



"AD MAJOREM DEI GLORIAM."

THE ONLY CATHOLIC PAPER PUBLISHED IN ENGLISH IN NORTH-WESTERN CANADA.

VOL. XII, No. 27.

WINNIPEG, MANITOBA, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 6, 1897.

{ \$2.00 per year.  
Single Copies, 5 cents.

## CATHOLICS OF MASSEY RIVER PROTEST.

Massey River, Dec. 20, 1896.

At a public meeting of the Catholics of the district held after High Mass, the following resolution was carried unanimously:

Whereas, The Dominion Government endeavored to sacrifice our school to our enemies, the Manitoba Government, contrary to the decision of the Privy Council and the constitution:

Be it Resolved, That we protest against the scandalous surrender of our rights in our schools to the Manitoba by the Dominion Government; and, as we want nothing but our rights to have our schools restored to us as they were previous to the act passed in 1890, and that our taxes be applied to our own school and no other, and that we consider it our duty to support our noble Archbishop by every means in our power until all the school rights are restored to us.

Signed on behalf of the meeting.

JOHN M'DONELL,  
ANGUS M'DONALD,  
ANTOINE RICHARD.

The following letter appeared in the Free Press of the 29th Dec.

### "THE PRACTICAL SIDE."

To the Editor of the Free Press.

Sir,—To many citizens your article, headed "The Practical Side," will undoubtedly prove to be something of an eye-opener, inasmuch as it must convince all your readers that the proposed changes in the school law, which the promoters intend should settle the school question, but which the Catholics (and surely none should know better), have most emphatically declared will not settle it, will undoubtedly tend to throw the whole public school system of Manitoba into confusion and seriously interfere with the practical administration of the public schools of the province. Will you allow me to put before your readers a few of the reasons why, it seems to me, the Catholics can not and will not accept the proposals, and incidentally to add a word or two to what you have already said regarding the absurdities of the promised legislation.

In the first place Catholics say that the proposals would not ease them of the persecution under which they have suffered for six long years, but would simply clinch the obnoxious provisions of the intolerable act of 1890. A common sense study of the position will make this contention clear. What was the act of 1890? It was a law abolishing separate schools and compelling Catholics to send their children to the public schools or go without any share of taxes which they pay towards the cost of primary education in this province. The proposed amendments would not make the slightest change in this state of things. The sum of the constitutional grievance as declared by the Privy Council was the destruction of the Catholic idea of education, and a remedy for that grievance can be found only in a plan which will restore the principle of Catholic schools. Yet the proposed settlement does nothing of the kind; it retains as the public schools of the province to which Catholic children are to be sent the very schools which have existed under the obnoxious law of 1890, without the slightest change regarding their management or the text books to be used therein, but simply with the addition of a deceiving provision regarding religious teaching which is a delusion and a snare, a further provision which is even more paltry and absurd regarding the employment in certain cases of Catholic teachers, and an additional clause arranging for the teaching of English to children of French Canadian and foreign parents through the medium of their mother tongue. The one thing which Catholics have been contending for is still to be withheld from them, and they are asked to accept a measure which not only does not rest their constitutional rights, but which as a matter of fact, would perpetuate schools just as obnoxious from a Catholic point of view as the present public schools.

Allow me briefly to consider two of the three proposed changes. The clauses regarding religious instruction provide that any Christian (Clergyman—why not Jewish Rabbi?) may be authorized by a majority of the school trustees, on the petition of the parents or guardians of ten children in a rural district, or twenty-five in any city, town or village, to give religious teaching on specific days, from 3.30 to 4 o'clock. With-

out stopping to consider what a travesty of religious teaching this would be even if carried out to the full extent the law would allow, let us see how really absurd and unworkable it is and how it must effectually lead to purely secular schools and thus, it may be remarked, carry out the real aim of the promoters of the 1890 school act. In the first place religious teaching is treated as a thing that is simply tolerable after a specified number of parents have petitioned for it. Even then it is only tolerable for thirty minutes in a day when the children are tired, longing for freedom and when to be kept in for an additional half-hour will seem to them an intolerable penance, with the result that religious instruction under such circumstances instead of being beneficial to them will become perfectly odious. But apart from this view of the matter the proposal is positive-unworkable. In your article you have given some good points which prove this and there are many others which you did not give. For instance, in Winnipeg Catholic children would probably be scattered around in a large number of schools and a corresponding number of clergymen would need to daily hold themselves in readiness to rush in at the exact moment that school would be dismissed, and if that could not be arranged (and every one knows it would be a physical impossibility) the clergyman would have to authorize "teachers or some other persons" to do the work for them. It is one thing to authorize and another to enforce, and no provision can be devised by which clergymen shall be able to select teachers for the schools or compel those appointed by the school trustees to do this duty, and this is evidently the reason why the words, "or other persons," are inserted, so that in case the teacher refuses to act in the clergyman's behalf, or there may be no teachers qualified to so act, "some other person" may be selected, and it would naturally follow that Catholic parents would have to keep up a regular staff of such persons to attend to this matter daily, or suffer their children to be brought up under an absolutely secular system of education. The time has not yet arrived in Canada when legislators dare openly to drive God out of the schools, but they have surely done their best in this case by arranging an absurd and complicated set of permissive conditions, which will make it as difficult as possible to bring Him into the public schools of Winnipeg. Truly the "religious" clauses of this treacherous arrangement are not only absurd and unworkable, but in their intent and meaning are hypocritical and anti-Christian.

The clause regarding the appointment of Catholic teachers is no less absurd. Wherever in cities there is an average attendance of forty Catholic pupils or upwards, or twenty-five or upwards in the country, the trustees may on petition appoint on Roman Catholic teacher. One absurdity about this is that if in a city school the average attendance of Catholic pupils was only thirty-nine or under, and in a country school twenty-four or under, the necessary petition could not be got up, and there could be no Catholic teacher, so far as this provision is concerned whilst, on the other hand, if there were several hundreds of Catholic pupils in the school there could be only one teacher. But, more than that, clause 8 distinctly shows that the teacher is not to be there for the purpose of instructing Catholic children, inasmuch as it provides there shall be no separation of pupils by religious denominations during the secular school work. It would naturally follow that in most cases the Catholic teacher would probably be instructing the Protestant children, whilst the Protestant teachers would almost invariably be placed over the Catholic pupils, and this being so it is difficult to see why such a provision was put into the arrangement, unless that it might be used by interested parties in deceiving fair minded people by saying, as it has already been falsely said by politicians in the east, that Catholic teachers are to be provided for Catholic children.

It will thus be seen that as a matter of fact, there is nothing in the nature of restoration of Catholic rights either in the provisions regarding religious teaching or in that concerning employment of Catholic teachers. Yet these two provisions, and the paltry one regarding the teaching of English to French Canadians and foreign children, embody the whole of the changes which it is proposed to make in the school act, and outside of these the schools are to remain exactly as they have been since 1890. There is to be no change in their control—in Winnipeg the same Protestant board of trustees which

now manages the public schools will go on managing them for the future, and Catholic views will be entirely without representation on the governing body. There is to be no change in the text books—the same un-Catholic and in many instances anti-Catholic histories, the same readers as are at present used in the public schools will be used in the future—in a world. Catholic children are to be offered schools in which they may spend their days in an atmosphere permeated with Protestantism or irreligion, to be taught in most cases by Protestant, or, it may possibly be, non-Christian teachers, out of books literally teeming with Protestant and un-Catholic views.

These are some of the reasons why Catholics, it seems to me, cannot fairly be asked to accept the arrangement. The constitution guarantees them their educational rights, and the Imperial Privy Council has declared it to be the duty of the Dominion government to see that those rights are restored, and having the constitution on their side they cannot be expected to give up the battle until religious liberty again prevails in the province. In the meantime, considering the proposed amendments will not settle the school question, and fomenting the rivalry and bickerings which the religious clauses will undoubtedly give rise to amongst the various sects, with the almost certain results that the children will ultimately be given a purely secular education, will sincere Protestants, who are proud of the present public school system, allow its best features to be destroyed by a set of scheming politicians, who, for their own purely selfish reasons, intend to tamper with that system by introducing regulations which are utterly ridiculous and which must eventually, after much strife and trouble, drive every vestige of Christianity out of the public schools of the country?

F. W. R.

P. S.—It may not be amiss to add a note that the paragraph alluding to Protestantism in the school's will not, I hope, be taken as a sneer at Protestant ideas or teachers. Nothing of the kind is intended—my only object being to show how the matter stands from a Catholic point of view.

Winnipeg, Dec. 26.

## THE BIBLE NOT A SUFFICIENT RULE OF FAITH.

(N. Y. Freeman's Journal.)

A Canadian subscriber sends us a small pamphlet requesting that we make some comment on it. It is issued by a Protestant tract society of Toronto, and claims to prove that the Catholic Church is at variance with the Bible. The plan of the author of the tract is to first state what he believes to be a Catholic doctrine, then state the contrary or contradictory of it, and then endeavor to prove the latter from the Bible. The plan is a good one. It makes the issues clear and in few words. Some of his statements of Catholic doctrine are correct, others are incorrect and others misleading. In dealing with each we will refer it to its proper class.

The first proposition which the tract says down as Catholic doctrine is this: "Holy Scripture does not contain all that is necessary to salvation." This we accept as a correct statement of what Catholics believe.

In opposition to the above the tract gives the following: "Holy Scripture does contain all that is necessary to salvation," and endeavors to prove it from Scripture. These two propositions being contrary, it follows that if the former be true the latter is false, and if the latter be true the former is false. Therefore, if we show that the latter is false, we prove the truth of the former or Catholic proposition. Let us then consider the latter, namely, that the Scripture contains all that is necessary to salvation.

The Rev. Mr. Gardner, the author of the tract, recognizes the precept of sanctifying the Sunday, that obedience to this precept is necessary to salvation, for to disregard it is to disobey God, and to disobey God brings condemnation. But this precept is not found anywhere in the Scripture. Therefore there is at least one thing necessary to salvation that the Scripture does not contain. This one exception is sufficient to upset his proposition. The Scripture in many places commands that the Sabbath, the seventh day, Saturday, be kept holy. "Remember that thou keep holy the Sabbath day. Six days shalt thou labor and shall do all thy work. But on the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God. Thou shalt do no work on it." (Exodus xx., 8-9.) The Rev. Mr. Gardner will look in vain

for any text of Scripture abrogating this command or giving a new one. Now, as he can find no authority in the Scripture relieving him from the above command recorded in the Scripture, he must admit one of two things; either that there is some authority not found in the Scripture to justify his disregard of the written law or that he has been all his life disobeying the command to keep Saturday, the seventh day, holy. In a word, that he has not been doing what is necessary to salvation, and is therefore not in the way of salvation. To justify his conduct he must go out of his Bible and appeal to Christian tradition. The Scripture, then, does not contain all that is necessary to salvation.

But there are other things in Rev. Mr. Gardner's view that are necessary to salvation and yet are not found in the Scriptures. He does not find in them any statement defining what constitutes the Bible, how many books complete it. There is no list of such books in the Bible. The only authority he has for the book as at present made up is that of tradition and the Catholic church. He can find no authority in the Bible that any of its books are authentic, and no authority that the Bible as a whole is inspired, no authority that it has not been corrupted in the course of ages or that it has been correctly translated. As a matter of fact he has accepted the book as divine on authority external to it, on Jewish and Christian tradition, and the authority of the Catholic church. He has done this unconsciously, and never thought of analyzing the process by which he arrived at his present mental attitude in regard to the book.

But the Bible itself gives unmistakable evidence that it does not contain all that is necessary to salvation. St. Paul in his second epistle to the Thessalonians (ii., 14.) says: "Brethren, stand fast and hold the traditions which you have learned by word or by our epistles." Here St. Paul makes no distinction between traditions handed down by word and the truths contained in his letter. Both are to be held as of equal authority. Where in the Bible do we find those traditions which the Thessalonians received by word of mouth? They wrote no book to tell us what they were. They were evidently necessary to salvation, since the great apostle exhorted them to stand fast and hold them.

Again, in his first epistle to the Corinthians (xi., 2), the same Apostle writes: "Now I praise you, my brethren, that in all things you are mindful of me, and keep my ordinances as I have delivered them to you." What were these ordinances? As this is St. Paul's first letter to the Corinthians it is evident that these ordinances were instructions which he had given them by word of mouth. Were these ordinances now? The Corinthians have left no book to tell us what they were. You may say they are in other parts of the Bible, but you have no statement in the Bible to that effect, and gratuitous assumptions do not go.

Ag in, St. Paul wrote to Timothy: "O Timothy, keep that which is committed to thy trust. Hold the form of sound words which thou hast heard of me in faith, and the love which is in Christ Jesus." Where are these things committed to the trust of Timothy, where the form of sound words which he heard from St. Paul? Timothy wrote no book to tell us of these precious things. Are they lost? No, they come down to us by tradition from the oral teaching of Timothy. They are in the sacred deposit of revealed truth confided to the church.

Again, to the same Timothy St. Paul wrote: "The things which thou hast heard from me before many witnesses, the same command to faithful men who shall be fit to teach others also. (II. Tim., ii., 2.) As we have said, Timothy left no record in writing of the things which he heard from St. Paul and which he was to teach to others. There is no evidence in the Bible that they are recorded there. We cannot assume that they were unnecessary things, for that assumption would impeach the wisdom and inspiration of St. Paul.

Again, St. John in his second epistle, verse 12, writes: "Having more things to write unto you, I would not by paper and ink, for I hope that I shall be with you and speak face to face, that your joy may be full." And in his third epistle he repeats to Gaius almost the same words: "I had many things to write unto thee, but I would not by ink and paper write to thee. But I hope speedily to see thee, and we will speak mouth to mouth." (Verses 13 and 14.) Where are these oral instructions of the Apostle to the lady

Electa and her family and to Gaius? Again, there are twenty-two books referred to in the Old Testament that are no longer found there, that are lost. For instance, the Book of the Covenant, mentioned in Exodus, xxiv., 7; the Book of the Just, cited in Josue, x., 13, and in II. Kings, i., 18; the Three Thousand Parables of Solomon, III. Kings, iv., 32; the Thousand and Five Poems of Solomon, III. Kings, iv., 32; the Book of Nathan the Prophet, I. Paralipomenon, or Chronicles, xxvii., 29; the Book of Gad the Seer, I. Paralipomenon, xxvii., 25. We need cite no more. There are in all twenty-two lost books of the Old Testament, and there is nothing in the New Testament stating that it contains all the inspired writings of the Apostles. Now, in view of these lost books, what valid reason has Rev. Mr. Gardner for saying that the remnant that remains to us contains all that is necessary to salvation? From the beginning to the end of the Bible he cannot point to a single text stating that the book as now constituted contains all that is necessary. That, it would seem, is a necessary text, but it is wanting. And as he repudiates any authority outside the Bible, he has no evidence whatever that the Bible contains all that is necessary to salvation. His statement, therefore, is not proved, and as a consequence the Catholic proposition that the Bible does not contain all that is necessary, stands.

We will now consider some of the texts quoted by Rev. Mr. Gardner in proof of his contention, and see their bearing.

He quotes St. Paul's second epistle to Timothy, iii., 15, as follows:—"From a child thou hast known the Holy Scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation, through faith in which is in Christ Jesus."

The Scriptures referred to here were the books of the Old Testament, for in the infancy of Timothy a good part of the New Testament was not written, and none of its books were at that time placed on the canon of the Scripture books. If, then, his text proves anything to the purpose, it proves too much, namely, that the books of the New Testament are not necessary to salvation. Is Rev. Mr. Gardner ready to accept this result?

Again, St. Paul makes the profitability of the Scriptures known to Timothy in infancy, that is the Old Testament, depends on the faith which in Christ Jesus. In other words, it is through the light of this faith in Christ that the Scriptures known to Timothy could make wise unto salvation. Timothy acquired this faith in Christ not from the Old Testament, which he knew from infancy, nor from the New Testament, which was not yet written, but from the oral teaching of St. Paul. He then acquired the true faith in Christ without either the Old Testament. Since faith, according to St. Paul, is necessary to an understanding of the Scriptures, this faith must precede a correct knowledge of them. It is a condition sine qua non of understanding the Scriptures. This is what the text proves. Rev. Mr. Gardner will admit that faith is necessary to salvation, since without faith, it is impossible please God. Since this faith precedes the understanding of the Scriptures, as is clearly indicated by St. Paul's words to Timothy, how can Rev. Mr. Gardner acquire it? He cannot acquire it from the Scriptures, for to understand them or believe that they are inspired, he must first have that faith in Christ which St. Paul tells us makes the Scriptures profitable to salvation. The Scriptures, then, do not impart that faith that is necessary to salvation; they presuppose it. Therefore, there is at least one thing necessary that is not found in the Scriptures, namely, the faith in Christ referred to by St. Paul, and by the light of which the meaning of the Scripture is seen.

Whence must this faith come? From the living church which Christ built upon a rock and commissioned to teach all nations. It is the sanction of this church that gives the Scriptures their value to us, because it alone can verify their inspiration. Rev. Mr. Gardner quotes his text: "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished to all good works." (Timothy, II., 16.) This text does not tell us what is meant by "all Scripture." It certainly does not mean all kinds of writing (scripture) for that would prove too much. It meant some definite books known to Timothy, but it does not tell us what they are, and consequently it affords

(Continued on page 3.)