

The Catholic Record.
 Published Weekly at 486 and 488 Richmond
 street, London, Ontario.
 Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

EDITORS:
 REV. GEORGE R. NORTHGRAVES,
 Author of "Mistakes of Modern Catholics."
 THOMAS COFFEY,
 Publisher and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY,
 Messrs. LUKE KING, JOHN NICH, P. J.
 NEVIN and WM. A. NEVIN, are fully author-
 ized to receive subscriptions and transact all
 other business for the CATHOLIC RECORD.
 Rates of Advertising—Ten cents per line each
 insertion, space measured.
 Approved and recommended by the Arch-
 bishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa, and St.
 Boniface, and the Bishops of Hamilton and
 Peterboro, 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.
 Advertisers must be paid in full before the paper
 can be stopped.

London, Saturday, April 25, 1896.

REVERENCE TO THE BLESSED VIRGIN.

In a recent issue of a Moncton, N. B., paper there appears a report of a sermon preached by the Rev. W. B. Hinson of the Reformed Episcopal Church, on Good Friday morning, the subject being announced as "The Seven Utterances from the Cross."

These last utterances of our Blessed Lord are words full of charity for all mankind, implying the intense love which led Him to pray at that time of His agony, even for His persecutors. It would seem hard to distort such words to the extent to which Mr. Hinson has done in his sermon. But he belongs not to the Church of England, whose clergy are now-a-days at least usually disposed to charity; but to a Church which is founded on the principles of hate and misrepresentation of Catholic doctrine, and he fully keeps up the character under which his Church seceded from Anglicanism.

The secession of the Reformed Episcopal Church was based upon the hypothesis that Anglicanism does not erect sufficient barricades against Popery, and certainly Reformed Episcopalianism as it is represented by such men as Rev. W. B. Hinson, does carry out its purpose of keeping up special barriers in the shape of misrepresentations which the rest of the civilized world has relegated to the shades of Ilium.

But we would like to be informed if the original Church of Christ had for its foundation the same principle on which Reformed Episcopalianism is based, opposition to Popery. If this is really the case, and it is the only hypothesis on which Reformed Episcopalianism can claim to be the Church of God, Popery must be ancient indeed, not only more ancient than the Reformed Episcopalianism would have us believe, but more so than we ourselves claim it to be, for we only claim that the primacy was given to St. Peter, the first Pope, when our Blessed Lord made him the rock whereon he built his Church, whereas this hypothesis would make Popery more ancient than the Christian Church itself.

This point is too farcical for serious argument. We scarcely think the most zealous Reformed Episcopalian would pretend that his Church is the one which Christ established on earth, or that Christ established His Church on the new-fangled notion of opposition to Popery, which is the foundation-stone of Reformed Episcopalianism. There can be no claim, therefore, that Reformed Episcopalianism is the pure and original Church of Christ, and we are not even aware that any polemist of that Church has claimed that it is so.

But let us consider Rev. Mr. Hinson's sermon apart from the character of the sect of which he is a minister. He chooses to make an attack on Catholics by occasion of the words which Christ addressed to St. John and the Blessed Virgin while the two were at the foot of the cross bemoaning the ignominious death to which his Master and her Son was subjected.

Christ said to John: "Behold thy mother," and to Mary: "Behold thy son." Mr. Hinson, by a very queer process of reasoning, asserts that by these words Christ dealt a heavy blow against the Catholic Church. He says:

"These utterances deal heavy blows at that Church which has claimed for Mary what she never claimed for herself; for if, as Catholicism suggests, Mary be equal with, if not superior to, the Deity, how could Christ have told John she henceforth would be to him as a mother, and He be to her as a son? Small wonder is it that the bible is a closed book to the professors of such a faith; for she to whom the Lord in His youth said: 'Wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business,' and here other words of our Lord are quoted—but we do not conclude the sentence, because Mr. Hinson does not do so. The gentleman probably imagines that he has issued a powerful argument, but as he has

not sufficient respect for the rules of Lindley Murray to say what she (the Blessed Virgin) did, said, or thought, we cannot penetrate his meaning, or see the force of the argument.

However, he adds at the end: "Ah no! Mary took her proper place when she said 'My spirit hath rejoiced in God my Saviour,' and when Catholicism would enthroner her queen of the skies, it seeks to do that for which no authority is to be found in the word of God."

Mr. Hinson's assertion that Catholics place Mary on an equality with, or in a position superior to, the Deity is a falsehood not worth refuting seriously. Only those among Protestants whose ignorance is too gross to listen to common sense give such assertions any credit, for all know that Catholics honor the saints as God's special friends and servants, and Mary as being the first among God's friends and servants, because she is the Mother of God, the second Person of the Adorable Trinity. We do not give divine honor to any creature.

Catholics do not give to Mary any position which she did not in modesty and humility claim for herself; for she said: "He that is mighty hath done great things to me and holy is his name—and behold from henceforth all generations shall call me blessed." (St. Luke i, 48.) Mr. Hinson's admirers may well consider whether they are included among the faithful Christians of whom these things are foretold. Are they not rather among those who vilify and abuse the Mother of God? We know it to be a fact that this is the course of those Protestants who take Mr. Hinson's path of maintaining that the Mother of God is not to be honored.

When our Blessed Lord was dying on the cross He committed her to His disciple, the beloved one by pre-eminence, to be loved, cherished and respected as a mother. It certainly requires wonderful acumen to discover in this fact a proof that the Blessed Virgin ought to be treated with disrespect and the contempt with which she is usually regarded by Christians of Mr. Hinson's stamp. We remember that some years ago in the parish of Blackheath, near London, there was a no-Popery demonstration, at which the image of Christ crucified was dragged through the mire, and the effigy of the Blessed Virgin burned by Mr. Hinson's co-religionists. While this disgraceful scene was going on one of the mob said to a Catholic Irishwoman who was looking on: "See what treatment your Virgin is getting." The Irish woman answered: "Yes! I see, but she has a Son who will make you smoke for it yet."

Does Mr. Hinson think that the reverence which our Lord intended that St. John should show toward the mother designated for him is a justification for the rabid hatred with which teachers of Mr. Hinson's class endure their flocks with regard to the Blessed Virgin? We prefer to think that it is an evidence that we too should regard her as our mother, for we believe that in commanding St. John to regard her in this light, our Lord intended that all faithful Christians should do likewise. Christ's words on the cross are a heavy blow to Blackheath mobs and to all who like Rev. Mr. Hinson would refuse to the Blessed Virgin the honor due to her as Mother of God.

A. P. A. TACTICS.

The A. P. A. of the United States are playing either a very wily trick, or one which must result in their greater degradation in the eyes of the public, if there is a lower depth to be attained by an association whose every successive act has been such as to make it more and more contemptible and ridiculous. We are strongly inclined to the belief that the course it is now pursuing will prove to be as great a failure as its previous escapades.

A conference of this proscriptive association took place at Washington last month at which it was decided to bring the forces of the order into operation so as to oblige both political parties of the Republic to make a declaration of A. P. A. principles. It was also decided to use their influence in the selection of a Republican candidate for the Presidency, who would be favorable to their order, if not a member of it, and it has been for some time understood that Governor McKinley, of Ohio, would be their candidate.

The Philadelphia Times stated in a recent issue that only within the last few weeks it was discovered that A. P. A. organizations of the country are enlisted in Mr. McKinley's favor, and that the fact has "chilled the ardor of very many fair-minded Republicans who would be quite willing to accept McKinley if fairly nominated

by the honest expressions of the Republican party."

The same journal asserts that it is the A. P. A. element which stirred up opposition to several others who have been designated as likely candidates for Presidential honors, among whom are Messrs. Reed, Morton, Quay, Cullom, Davis, and Manderson, in their respective States.

Gov. McKinley himself has been ominously silent concerning the A. P. A., and therein he has acted very differently from the other possible candidates whom we have named, especially Messrs. Morton and Cullom, who have been very outspoken in denunciation of secret, political proscription on religious grounds.

But Mr. McKinley's silence has not been pleasant to others than himself. The Catholics look upon him suspiciously on account of it, and respectable Protestant Republicans are incensed at the double game he appears to be playing; and now it is further announced that the A. P. A. have taken umbrage at his silence, or at least they make a pretence of it, so that, on the 13th inst., Judge J. H. D. Stephens, of Cincinnati, Chairman of the National Executive Committee of the Apaisists, announced that the order "will not support Mr. McKinley, either for the nomination, or in the election, if he be nominated," giving for reason for this that "the Major (McKinley) has treated the A. P. A. with indifference," and the judge adds that "the A. P. A. will fight him to the last, and W. S. Linton is the coming man."

It is just what might be expected from Apaisists. They will attend the Republican convention and will endeavor to capture it, being under obligations freely taken that they will give their support to the Convention's nominee, but if the result do not suit them they will turn tail on the party and their promises at the same time.

It is hard to say whether Judge Stephens is honest in his declaration that the society will drop their recent pet, the Ohio Major. Nothing that is really honest can be expected from such a quarter, and the plan may be to divert public attention from the support which has hitherto been ostentatiously given to Mr. McKinley. At all events, Linton does not appear to have the ghost of a chance of the party nomination, or of election if he be nominated. He is the Congressional Representative of a Michigan district, and has rendered himself notorious by his opposition to the statue of Father Marquette in the statuary hall of the Capitol, but he is not distinguished as a statesman, and the country would be blind indeed if it were to elect him to the high office of the Presidency. But there is not the least likelihood of such a thing occurring, as even in his own town, Saginaw, he has received such a rebuff at the late elections that his A. P. A. brother, who ran for the mayoralty, was beaten by a majority of 1,600, where the Democrats usually obtain only 500 votes all told. Apaisism is evidently coming to be taken already at a great discount even in its strongholds of Michigan, and it is scarcely to be expected that it will capture the country while its hold is so precarious in its own cradle.

Col. McClure, who is the editor of the Philadelphia Times, already quoted in this article, says:

"The fact that a secret and powerful element is likely to become the leading or controlling factor in the nomination for President, is a clear indication that a general recasting of political lines is not far distant. The party that becomes the creature of a secret organization may win a temporary victory, but only to hasten its dissolution. Even so great an organization as the Republican party cannot survive the demoralization that must inevitably follow such a control of its councils and actions."

Mr. Linton's pretence on which he founded his opposition to the Marquette statue was that Father Marquette was not a citizen of the United States, and therefore that the law providing for the admission of statues to the Capitol at the request of the State Legislatures did not contemplate such a case as the present; and also that it is improper that there should be a statue in ecclesiastical dress. As regards the first objection, it may be remarked that there is truth in the allegation that the great Jesuit explorer was not an American citizen. In this respect he was in the same category with Columbus, and for the very same reason, that the time was rather early. The second objection is thus disposed of by the Detroit News of 13th April:

"The reverend figure of the pious explorer has a place in the circle of the country's great benefactors, and Linton's resolution lies buried in the Library Committee, and this is all the senseless agitation amounts to, except to exhibit an unworthy and excessive

excitement over the preference of the sculptor's chisel in tracing out a cassock and cowl for the consecrated discoverer, instead of a full-dress suit and silk hat, which were not generally worn when he was engaged in his merciful mission in Michigan and Wisconsin."

This blundering organization has just rendered itself ridiculous by another act.

To the present time the United States torpedo boats have been painted white, but it has occurred to the naval authorities this color rendered them too conspicuous an object in the water, and it has been decided to have them all painted sea green. There was certainly no intention to show special deference to Catholics or Irishmen in this choice of color, but the A. P. A. have taken offence at it, and threaten to impeach Secretary Herbert for issuing the order, the more especially because by a coincidence it was signed on St. Patrick's day.

The Apaisists declare that is an act of deference to Irish Catholics, and by petition they have asked Congress to annul the law. The Navy department will pay no attention to the petitions, and the boats are to be painted green as decided upon.

The green flag of the sixty-ninth New York regiment was very acceptable to the war authorities when carried side by side with the stars and stripes during the war with the Southern Confederacy, and President Cleveland is not the man to pay any attention to the senseless bigotry of an organization which has committed so many follies as the A. P. A. have been guilty of.

THE SIN OF SCHISM.

It is certain from Scripture and ecclesiastical tradition that Christ in establishing His Church intended it should be one fold, and so we find that the Apostles were joined by a bond of unity through the efficacy of Christ's prayer that they should be one even as He and His Heavenly Father are one. During the succeeding ages also one faith was preserved throughout the world by union and submission to the one supreme authority of St. Peter's successor.

National vanity and the rebellious spirit of man have ever been the causes why this essential unity of the Church has been broken by schism and heresy, and it is from these causes that Protestantism sprung up. It is in the natural course of events, therefore, that there should be divisions into sects, but there is nothing supernatural or spiritually good in these divisions.

In reference to the recent division in the Salvation Army there was at first a burst of enthusiasm in the United States on account of Mr. Ballington Booth's declaration of independence, for it flattered the vanity of those who followed their leader into the new organization of American Salvationists or Volunteers. But sober second thought has brought about a change, and now the newspapers are beginning to blame the ex-Commandant for having by insubordination broken up an organization which had done so much natural good by rescuing numerous unfortunates from the slums, though it did not furnish them with any more substantial religion than the beating of drums and the persuasion that they were saved.

It is now understood that Mr. Ballington Booth's schism has weakened the power of the Army to do good, and this is declared to be a great evil brought about by his stubbornness. It is certainly not what we would expect from the Apostles, that they would break the unity of the Church for the sake of flaunting the American flag, and of ripping out the red trimmings from their garments because they are supposed to represent British domination.

On the other hand, it is to be said that Mr. Ballington Booth had the same right to establish a new Army, as his father had to start the original one, and as Martin Luther, Calvin and Henry VIII. had to establish the sects which they originated.

St. Paul numbers sects or schisms among the sins which separate men from God and shut them out from the Heavenly Kingdom, but the schisms he speaks of are those which separate from an authority divinely instituted, and not those which spring up among man-made organizations, even though they dignify themselves with the name of churches.

There was a sin of schism in the separation of the Reformers from the Catholic Church, but it is a fallacy to suppose that either the Salvationist Commandant or the four or five hundred other sects of Protestantism were

guilty of schism in separating from each other. They had certainly more right and less wrong in doing this than had the sects from which they separated to depart from Catholic unity, and in setting up their new-fangled Churches they followed the principle of individual judgment in religious matters, which Protestantism proclaimed to be the right of every human being.

THE REMEDIAL BILL.

As has been anticipated for some time, the Remedial Bill for Manitoba has been withdrawn from the further consideration of the present Parliament. Sir Charles Tupper moved that the Committee rise, and it was further announced that there is other business to which Parliament must devote its attention during the few days which remain for its existence. After that business is completed, he said, the remainder of the session would be devoted if possible to the Remedial Bill, but it is perfectly understood that it is now impossible to complete its consideration.

It was always our desire that Manitoba itself should settle this troublesome question. There has not been since Confederation any interference on the part of Parliament with the Provincial systems of education, and under the Canadian Constitution it is not desirable there should be such interference; yet it was not without good reason that the British North America Act provided that minorities should be protected by the Federal Parliament wherever Separate Schools then existed by law or might afterward be established. It was understood that the Catholic and Protestant minorities valued highly their rights to Separate Schools, and yet that it might happen that in a moment of ill humor, or after some such furious religious agitation as had not been previously unknown in Canada, the majority in the Provinces referred to might sweep away the rights thus existing, and it was to prevent such hostile action that the Separate Schools clauses were introduced into that Act through the Hon. Sir A. T. Galt, as representing specially the Protestant minority of the Province of Quebec.

By these clauses the Provincial Legislatures were directed to leave intact the educational rights of minorities. The case of Manitoba was somewhat different from that of the other Provinces. It entered into Confederation with a population almost evenly divided between the two religions, Catholics having a small preponderance. It was impossible to foresee on which side the scale would preponderate in the course of time. The large increase of population there was certainly not then expected, and it was the general belief that Quebec would send a large proportion of the new settlers, who, it was thought, would prefer homes in Western Canada, instead of emigrating to the United States, as they had been doing in large numbers.

It was, therefore, at least as much to satisfy Protestants as Catholics that it was insisted on by the Manitoba delegates that there should be Separate schools in the new Province.

We do not enter upon the question whether or not the Manitoban Bill of Rights contained a clause to this effect. There is at present a difference of testimony in this regard, but the Canadian Supreme Court, and the British Privy Council both attest that the point was fully agreed to and constituted a compact; and it was in accordance with this compact that the Separate school clauses were introduced into the Manitoba Act, as accepted and agreed to by unanimous vote of the Manitoba Legislature.

We say then that it was an act of treachery on the part of the Manitoba Government and Legislature to abolish Separate schools, and it thus became the duty of the Canadian Government to protect Catholics against the action of a tyrannical majority. It would have been preferable if that majority would undo its own work and settle the trouble of its own making; but since it has positively and persistently refused to do this, it was the natural and proper course for the Catholics of the Province to appeal to the authority of the Dominion, as this is the course provided for in the Constitution.

We have been told sometimes that if Mr. Laurier were to become Premier Mr. Greenway's Government would solve the trouble in a satisfactory way. This is no excuse or justification for the Manitoba Government, nor is it a valid reason why Remedial Legislation should not be passed. The inherent rights of Catholics are not to be made dependent on the support or non-

support of either political party, nor are they to be left subject to certain party contingencies, which may or may not happen.

We have not been over enthusiastic in admiration at the course of the Dominion Government, because we could not entirely exonerate them from being somewhat responsible for the delays which have resulted in the laying over of the Remedial Bill till another session.

Mr. Dalton McCarthy spoke very gleefully because the measure has been effectually shelved for the present. He boasts that the Remedial Bill has been buried and that the House is now "celebrating its obsequies." He will find that his self-gratulation is premature, for he may rely upon it that the Catholics of Canada are determined not to abandon their Manitoban co-religionists in this matter of constitutional right. Mr. McCarthy and his clique have succeeded in putting the country to the expense of some hundreds of thousands of dollars, but he will find that there is honor enough among the liberal Protestants as well as Catholics of the Dominion not to permit the gross injustice of Mr. Greenway to be perpetuated.

We do not anticipate sanguinely that the Greenway Government will itself act loyally to the Constitution by securing the passage of a remedial measure; yet it is not altogether unlikely that it may do so, now that it must be convinced that the Constitution is not to be a dead letter. As the Provincial Legislature is now in session, it will have an opportunity to do this before the next session of Parliament; and it will do so if it wishes to retain control of the Provincial educational system.

The following editorial pronouncement from *La Verite*, of Quebec, presents a view of the case with which those who are not swayed by a too ardent partyism will be likely to agree:

"It is apropos to remark that it was the Government which insisted that the Committee of the Whole should sit days without interruption, under the pretext that if the committee had risen the obstructionists led by Mr. McCarthy would not have permitted it to sit again. The Government would have done better, it appears to us, to have accepted the proposition of Mr. Laurier, who insisted that the committee should sit every day from 3 in the afternoon till 2 or 3 in the morning. The obstruction could hardly have been more disastrous than it has been, since, in spite of this uninterrupted sitting of the week, the committee has only been able to adopt twelve clauses of the unhappy bill, which contains one hundred and twelve of them; and a normal sitting of twelve hours interrupted by a regular adjournment would not probably have degenerated into a Parliamentary scandal. What sort of duty do you suppose a chamber can do which sits permanently during six days? We find, then, that the Government is very blamable for having insisted on such a sitting, which could be of no use and must necessarily be scandalous. If the Ministers have insisted on a procedure which, as they ought to have known, would be without practical result, it is apparently because they wish to throw dust in the eyes of their partisans, especially in the Province of Quebec. 'See,' they will say to the Catholic and French-Canadian electors, 'the superhuman efforts that the Ministers have made to secure the adoption of the remedial bill; they have made the House sit day and night for a whole week, and if they have not succeeded it is the fault of the Opposition.' We do not believe that our people will let themselves be thus blinded. Without doubt Mr. Laurier is seriously blamable for having proposed the hoist to the fanatic in their desperate war against the bill. If the French members, instead of dividing into hostile camps, were united like one man to insist upon the principle of Federal intervention, perhaps the McCarthy, the Wallace, the Martins, etc., would have shown less boldness. But, seeing our people divided, as always, by the spirit of party, they said to themselves, 'We are all powerful; let us march boldly to the assault of the bill and choke it.' Mr. Laurier and those who followed him have, therefore, a large part of the responsibility in this grave crisis, but, after all, it is the Government which must be especially blamed for not having done what it might have done to avoid the formidable check which it and remedial legislation have received. The Government has no right to put itself at the mercy of the Opposition, especially when it knows that in that Opposition there are elements absolutely irreconcilable and sectarian, which will try every move to make the Ministerial policy abortive. In the month of July last the Hon. Mr. Angars, in explaining to the Senate his departure from the Cabinet, said: 'I think the Premier of Canada is animated by the same spirit, but unhappily I fear that the opposition exerted to prevent the execution of the Queen's order will be greater and stronger than his intention. The hon. leader holds in his hand the present; perhaps no man in Canada could more effectively than he present at this session legislation favorable to the minority; but if the hon.