

The Catholic Record.

Published Weekly at 454 and 455 Richmond street, London, Ontario.

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

EDITORS:

REV. GEORGE R. NORTHGRAVES,

Author of "Mistakes of Modern Infidels."

THOMAS COFFEY,

Publisher and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY,

Managers, L. R. BROWN, JOHN BROWN, J. J. BROWN, and W. A. KEVIN, are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transact all other business for the CATHOLIC RECORD.

Rates of Advertising—Ten cents per line each insertion, adage measurement.

Approved and recommended by the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa, and St. Catharines, and the Bishops of Hamilton and Peterborough, 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.

Advertisements must be paid in full before the paper can be stopped.

London, Saturday, October 19, 1895.

THE SCHOOL QUESTION IN ENGLAND.

The question of extending systematic State aid to voluntary schools is at the present moment exciting much discussion in England, and, as in Canada, on the question of religious teaching in the schools, there are two parties with well defined and distinct views.

The voluntary schools are those which have been established under the control of religious bodies, and are mostly Catholic, Church of England, and Wesleyan; and these three bodies are almost unanimously in accord on the importance of maintaining these schools, which, they contend, should be aided by the Government, in proportion to the work done in them, equally with the Public Board schools, in which there is no religious teaching.

Many letters have appeared in the London Times on both sides of the question, among them being one from Cardinal Vaughan, proposing a basis for common action on the part of Catholics, Anglicans and Wesleyans. He maintains that all efficient schools which afford a satisfactory elementary education should be supported by the State, and suggests, as a fair basis for the State educational grant, that a fixed sum should be given for every pupil educated in the religious schools.

This mode of apportioning school monies would not differ greatly from the methods followed in Ontario and Quebec in regard to the Separate schools, Catholic and Protestant, but it is strenuously opposed by most of the non-Conformist bodies, whose representatives maintain that as the people cannot agree upon a common religion, the State should support only a purely secular school system.

The Congregational Union, which met recently at Brighton, has taken this view, and proposes the formation of a national committee to resist all future endowment of religious schools. Other non-Conformist bodies have taken a similar stand.

Statistics show that the voluntary schools have cost ten shillings per pupil less than the Public Board schools, but they are besides less efficient, being in many cases barely existent in a precarious manner; in many instances, also, they have been harassed by the local Board school authorities, but, in spite of this, many of them are highly efficient and are managed quite as ably as the Board schools. This is especially true of the Catholic schools in the important centres of population. These have stood high in the public examinations where their pupils have come into competition with those of the Board schools; and if the proposal of Cardinal Vaughan were carried out there is little room for doubt that the Catholic schools throughout the country would make a good showing.

It has been stated in a cable despatch to the New York Tribune that Lord Salisbury and Mr. Arthur Balfour, the leader of the Government party in the House of Commons, are not disposed to give further aid to the voluntary schools, many of which at the present time are receiving a miserably small amount of State assistance. Mr. Ford writes to the Tribune that the Government will probably say to those who are making the demand for an improvement in this respect, that the Government cannot do anything more than they are doing now for these schools, unless the various denominations which are demanding aid agree upon some common basis on which it may be extended to them. It is interesting to note, however, that all the public declarations and utterances which have been made by members of the Government are positive to the effect that they are in favor of religious education, and that they are willing and anxious to increase its facilities.

Several times both Lord Salisbury and Mr. Balfour have declared this, and only a few days since Mr. Balfour wrote a letter to Lord Cranbourne, the eldest son and Secretary of the Prime

Minister, wherein he indicates this in unmistakable terms.

Lord Cranbourne had called Mr. Balfour's attention to a resolution of the Anglican Church parliamentary party to introduce a motion affirming that many parents are in favor of religious education, and that it is advisable to meet their wishes. Mr. Balfour in his reply speaks of this matter, and thus refers to the voluntary or denominational schools:

"I am extremely anxious that something effectual shall be done to relieve the intolerable strain to which these schools are subjected. This is the general wish of the party and of the Government."

The voluntary schools of England represent the system of education which existed before the Board schools were established. They answered their purpose, and they were almost the only means of education for the bulk of the population until the recent date when it was found necessary to institute the Board schools to supplement their work, as there were many places where there were no voluntary schools, and even where they existed, many parents would not use them, as they had conscientious scruples against so doing; but in instituting the Board schools the Government incorporated the voluntary schools into the public system. The latter were not able, however, to keep pace with the former, which were fostered with a larger share of Government aid, for building, repairs, maintenance, etc., and it is for this reason that all who feel an interest in the voluntary religious schools wish them to be placed on an equal footing with the Board schools, and they ask in the name of justice that this should be done. They maintain with good reason that it is the business of the Government to see that education be given to all the children, but not to manage all the details of what shall be the special character of the teaching, particularly in the matter of religion, and the system of morals founded thereon. These are matters which pertain to parents and the religious guides of the people.

The present Government appears to be in sympathy with these principles, and it is likely to introduce a measure into Parliament to put them into practical operation, if the diverse denominations conducting the religious schools can unite on a mutually satisfactory and equitable plan whereby this may be effected.

The Anglican Provincial synod, representing nearly the whole of Canada, has also by its recent resolutions put itself on record as being in favor of religious teaching in denominational schools; but beyond the Anglicans, not even the Methodists, who in England advocate religious schools, will consent to declare themselves in favor of having them in Canada, though they and others generally assert that they are in favor of religious teaching of some kind. It is not probable, however, that there will be any general system of religious teaching agreed upon by the various sects, and religion will have to be excluded from the schools entirely, as at present, unless they fall into line with the Anglican synod's resolution in favor of parochial or distinctively religious schools.

The Catholics are the only religious body who from the beginning foresaw the consequences of excluding religion from the schools, and the Separate school systems of Ontario, Quebec and Manitoba are results of this foresight. Surely if the various Protestant denominations in the Dominion are "wise in their generation," they will see the necessity of uniting in the demand that the Catholic schools of Manitoba shall be made more efficient, by having a helping hand extended to them by the State, rather than that the cause of religious education should be put back half a century by the destruction of the advance already made in a cause in which all Christians should be deeply interested. It is scarcely possible that the Catholics of Manitoba shall fail in the demand they are now making for a redress of the grievances under which they are laboring, but if they do fail Anglicans and all others who desire a system of religious education must fail also, and it is not unlikely that in the general confusion which will ensue the Protestants of Quebec may be among the first who will lose what privileges they now possess. The guarantees of Confederation cannot be violated in Manitoba without endangering the whole system of guarantees established by the fathers of Canadian Confederation.

Coming back to what is now going on in England in relation to the voluntary schools, we notice that, beside the action of the Anglican Church Parliamentary party, to which we have

already referred, the Archbishop of Canterbury has called together a general conference, which has probably already met and reached some practical conclusion on the subject, so that between the vigorous action of Cardinal Vaughan and that of the Anglican Church it may well be expected that a new impetus will be given to the movement in favor of Christian schools. So far in the United States this movement has developed but little strength. The popular sentiment has been decidedly opposed to it; but it is supposed that in Canada popular sentiment looks to England for precedents of policy rather than to the neighboring Republic. It is, at all events, desirable that this should be the case as far as reverence for religious convictions is concerned, and this is an important factor in the school question.

CHRISTIAN UNITY.

The Anglicans are greatly exercised over the pronouncement of Cardinal Vaughan anent Christian Unity. The case was stated simply and distinctly, too much so for those who are indulging in dreamy and fanciful speculation in the subject. Loyal and unquestioning allegiance to the Catholic Church is the condition *sine qua non* of Christian Unity, and they who cherish the idea of a compromise or a minimizing of certain details, as they are pleased to term them, are hugging a delusion.

And yet all who read Cardinal Vaughan's speech must admire its manliness and straightforwardness. His priestly heart longs to see all within the fold established on earth by the Saviour, and he would be the first to regret the utterance of any word not inspired by holy charity. But truth is immutable, not to be entangled in a net of meaningless phrasings.

There are, we believe, myriads who wish but to see the truth to embrace it. This is well understood by those who read the times aright, and, fearful of losing prestige and place, they dangle before the eyes of their hearers the bauble of a unity absurd and impossible. Taking for granted that religion depends on the individual, they logically set to work to formulate a scheme that may unite Christendom. But the bond that binds man to his Creator has been forged and fashioned by divine agency and given over to a society that alone has the power and means to dominate and to help humanity.

THE CHURCH AND THE BIBLE.

Under the title "Rome's Care for the Bible," the Presbyterian Review of the 10th of October, has a short comment on a lecture delivered by Archbishop Carr in St. Patrick's Cathedral, Melbourne, Australia, proving that it is to the care of the Catholic Church for the Bible that we owe our possession of that precious volume to-day.

The Review says: "The Bible, indeed, the Archbishop would almost have us believe, is the private invention of the Romish Church, its magnificent gift to the world; and but for it, we are assured, there might be no Bible to-day. The Romish Church, in a word, has been a sort of ecclesiastical Providence which has kept the Bible from simply disappearing. This is perhaps the most amusing inversion of history on record."

It is one of the evidences of a bad cause when a polemic is compelled to misrepresent the language of his adversary in order to make a point or to build up an argument, and this is what the Review does.

Certainly the Archbishop did not assert that "Rome" in the Review's sense, invented the Bible; and yet it is certain that Rome had something to do even with the compilation of the Bible. It is certain that two books of the New Testament, at all events, were written by the first Pope or Bishop of Rome, and it is almost, if not quite as certain that they were written at Rome. St. Jerome also assures us that St. Mark's Gospel was written at Rome under supervision of the same first Bishop of Rome.

But apart from this, it is no inversion of history to say that were it not for the care of the Catholic Church for the Bible we would have no Bible to-day.

Now that the art of printing has issued Bibles by millions, it is very easy to say that no power could suppress it, and no want of care could prevent its preservation; but this was not the case during the more than fourteen centuries after Christ, when the Bible, or any other book, could not be issued, until it was written out by hand, and it needs no lengthy proof on

our part to sustain the well-known fact that it was through the manual industry of Catholic monks that Bibles were furnished to all important Churches and scholars during that period; and it is because the Catholic Church used and revered the Bible that such pains were taken to multiply copies of it, and to translate it into many tongues. In fact it was to publish the Bible, and other religious books that before Presbyterianism had a cradle, the art of printing was invented; and the first important work to which this great art was applied was to print the Bible.

The Catholic Church has always revered the Bible, but she has not approved of wilfully mistranslated versions, and this is the basis of the misrepresentations in which the Presbyterian Review, and generally, dishonest controversialists, have indulged in when pretending that the Catholic Church has been an enemy to the Bible. The Catholic Church also disapproves of the misuse and perversion of the Bible to mislead souls through every wind of doctrine.

The Review says the Catholic Church "prudently dispenses with the Bible"; thus distorting Archbishop Carr's true words that she has been "The jealous guardian, the faithful witness, the authoritative interpreter, and the prudent and reverent dispenser of the Bible."

The Review may consider it wit and logic to distort words in this way, but no reasonable reader will regard it as anything but buffoonery.

A PROPOSED CHANGE OF FRONT.

The Episcopalians, or Americanized Anglicans of the United States appear to have become pretty thoroughly impressed with the incongruity of calling themselves "Protestant" and at the same time claiming to be the one Church which Christ instituted. The Church Christ established was not based upon protestation or negation, but on the very opposite principle of His revelation, and hence Christ declared that "he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be condemned." This fundamental principle was further explained by the inspired Apostle to mean that "without faith"—that is, without positive belief in dogma—"it is impossible to be saved."

The idea contained in the term "Protestant" is altogether contrary to this. It gives a sanction to negation, and implies the right and duty of rejecting what the Church teaches, or at least some portion thereof, which is quite alien to the idea of the Church of Christ conveyed by the Holy Scriptures.

Hitherto Anglicans, with the exception of the very modern section of them who are known as High Churchmen or Ritualists, have gloried in the name "Protestant"; and the Church of England is described by its creator, that is by many Acts of Parliament, as not only a Protestant Church, but as the Protestant Church of England, as if it alone were entitled to the glory of that designation.

But it is well known that the Ritualists detest the title "Protestant," as they declare that it marks that the Church is without a purpose unless there is some more ancient Christian Church in existence against which it protests. This is an acknowledgment of the absurdity of the claim set forth by modern Anglicans that Anglicanism has had a continuous existence since the days of the Apostles, and that it is one organization with the Church which was established among the ancient Britons so early as the second century of the Christian era.

It is too late to put forward such a claim, after acknowledging for three and a half centuries that it is a protesting or negative body, and nothing more; that it protests, in fact, against the entire Christianity of nineteen centuries. The change of title is, indeed, an acknowledgment that it has been essentially in the wrong in the past, but it can never restore its unity with the Church of past ages, or supply the links needed to connect it with the Church of the ages which preceded the Reformation, except by returning to the one fold which has continuously subsisted since its establishment by Christ.

The American Episcopal Church is making the first movement toward giving itself a new name. Its official title up to the present moment has been "the Protestant Episcopal Church of America," but as it has grown in importance it has become more and more dissatisfied with this title of its own choice; if with all the changes

which time has wrought in its organization and doctrinal standards it is to be regarded as the same Church which it was a hundred years ago.

There is now in the United States a very general dissatisfaction with the name by which it has hitherto denoted its mutability. Ten years ago it was mooted to change the title of the Church, and the advocates of the change who then forced the question before the general synod to be discussed, though left in a minority, succeeded in getting very nearly half the assemblage to vote with them.

There is being held now a general convention or synod of the Church at Minneapolis, and this question is to be brought forward once more, and the general impression is that it will be carried that the Church shall call itself by a new name, repudiating altogether the designation "Protestant."

The name proposed ten years ago and rejected was "the American Catholic Church." It is supposed that the title which will be proposed, and which may be adopted by the synod now in session, will be "the Holy Catholic Church."

There is something very preposterous in a local institution such as this Church certainly is, presuming to adopt the title Catholic or universal, a title which can belong only to the one Church which possesses the characteristic of threefold universality which Christ declared would belong to His Church when He commanded His apostles to teach all nations all things which He revealed, and promised to remain with them all days to the consummation of the world. Herein it is implied that the Church shall be one organization extending through and teaching all nations; that its doctrine shall be unchanging and always in accord with that which Christ delivered to the saints, and that it should exist in all ages from the time when He announced its first existence. There is one, and only one, Church which possesses, or can possess, these characteristics, and there can be therefore only one Catholic Church.

The claim that Anglicanism or American Episcopalism or both together constitute the one Church of which Christ here speaks, or a branch thereof, is an absurdity. Even taken together these two Churches are simply local institutions, and they have not, nor do they claim, any universal jurisdiction, for they are based upon the theory of independent nationalities in religion, with the denial of any right of universal jurisdiction. It is a contradiction of terms to assert that a Church or organization based on such a theory can be universal or Catholic, and the absurdity of such a claim is rendered all the more glaring by the addition of such a prefix as the American Episcopalians proposed when the title of American Catholic Church was thought of for their designation. We could readily understand the use of the local national prefix, American or Anglo, if it were employed merely to designate the part of the Universal Church existing in any particular country, as America or England; but it is not in this sense that the words are taken here. It is understood that these are independent Churches whose centre is in the nation indicated by the prefix, and the absurdity lies in adding thereto a designation which implies universality.

We are aware that those who are so fond of flaunting the name "Catholic" in union with a national prefix will say, as they do say in fact, that if there is an incongruity or contradiction of terms in the expressions Anglo-Catholic, American Catholic, etc., there must be the same incongruity in the expression "Roman Catholic." This is not the case.

The expression "Roman Catholic" is not self-contradictory, for the reason that the prefix "Roman" is not used here to signify the nationality of the Church, but for the purpose of indicating where we are to find the central authority of a Church which is truly universal, and whose jurisdiction is therefore not limited by any national boundaries. There is, therefore, no similarity between the two cases. It is not pretended by the most extreme High Churchmen that the Archbishop Bishops of New York State, has universal authority. Their churches are, therefore, purely local, as the late Lord Macaulay said in his review of Burke's history of the Popes: "as local as the court of Common Pleas."

Language at the best is scarcely adequate to express every shade of thought, and if by any far-fetched interpretation there be found some incongruity in the expression "Roman Catholic," it arises from the

inadequacy of human speech, and not from any inconsistency in the idea intended to be conveyed. Yet we venture to assert that the designation is fairly appropriate. It must be remembered, however, that the term Roman Catholic is not the precise name of the Catholic Church, as she has never adopted it as her designation.

It is the name forced on the Church by English legislation, and accepted by the local Church authorities as sufficiently descriptive, but the real title of the Church is "Catholic," or, as more fully set forth in the Nicene Creed: "One, holy, Catholic, and Apostolic." The Church is Roman, however, inasmuch as it is subject to the See of Rome; and in the Concordat with France it was agreed between Napoleon I. and the Pope that its legal title in France should be "Roman and Catholic," which is more descriptive of its real character than the name given by British legislation, which, however, we do not by any means repudiate; but it is to be understood in its proper sense.

It is further to be remarked that as the title Catholic is entirely inappropriate to either the Anglican or the American Protestant Episcopal Church, it must be inapplicable to these churches individually, for a more cogent reason. These Churches are not in any sense branches of one Church, notwithstanding their resemblances to each other. They are distinct and independent individualities, and they even differ somewhat in doctrine, the American Church having materially changed the prayer book to adapt it to the American mind.

It must also be said that the Anglican Church in Canada is quite distinct from that of England, as it some years since declared itself an independent organization, not subject in any way to the Church in England. It has not yet departed from the common doctrinal standard, in theory at least, but there is not the least doubt that it will do so in time. This is the natural consequence of a divided authority, and it is not to be expected that unity of doctrine will last very long, where there is no central authority to preserve it.

Some other changes are to be proposed in the constitution of the American Church, but we shall not undertake to discuss them till they assume a more definite form than that in which they appear at present.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

RIGHT REV. D. O'CONNOR, D.D., administered confirmation last Sunday in the parish of La Salle, of which Rev. P. Corcoran is pastor.

The Rev. J. C. Madill, ex-President of the P. P. A. of Canada, is quite dissatisfied with the conduct of one-half of the P. P. A. party in the Ontario Legislature! Speaking a few days ago in Forest, he said: "They in West Lambton have no further use for Lister. He could be pleased if any Grit would point out any one thing that Lister has done for Lambton. He has always voted with his party, regardless of his constituency. Sarnia is the largest town in Canada without a good post office, and it is also the home of Lister." And so the P. P. A. policy, which was to have revolutionized Canada, and to have rid Ontario in particular of Jesuits and Catholics generally, has degenerated into a grab for public buildings in a town which by a singular coincidence is Mr. Madill's home, as well as Mr. Lister's. Rev. Mr. Madill is a staunch representative of the element which is very much in need of common sense, intelligence, and—soap.

The Canadian Magazine for October contains a number of very interesting articles. Ltut. Col. Denison writes of Lord Wolseley, and gives much information concerning the distinguished soldier. Madge Morton has a racy article on the womanly woman, and takes occasion to administer many a sharp knock to the hideous phantom yeelp the New Woman. It is a common-sense talk that will be appreciated by all whose ideas of woman are portrayed by the virgin and purity within the hallowed precincts of the home, and not by the virago clamoring for rights on public platforms. The New Woman has become an unmitigated nuisance, and when she is buried by her sisters we shall inscribe on her tombstone: "Here Lies the Colossal Humbug of the century." It is a pity that the editor did not manifest a nicer sense of discrimination in his selection of the articles. Take, for instance, the fiction entitled, "Love Story of a Pope." The writer styles himself a lay member of