catholic Record.)

Through the sunlit October air, rich and sweet with the breath of dying flower and foliage, under the autumn sky, so soft, so tender in its azure depths, we drove through this fair Canadian city, Toronto, seeing much to admire, and perhaps much to wonder at. How fast she has grown—this young Forest Queen! How full of life, and vigor and enterprise! What may we not prophesy for her future, if she advances so steadily as she has done for the last quarter of a century!

We visited the grey, picturesque University, which looks as if it were transplanted here from some grand old park in the good England of the Normal School, of which the good citizens of Toronto are justly proud; Osgoode Hall, and the many stately temples to the living God, that rise in still, calm beauty, among the busy haunts of commerce. Last of all (and my mind is so full of this last that I needs must write of it now), we drew up at the "House of Providence," an ancient-looking turreted structure, on one side of which a bright new "wing" built in modern style, contrasts strangely with the mediæval appearance of the main building. Subsequent observations led us to conclude that the development of a similar wing on the other side would be a desideratum, not only as regards the symmetry of the edifice, but also the growing wants of the institution. What a monument of charity is this House of Providence! Who can calculate the amount of good this noble work achieves? In this home of the homeless are gathered between four and five hundred destitute persons, ranging from the little child just entering the untrodden paths of this world of sorrow and sin, to the old man tottering feebly to the grave. Surely 'tis a noble mission to tend and care for these—God's poor! These helpless ones, whom the busy world has cast from her. How little we think of the quiet heroism of these good Sisters of St. Joseph, who devote their lives to this work. One of them led us through the house, explaining, and giving us all the information we asked as we went along.

Through the long airy corridors we went, into the boys' school-rooms, where were assembled over one hundred orphan boys, who rose simultaneously as we entered. We were agreeably surprised at the healthful appearance of the little fellows and their neat dress. At signal from the Sister they sang, in good time and tune, a song whose bright melody haunts us even yet, not the usual mournful dirge of the orphanage, but a ringing, joyous air, that seemed to us an escape from the gloom of young hearts. We then passed into a wide bright hall in the new wing, and were greeted by one hundred and twenty-three orphan girls all clad in pretty, comfortable dresses, all tidy, happy and healthy-looking, from the little tottling lassies who seemed special pets of the house, to the studious girl in her teens, ambitious of winning her share of prizes at the Christmas examinations. They sang for us, and we remarked with pleasure the evidences of careful training in the taste and expression with which they rendered the simple ballads chosen for them.

Across the corridor, half the length of the wing, is a spacious apartment, called the "Women's Work-rooms." Here we found about sixty women, under the supervision of a Sister, sewing, knitting, mending, spinning, etc. In a similar room on the next flat are the older orphan girls employed in making dresses, etc., for the younger ones.

We were conducted to the infirmaries, four in number, where are over seventy sick women. Here is misery in almost every form, attended and soothed by these good Sisters. Here is helpless old age, where utterances betray second childhood. Here are sufferers from cancer, tumor, paralysis, blindness, consumption, etc. Ah! It saddens one's heart to be brought thus face to face with human suffering—human misery. It brings a blush to the cheek of the silent woman, more eloquent than the grandest pulpit oratory. What sad thoughts are evoked from our startled souls by the sight of these poor sufferers, whose "days go on" so fraught with pain here in this quiet infirmary, all unheeded by the gladness and glory of the beautiful world without, with its mellow, radiant sunlight, its scents and sounds of

(To be Continued.)