

The Catholic Record.

Published Weekly at 424 and 426 Richmond Street, London, Ontario.

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

EDITORS: REV. GEORGE R. NORTHGRAVE, Author of "Mistakes of Modern England."

PUBLISHER AND PROPRIETOR, Thomas Coffey.

Advertisement—Ten cents per line each insertion, agents measurement.

Approved and recommended by the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa, and St. Boniface, the Bishops of Hamilton, Peterborough, and Oshkosh, N. Y., and the clergy throughout the Dominion.

Correspondence intended for publication, as well as that having reference to business, should be directed to the proprietor, and must reach London not later than Tuesday morning.

When subscribers change their residence it is important that the old as well as the new address be sent us.

London, Saturday, February 3, 1900.

NOT ALLOWED A SEAT.

Final action was taken by the United States House of Representatives on the 25th ult., in regard to Representative Roberts of Utah. He had not been allowed to take his seat on the meeting of Congress, and his claim was referred to the House Committee on Privileges. It will be remembered that in defiance of United States law, Mr. Roberts retains his three wives in accordance with Mormon usage.

FRENCH ASSUMPTIONISTS PERSECUTED.

A French court has fined fifteen Assumptionist Fathers \$3 each for interference in a recent election in Paris, and has declared the Assumptionist order dissolved. French courts override liberty of action under the present anti-religious regime, in a manner incomprehensible to the rest of the world.

LEO XIII AND THE ITALIAN GOVERNMENT.

A despatch from Rome via Paris asserts that Cardinal Capocciato, Archbishop of Capua and Prefect of the Vatican Library, made a speech a few days ago in which he stated that "Pope Leo XIII. is merely awaiting a Government capable of accepting his invitation." This is interpreted to mean that when there will be an Italian Government which will be ready to negotiate a reasonable settlement with the Holy See, the present state of affairs, whereby the State and the Church are in an attitude of hostility, may be turned into one of good will, so that harmony may be restored, and that Church and State may operate together for the general good.

the sentiments of the Holy Father in this utterance.

MORE HAZING OUTRAGES.

Another horrible hazing outrage has been perpetrated in an American college. The atrocity was committed at Thell College, Greenville, near Sharon, Pa. Two freshmen named Faust Davis and Walter Zimmerman were subjected to the horrible treatment known as hazing, and are, in consequence in a critical condition from the injuries inflicted.

The young men were attacked in their beds by the under-graduates and graduates, and being dragged therefrom in their night clothes, were gagged to prevent them from crying out, and then bound tightly to trees.

Their brutal assailants next beat them with heavy clubs and barrel staves until they lost consciousness.

The intelligence of what was going on was brought to the freshmen's class by one or two of the members who happened to see part of the outrage, and the whole class of freshmen turned out to effect a rescue, but were beaten off by the under-graduates and graduates, who were superior both in numbers and physical strength.

The faculty of the college are engaged in an investigation, with the object of punishing at least the ring leaders; but as usual every effort is being made by those concerned to shield the guilty ones, and to throw the authorities off the scent.

The frequency with which outrages of this character occur is a disgrace to the educational system of the age. It is true that the horrible practice of hazing dates back for generations, but it is none the less condemnable for this fact. It could not be kept in existence in the enlightenment of the nineteenth century if education were based upon religion; and hence we observe that, as we have several times stated in our columns, these exhibitions of barbarity are unheard of in the Catholic colleges. Surely the only remedy which can be efficaciously applied to this evil is to reconstruct the system of education on a thoroughly moral and religious basis.

THE FRENCH ADVANCE IN CHINA.

China has been again obliged to make territorial concessions to France at Kwan Chan Bay, where the Chinese assailants of French missionaries and other Frenchmen have been several times defeated, two of the defeats having been recently inflicted.

The viceroys of the two Kwang provinces has been dismissed and Li Hung Chang has been appointed to succeed him. It is expected that, with the knowledge of western countries which Li Hung Chang will bring to bear upon the administration of affairs, the rights of foreigners will be better respected. The Chinese must learn that though they claim to have the only "Celestial Empire" on the face of the globe, they are not the only people who have the right to existence.

The Chinese Government has promised to punish the prefect who began the war against the French; and the punishment to be inflicted is to be nothing less than decapitation. We are sorry that it is deemed requisite to inflict so severe a penalty; but it appears to be necessary to use most stringent measures to bring the uncivilized population of that country to a sense of what is due to other nations.

The Government of China has also agreed to pay 200,000 taels, or about \$300,000 indemnity to the families of Frenchmen who have been killed in the attacks made upon them.

Toward the end of December a company of eighty French soldiers was sent into the interior, and later in the same week, three companies of marines were sent for a similar purpose. These encountered bands of murderous assailants, including some regiments of Chinese regulars who were engaged in the work of exterminating Frenchmen. The Chinese were totally defeated, about two hundred being killed. The French warships in Chinese waters further announced to the Government

that they would go up the river and bombard Canton, whereupon the Government yielded and promised full satisfaction for the outrages which had been committed.

The French in Tonquin are highly elated over their success with the Chinese, and declare that they would have been opposed in their demands by Great Britain if the latter power were not now so busy in South Africa. Several French papers assert that now is the opportunity for France to extend her sphere of influence in Kwang Tung, Kwangsi, and Yunnan, while England is so busily occupied elsewhere. The French people wish to see their influence recognized in China as on an equality with that of England.

PENANCE AND WORKS OF SUPEREROGATION.

What is described as "a new departure" was inaugurated at the banquet of the Methodist Union of Toronto which took place on the 18th inst. in that city. A resolution was presented by Mr. Chester Massey to the effect that all social amusements should be given up by Methodists during one month in each year, so as "to direct all energies to the awakening of a sound spiritual sense." The month of October was suggested as a suitable time for this purpose.

The Rev. Dr. Carman, the General Superintendent of the Methodist body in Canada, strongly approved of the resolution, and it passed unanimously, Dr. Carman promising to urge its adoption by the Church.

There is in chapter 21 of the Westminster Confession, by which Presbyterians still profess to be guided, a clause (5) which mentions "solemn fastings" as one of the "parts of the ordinary religious worship of God," "to be used in a holy and religious manner" in its proper time and season, and among the texts whereby this prescription is supported we find the following:

"Joel iv, 12: Therefore also now, saith the Lord, Turn ye even to Me with all your heart, and with fasting and with weeping, and with mourning."

"Esther iv, 16: Gather together all the Jews that are present in Susana, and fast ye for me, and neither eat nor drink three days, night or day: I also and my maidens will fast likewise, and so will I go in unto the king."

It is understood, however, that this direction for fasting is a dead letter among Presbyterians, who have, with out exception, been in the habit of reproaching Catholics with performing unprofitable works of supererogation by observing the fasts of Lent, Advent, and other penitential times. The Methodists also, who have rapidly approximated their teachings to Presbyterianism, during the hundred and odd years of their existence since they separated themselves from the Church of England, have followed the course of the Presbyterians in condemning fasts and other works of penance as "arrogant and impious." There is, in fact, a special "Article of Religion" in the authorized book of discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church of the United States which declares specifically that

"Voluntary works—besides, over and above God's commandments—which are called works of supererogation, cannot be taught without arrogance and impiety. For by them men do declare that they do not only render unto God as much as they are bound to do, but that they do more for His sake than of bounden duty is required, whereas Christ saith plainly, When ye have done all that is commanded you say we are unprofitable servants."

This teaching is also found among the articles of the Methodist Church of Canada, and likewise of the Church of England, from which it has been bodily taken. The Presbyterian Confession of Faith has a chapter of like purport.

It has been said very truly that the proposed change is "a new departure;" and it is worthy of remark that it is certainly with design that the new penitential season is proposed to be kept, not with fasting or abstinence like that of Catholics on Fridays and fast days, but with abstinence from social festivities, so that it may not appear that this new departure is an imitation of the Catholic practice. Nevertheless it cannot be concealed that the principle is the same, to do penitential works.

It is equally with design that the month of October is proposed instead of the penitential seasons of Lent and Advent, observed by Catholics; but all the same, it is now conceded that works of penance and "supererogation" are necessary for the sanctification of Christians.

How changed are the Methodists of to-day from those of the olden time!

MONTREAL SYNOD ON THE HISTORY OF ANGLICANISM.

At the recent Synod of the Anglican Church of the Diocese of Montreal, a resolution was introduced by the Rev. G. Osborne Troop, and unanimously adopted to the effect that "in the opinion of the Synod, the time is opportune for the presentation, by means of illustrated lectures or otherwise, of the antiquity and continuity of the historic Church of England."

Mr. Troop announced that he made this motion "without any idea of starting a mission in opposition to the Roman mission which was at the present moment being held in the city, but rather that the Church should do all it legitimately can to give the plainest and simplest statement of the historical facts which every churchman ought to know."

We do not call in question the right of the Church of England clergy to make known to their flocks, and to others who attend their services the basis upon which their Church rests its claims to be the Church of Christ. But we detect in the speech made by Rev. Mr. Troop in sustaining his motion, and in the speeches of other members of the Synod, the aggressive spirit in which the motion was made, and we have the assurance from the speakers themselves that the resolution will be put into effect by misrepresenting Catholic doctrine, and putting forward a false version of history as the real basis of Anglicanism.

Thus Mr. Troop said: "If there is anything in this wide world which is anti-Roman, it is the Bible or Sacred Scriptures; if there is anything in the world that is anti-Roman, it is the Book of Common Prayer."

It would be beyond the scope of a short article in our columns to go over the whole field of Catholic theology to show that Catholic doctrinal teaching is strictly Scriptural, but this is done ably in many Catholic works easily accessible to our readers, such as "The Faith of our Fathers," "Catholic Belief," "The Sincere Christian," "Miller's End of Controversy," etc. We will therefore confine ourselves here to a few remarks on some of those passages of the Anglican Prayer Book which make special reference to Rome as the centre of the universal Christian Church, and we shall thus see whether the Catholic or the Anglican Church is the Church of Holy Scripture.

The 19th Article of the Book of Common Prayer has the temerity to assert that "as the Churches of Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch have erred; so also the Church of Rome hath erred, not only in their living and manner of ceremonies, but also in matters of faith."

As by the Church of Rome here is meant not merely the local Church of the Diocese of Rome, but the whole Western Church, this is equivalent to asserting that the whole Church of Christ on earth has erred, and the homilies, which are also authoritative as part of the doctrinal standard of the Church of England, assert that all Christendom for nine hundred years and more was sunk into gross idolatry, that is, until the articles of the Church of England were concocted.

All this is, of course, a direct contradiction of the words of Scripture that the Church of God is "the pillar and ground of truth," and that the gates of hell should not prevail against the Church of Christ. But independently of the assertion which is the more astounding when we consider the circumstances under which the Church of England was established and her articles of religion framed.

As Rev. Mr. Troop declares that he wishes the people of the Church of England to know the history of their Church, he should be thankful to us for recalling some incidents of that history, and the few facts we will give are undeniable.

We will for the present pass over the details of the uxoriousness of Henry VIII, who first instituted that Church because under subjection to the Pope he could not freely exercise his lustful passions. We will here summarize from Lord Macaulay's history the manner in which the boasted Book of Common Prayer was compiled.

Lord Macaulay says: "The man who took the chief part in settling the conditions of the alliance which produced the Anglican Church was Thomas Crommer. Saintly in his professions, unscrupulous in his designs, zealous for nothing, bold in speculation, a coward and slave in every way qualified to arrange the terms of the coalition between the religious and the worldly enemies of Popery."

To this day the constitution, the

doctrines, and the services of the Church retain the visible marks of the compromise from which she sprang. She occupies a middle position between the Churches of Rome and Geneva. Her doctrinal confessions and discourses, composed by Protestants, set forth principles of theology in which Calvin or Knox would have found scarcely a word to disapprove. Her prayers and thanksgivings, derived from the ancient liturgies, are very generally such that Bishop Fisher or Cardinal Pole might have heartily joined in them.

A very passable crazy quilt might be constructed by these methods, but they are scarcely a suitable foundation for the constitution of a society which is to be the "pillar and ground of truth," and which undertakes to pass judgment upon the truthfulness or falsity of the doctrines of all Christendom.

And what is the present condition of the Church of England, as a consequence of this page of history and compromise?

The facts are notorious. We need go no farther than to the Anglican Church press and clergy for an account of the lugubrious war which is now going on in Anglicanism between Ritualists, Broad Church men and Eclects, to ascertain to what extent Anglicanism has the right to sit in judgment on questions of Christian doctrine and truth.

Archdeacon Taylor of Liverpool complained in the pulpit of St. Andrew's Church, in July, 1898, that "more than one half of the parish churches in England, to the number of eight thousand one hundred and eighty-three, are more or less Ritualistic, reversing the work of the English Reformation;" so that "the Reformation is undone, and among the parochial clergy there is a reign of lawlessness, anarchy and self-will, the only remedy for which is for the people to take the law into their own hands."

The Southern Churchman of Richmond, Virginia, commenting on this Babel-like confusion, said: "The Bishops may be able to do but little if nothing is done by them, something will be done by the State." It expresses further the fear that by the Church itself "nothing will be done. The advanced clergy will not obey the injunctions of the Bishops. It is the same with our Church in the United States. No one will present these ministers for trial, and if he did, what prospect is there of the trial doing any good?"

Surely a Church which is in this inextricable state of confusion, and crying out for the intervention of the civil power, which is an agglomeration of all religions and of no religion, is ill qualified to bring before its tribunal the whole Church of God, to be judged by the standard of its "Book of Common Prayer."

If the proposed historical preachers to be selected in accordance with the synodical resolutions tell a true history, they must state such facts as these, instead of dealing in the fiction told by Rev. Mr. Troop to the synod, as that the present Church of England "is the Church of Augustine, of Alfred, of Magna Charta," and continues only of pre-reformation times.

St. Augustine brought to England the same faith which the Catholic Church holds to-day, and it was from a Pope that he received his authority as Archbishop of Canterbury, and the modern Church of England differs from the Church of England which was in communion with the universal or Catholic Church of antiquity, as much as the latter differs from Buddhism or Mahometanism and more than between Catholicism and Judaism in its head, its constitution, its unity of faith, its doctrine, its ministry, its public worship and ritual, and its entire discipline.

We remark that the attendance of Protestants at the explanations of Catholic doctrine recently given by the Paulist Fathers, and especially by Father Younan in Montreal, was exceedingly large, reaching an average of about one thousand five hundred every night. It is evidently this fact which has raised the anger of Rev. Mr. Troop, but he will scarcely better the conditions by a series of falsified historical lectures.

A GOOD SUGGESTION.—A plausible practice, which ought to be adopted by all Catholic families in places where the Angelus bell is not regularly heard, has been proposed by an English priest. He suggests that in each household a little bell be rung thrice, as in the Angelus, the fourth ringing to serve both for the prayer and for the call to meals. The practice requires only a modicum of good-will; and if conscientiously carried out, will help to cultivate the Catholic family life. —Ave Maria.

LEAGUE OF THE SACRED HEART.

Freedom of Education.

GENERAL INTENTION FOR FEBRUARY 1900.

Recommended to our prayers by His Holiness Leo XIII.

American Messenger of the Sacred Heart.

By freedom of education, we do not mean that every individual or association of men and women should be free to educate others as they please, or even to offer instruction to others, whether privately or publicly, without any regard or responsibility to the religion or laws of the people whom they seek to instruct. This would be license, not liberty; and yet though this distinction should be clear, the confusion with which many are accustomed to use the term liberty nowadays, leads them to accept as a first principle, that education should have the same freedom which the press, for instance, wrongly assumes, so that any person who chooses, whether morally and morally competent or not, may undertake to train others, young or old, and instill into their minds principles which are just as likely to be hurtful, as helpful, to religion and society. People who would promptly condemn and repress such license of education, were they asked to judge it under its proper name, are but too willing to tolerate it when introduced in the name of liberty.

While on our guard against confounding license with liberty of education, we must also avoid another source of confusion, which arises partly from the fact that we commonly look to the civil power to repress license in this as in other matters of public welfare, and partly from the fact that during the past century, the civil power has everywhere been usurping the domain of education as one of its proper functions. Now, most men and women are content to take a fact for a principle, and to imagine that a thing which is wrong in itself can become right, if accepted by a majority or by a reasonable number of people, for a reasonable time; and, because the masses look placidly on this usurpation, the conviction may obtain that the state has not only the duty to protect and promote the free exercise of the sacred rights which parents have to educate their children, but also the exclusive right to permit them to exercise this function at all. This conviction would be a source of hopeless confusion, as it would effectively put parents at the mercy of the state, for the exercise of a sacred and inalienable right, given to them by God, not by the state, and, therefore, a right which the state must not only respect, but also protect and promote, and which, moreover, it cannot without suicidal injustice appropriate as its own.

Freedom of education is the free and unimpeded exercise of the right which parents have to educate their children, to determine what is best for them to learn, and to choose their teachers. This right springs from the duty which parents have of providing for the mental, moral, as well as for the physical, welfare of their children. This duty they are not free to neglect, but they must be free to exercise it in their own way. Both the right and duty of parents to educate their children are quite as sacred as their right and duty to nourish them in their infancy, and foster their physical development. The right, moreover, is as inalienable as the duty, and even when, unable to discharge the duty themselves, they entrust their children to school or tutor, they still retain authority, not only over the children, but also over their masters in all that pertains to their education. In God's providence, they are naturally the best fitted to judge what branches of knowledge their children should acquire, how much time they can devote to study, and for what avocation in life they should prepare; and as they are, also, the most interested, as they are under God chiefly responsible, in watching over the mental and moral development of their offspring, it is clear that they should have free choice of the masters to whom they entrust their children, so that they may repress this charge in men and women who as far as possible will replace themselves.

Self-evident though it be that the right of parents to educate their children follows directly from natural law, it is important to keep in view some reasons why they should possess this right, so as to see more clearly the shameful injustice of those who would deny or limit it. Leo XIII., in his Encyclical *Officio Sanctissimo*, thus speaks in general of the rights of parents: "In those duties which are assumed in the very act of imparting life, let fathers know that many rights are contained, in accordance both with nature and with justice; and that these rights are such that a man may neither free himself from exercising them, nor deprive any man of the same, since one cannot lawfully be absolved by man from duties by which he is bound to God." Now among these rights is surely that of educating the children for whose birth the parents are responsible; since they are bound to see that the life they have imparted be preserved and properly developed and perfected, not only in what concerns the body of their offspring, but chiefly in what concerns the soul. "He who has caused a man to exist must, as far as it is possible and necessary, secure to him the things which are necessary for a human and social life—this being the kind of life to which man is born," is the maxim of Grotius. "It is not easy to imagine or allow," writes Blackstone, quoting Puffendorf, "that a parent has conferred any considerable benefit upon his child by bringing

him into the world if he afterwards neglects his culture and education, and suffers him to grow up a mere beast, to lead a life unbecomingly and shamefully to himself, a natural impulse and moves parents to educate their children, and for this purpose they exert natural fitness, at least to select prudent masters or schools, who themselves are not competent to charge this duty.

If it be asked why we do not rights and special fitness of parents to educate their children, and, as a consequence, on their freedom to choose schools or masters for them, remember that education is not merely to convey or impart an amount of information, or, as been erroneously described, to "milk" what we know to does not know" it is not instruction, even when by instruction the mind of a young man before it can receive and master truth of science; for instruction is a part of education, which is not with one or the other of the or spiritual faculties, but with them, or rather with the entire of the child, which it seeks out, cultivate, develop and physically, intellectually and moulding every part of the training every one of its serve, and act harmoniously soul and its higher spiritual making imagination suborn reason, and subjecting all the of the will. For the parent education means more than this: it means not only perfect natural development of child, but the supernatural progress of the child in the Christ, growth in sanctification in the habit of virtue, in the which turns every earthly to heavenly account. It is then, that, parents worthy of are jealous of their right to the children masters who do them in such ways.

When, therefore, we plead freedom of education we do not any power on earth should freedom of education we that any power on earth should this freedom, which belongs by natural right, but we no earthly power should savor should protect or p something of great benefit fare of the state, and which this pro-secution and denatural law, we appeal to the edgment of this law by the allets of every age, and to end; if statesmen who have found wanting every other on which they thought or up a system of national With states, justice must be tion and aim of every law, no pretext whatever, what sity, or of economy, or of some fancied civic advantage cars abandon it without about their own destruction not do to claim that parents are not competent to attend cation of their children, left to themselves, they neglect it entirely, or ful very imperfectly. Parents very nature of things, are competent to educate their at least to select their schol- ters, than the ordinary of State school system, and if rule in this matter, it is sents who are brought up systems are usually in give their children the m they need. Hence, in charge of the education under this pretext, the s attempting to remedy an largely its own creation, remedy, far from curing perpetuate. The State parents to perform the du ing their children by pr with the necessary mean fishing those who neglect it has the right to pro children whatever parents to educate them, and whose guardians will u task; it may require all know the very title of ac- quired to live as law-ab- dicious members of so may provide special cial instruction for such received a full primary who may wish to offer candidates for special nial service, but his righ- tions stop here. Even economy cannot justify assumes its own the right to educate their children the injustice done, it is which seeks to save the purpose of all that is most effective as a means of perfecting the character.

Finally, the State has to assume entire charge of children, or to difficult for parents, this prerogative, und that common schools for fellow feeling," as we pressed but lately, though of students who go to universities never learning is that the State the same moral principles of all," as if the except in a State in agree on the right to and require "that the instruction that prevent him from being of injury to human decent parents could more, or a national ed- State as well as an in- tion from their parent add a religious educa-