

The Catholic Record.

Published Weekly at 95 and 98 Richmond Street, London, Ontario.

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

Editor: REV. GEORGE R. NORTHGRAVES.

Author of "Mistakes of Modern Infallibility."

THOMAS COFFEY.

Publisher and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY.

MESSRS. LEWIS, ALLEN, JOHN, NICHOLSON, P. J. NEVIN and W. A. NEVIN, are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transact all other business for the CATHOLIC RECORD.

Advertisement—Ten cents per line each insertion, single insertions.

Approved and recommended by the Archbishop of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa, 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.

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

London, Saturday, October 5, 1895.

THE REUNION OF CHRISTENDOM.

Canon Farrar of Westminster Abbey has published what is intended to be a reply to the Pope's Encyclical letter to the people of England inviting them to return to the one fold; but it is really no reply, only a carping criticism of a captious fault-finder.

The canon acknowledges that the Holy Father had a kind purpose in issuing his invitation, but he says it is "a benevolent invitation" and nothing more. It does not say so much as hint at the shadow of a concession.

Nearly all the Protestant religious journals which have made any comment on the Holy Father's letter have spoken of it in a similar strain. They seem to imagine that he should have offered to give up something of the doctrines of the Church in order to induce Protestants to agree to return to the fold, but in taking this view they entirely overlook this essential characteristic of the Catholic Church, her immutability in doctrine.

It is a most fundamental belief of the Catholic Church that Christ established His Church upon a rock, against which and against the Church the gates of hell shall not prevail. As a consequence, she can never teach any doctrine but the truth, and in regard to truth she must be unchangeable.

The canon asserts that the Church is not necessarily by Christ's appointment to be of one fold. He says the one fold is an "unimportant matter;" but it is of the very essence of the Church that this should be regarded as a matter of the first importance, and that there should be not only unity of doctrine, but also submission of the members to the Supreme Head of the Church.

All this is implied by our Lord when He commissions His Apostles to go forth to teach all nations—not what their fancy dictates, or what the nations desire should be taught to them, but "all things whatsoever I have commanded."

The Church, then, has no right to compromise doctrine even to the least degree, and if Protestants insist that such a compromise should be made before they will enter into a reunion, they must continue to remain outside as they are at present.

The Protestant churches show themselves willing to compromise doctrines. This is because they recognize that they are human institutions, and that their most cherished doctrines are human fancies which may or may not be true. But this being the case, why should they wish the Catholic Church to make a compromise on these matters at all? It is so much easier for them to compromise doctrine, they should not look for a compromise of doctrine on the part of the Catholic Church at all, if they are as much in earnest about a reunion of Christendom as they have of late years professed to be.

What doctrine is there on which Canon Farrar or any other Protestant would wish a compromise? Those who speak of such a thing are always very vague about answering this very natural query. There is not a single doctrine of the Catholic Church except certain metaphysical details which are difficult to be understood, and which we imagine do not constitute the obstacle to reunion, which is not held by one or another of the Protestant sects.

Why, then, should any of these sects ask that the Catholic Church should give up these doctrines for the sake of unity or union? If they are ready to tolerate these doctrines, and even to accept any one of them for the sake of reunion with petty sects which can afford to change them without losing their historic character of mutableness, why should they not be equally ready to accept these doctrines for the sake of reunion with the great Catholic Church, which outnumbers all the Protestant sects together by very nearly two to one?

The Catholic Church, absolutely, cannot afford to take into consideration the question of a compromise of doctrine. She claims to be, and she is, the one Church which Christ instituted. Notwithstanding all the declamation of Protestants against her supposed errors they cannot deny that she alone has preserved her identity by actual succession from the Apostolic age. Let us suppose for the sake of argument that she has become corrupt, as Protestants assert, by the gradual introduction of new doctrines or practices, she is still the Church which Christ established to last to the end of time, and if there is any abuse to be reformed, she has within herself the inherent power and authority to reform herself. She has no need to be reformed by any authority outside of herself, whether it be that of kings, or princes, or States, or of any other human institution.

As far as doctrine is concerned, there is no reform possible. The doctrines of the Catholic Church are those which Christ has revealed, and any change in them cannot be considered as an open question. Matters of merely ecclesiastical legislation or local usage are subject to change. Thus the fast days observed by the Church might be modified by being changed to other days, though the doctrine of the necessity of works of penance, and the utility of fasting and abstinence, must remain unchanged.

The superiority of the state of celibacy, when embraced for God's sake and for the better advancement of the Christian in the way of perfection, is a matter of doctrine which the Church must continue to teach as she has always done; but it is not of absolute necessity that she should insist that the clergy should in all cases remain unmarried. The Latin liturgy of the Church, handed down for over fifty generations, is a sacred usage, justified by the strongest reasons for the preservation of the unity of faith through succeeding ages, and for uniting different nationalities in the consciousness that they belong to one universal Church; yet there is nothing in the doctrines of the Church requiring that the liturgy shall be necessarily either Latin or Greek or Syriac, rather than English or French or German, or any other modern tongue.

the liturgy, which most of the High Churchmen would like to be English. Another is the celibacy of the Catholic priesthood. On this latter point, if the general discipline of the Catholic Church is to be rigidly adhered to, it would exclude from the priesthood the bulk of the Anglican clergy who might wish to return to the one fold. We have said that a relaxation of discipline on this point might possibly be allowed by the Pope, but it is not at all likely that such a relaxation would be offered unless the movement toward reunion prove to be of considerable magnitude on the part of the Anglicans.

In any case, it was not to be expected that the Holy Father would make a proposal on this matter, before having the assurance that such a concession and a concession in regard to the language of the liturgy would bridge over the difficulties now existing. It must be remembered that even if a very large proportion of the present High Church party is really anxious for a reunion, it would still be far from being the predominant part of the reunited Church, and it cannot expect that its desires alone are to be attended to in considering the terms of reunion. The wishes and even the prejudices of the twenty million Catholics who now speak the English language, or are at least within the domain of Great Britain and the United States, are to be accounted as an important factor in regard to concessions, even on points in which concession is possible. This appears to have been entirely overlooked by those who have been clamoring for concessions before they will think of returning to the one fold; yet it is a matter which requires grave consideration; and we are satisfied that the conservative convictions of those who are already Catholics will be all on the side of making as few changes as possible even in the purely disciplinary usages of the Church. At all events it will be necessary to know whether there will be any considerable number who require some concessions, and who will be satisfied with such concessions as are possible, before they can be offered by the Pope or the Catholic Church.

As far as Canon Farrar is concerned we are of opinion that no concessions which the Holy Father can offer would be satisfactory to him or the party he represents. His object appears to be to widen the breach, and not to close it; and they demand concessions only for the purpose of being enabled to assert that the doctrines of the Catholic Church are not so immutable as we have always claimed them to be, because doctrinal truth is immutable. It is only error which can be bartered away by compromises.

It may be a disappointment to those well meaning Ritualists who have in their minds the idea of a corporate reunion based upon doctrinal compromise, especially a compromise on the admission of the claim that the Pope has by divine appointment the right to teach and govern the whole Church, but Cardinal Vaughan has made it clear in a recent address at Bristol that there can be no reunion unless this fundamental doctrine be admitted. The Cardinal also stated that he does not expect any immediate submission of the body of the English people to the Catholic Church, but that the slower process of individual conversion is what is rather to be looked for at present. However disappointing the facts are it is as well they should be looked at straight in the face. After having during the centuries maintained that she is infallible in her teaching, it is not to be expected that the Church will proclaim her fallibility by admitting that she has been in error in asserting that the Pope is the successor of St. Peter and supreme visible head of the Church by divine right. Her position would be ridiculous if she could make such an admission.

COMMUNION WITH ROME.

They who desire the union of Christendom should peruse the writings of the early Fathers—unquestionable witnesses to the truth and sure guides to the Church established by Christ. They have in our days begotten many unto God as in the old times, when in monastic cell, or desert cave, or princely palace they transcribed their soul's belief. There is no ambiguity or obscurity in their simple sentences. Communion with Rome is the sign of Catholicity. Where Peter is, there is the Church: so say all the Fathers; and hence they who wish to be Catholics in very truth must bow in filial allegiance before the successor of St. Peter.

St. Jerome, writing to Pope Damasus, puts this truth in a very lucid manner. Referring to the attempts of heretics to dishonor the Church he says: "Therefore have I thought that I should consult the chair of Peter and the faith praised by the mouth of the Apostle. Therefore, though your greatness terrifies me, yet your kindness invites me. Let me speak without offence. I count not the Roman height. I speak with the successor of the Fisherman and Disciple of the Cross. I following were as the first but Christ, am linked in communion with thy Blessedness, that is with the chair of Peter. Upon that rock I know that Church. Whoso gather not with thee scattereth; that is, he who is not of Christ, is of anti-Christ."

It was, and will be always, the prerogative of Catholicity—obedience to the Holy See. We cannot change it. This supremacy is not the work of arrogance or of ignorance, but the gift of Christ, to be exercised forever. When a man lays aside his prejudices and preconceived opinions and seeks the truth, it will come to him, and with it a peace and knowledge that surpasseth worldly comprehension.

THE TEMPORAL POWER.

Our contemporaries who view with uneasiness the incipient agitation for the restoration of the temporalities of the Papacy should think over and study the question before committing themselves to any definite statement. It is beyond doubt that the agitation is justified by every law. It is a protest against robbery.

That the Popes have a title to the lands of which they have been despoiled is evident to any impartial reader of history, and that they have a right to demand their restoration is none the less evident. The pretext of the unification of Italy is but a veil to cloak the injustice of the act. For over a quarter of a century have the freebooters sat unmolested in another's dominion, and what has been the result? They have ruined the nation, morally and financially. They have kept the rightful owner of Rome a prisoner, in the vain hope of lessening his influence, and they know to their chagrin that they have failed. Never, even in most fortunate days, has Pontiff dominated human intelligence and activity as in this century. His wise and warning words sink deep into the heart of humanity. He scans the horizon and points out the shoals and quicksands that beset us in our onward progress. He is the magnet that draws yearly human life to Rome. All this is well known to the so-called rulers of Italy.

We know they advance the justice of the many laws enacted by them as a justification of their act of robbery, but we have yet to know any normal-minded minister who would admit this as an argument that may disprove the commandment, "Thou shalt not steal."

It is alleged by some that the people were unanimous in their demand for a kingly ruler. It is true that the cable flashed the news to the world that 40,000 votes were polled against Papal rule and 40 for its continuance, but we know how such a result was obtained. Honest men were prevented from approaching the polls, and the votes cast represented the scum of Italy. To give a semblance of decency to the iniquitous proceeding they guaranteed the Pope absolute independence, but subsequent events showed that a robber may be a liar.

They violated every condition. They put their sacrilegious hands upon institutions hallowed by the traditions of centuries. In the year 1867 they despoiled church property to the extent of \$116,000,000. They converted monasteries into barracks or brothels.

But enough: we might go on and point out laws, brutal and subversive of justice, enacted against the clergy. The words of Caproni are coming true: "Beware!" he said. "Oath of independence of the head of the Church depends our independence. If this independence is not secured we shall never possess Rome really and in security." Cavour even declared, in 1861, that "to interfere with the liberty of the Pope would be fatal, not only to Catholicism, but to Italy."

With a savage, pitiless lash of sarcasm he whips the scoffers who go through life attired in the taudy garments of doubt.

CORRECT PRINCIPLES.

Some time ago a magazine writer ventured to give Edwin Arnold's philosophy as a panacea for social evils. He proved this very satisfactorily to himself, but the rounded periods, etc., fell harmlessly upon our ears. Sir Edwin Arnold is a word painter and nothing else. His religion of sweetness and light is humbug of the worst kind. How any man can deny God and continue to preach Him is passing comprehension.

What a man wants are principles that keep him firm, despite the vicissitudes of life—principles that render him loyal always to the God who awaits to judge him. This is the aim of all who understand that in their keeping is an immortal soul. There will be, we suppose, always twaddle about culture. We do not condemn it, provided it be of the right kind. But let it be a reality that will shrink from uncleanness in thought or action—that will wrap itself around every fibre and sinew of our being and guard us against falsehood and evil of any kind. Modern culture cannot do this. Its thin veneering is soon rubbed off by the friction of everyday life. Back of all true culture stands Christ; and when Arnold's admirers bring his system to the baptismal font of Christianity it will then, and then only, be able to give consolation and peace.

THE SCHOOLMASTER ABROAD.

From an item in the Barrie Advance it will be seen that it is not necessary to go among the half-breeds of Manitoba to find evidence that the Schoolmaster may be abroad even where there is supposed to be in operation a very fair and successful school system. The Advance says:

"The following, rudely marked on a piece of board, was fastened to the fence of a lot not a hundred miles from Orillia:—

"Notis.
"Any person ketching on these grounds, or cows, or wimin, will be libolul two fine herself in a skrape."
Here is another:
"Counclle:
"In account with—contractor, for Burying one cat on— street on the 27, 50c.
"By order of inspecter"

"Although these are not evidences of very extensive or accurate scholarship they by no means prove anything against our school system."

And yet a Winnipeg barrister had written a book to prove that the school system of Manitoba, established twenty years ago, when the country was scarcely yet opened for settlement, and when the settlers were few and just struggling for the necessities of life, did not succeed in rearing a highly educated generation, and therefore should be swept away without any regard to the wishes of the people who were doing all they could to educate their children under adverse circumstances.

We do not refer to such matters for the purpose of casting any injurious reflection on the Public school system of this Province, which we acknowledge to be as good as could be expected, as far as merely secular instruction is concerned, though sadly deficient in regard to the teaching of religion and morality. But it is useful that we should be reminded sometimes of our defects, and it may make some people less vainglorious, and more considerate for the difficulties under which others labor, when they learn that, after all, even in Ontario, with all the efforts made to bring the little red school-house within the reach of all, the school-master is still abroad in regard to many localities.

In connection with this subject we may also call attention to the fact that a correspondent of the Toronto Mail and Empire, in the issue of Sept. 21, expresses the hope that a movement which is to be soon inaugurated to apply a "refining process" to the teachers of the Province may be crowned with success. This writer says:

"At the present time rough, uncouth manners and glaringly bad English seem to be prominent features of nearly all the Public schools throughout the country. On visiting some of these I have been grieved to hear young children of refined and cultured parents shouted at and ordered about in a manner altogether out of place in such institutions. This may be necessary in some instances.

Still the incorrigibles should not be permitted to give the tone to the schools attended by them, nor is it a right state of things that children properly brought up by educated parents should frequently have

opportunities of correcting their teacher's lamentable mispronunciation of words, and violation of the simplest rules of grammar. This, in my opinion, has a tendency to lessen the respect due from pupil to teacher. However well children may speak on entering these schools, before the end of a month they will have caught the taint or have been laughed into the approved and accepted dialect of the 'toughs' in a manner that in some instances verges on persecution."

It is possible that this correspondent exaggerates the extent of the evil of which he complains, but there can be no doubt it exists to some extent, and sufficiently to make those who boast that the Public school system, with its absence of all, or nearly all, religious teaching, should be forced upon those who desire that their children be educated in their duties to God simultaneously with these branches which are necessary for their merely secular advancement.

We venture to say that if statistics on the subject were attainable it would be found that the most virulent opponents of Catholic claims to the right of freedom of education, whether in Manitoba or Ontario, comprise a very large proportion of those who have profited least by the Public school system, and who consequently should be more disposed to be tolerant of the convictions of others who differ from them.

THE ARMENIAN ATROCITIES.

The reports of the Armenian atrocities furnish ample proof of the barbarity of Turkish rule. Some attempts were made to conceal the revolting particulars from the public, but the correspondents of the great secular newspapers have succeeded in unraveling the web of treachery and atrocious cruelty in which the Armenians were entangled. Whole villages were pillaged and destroyed. Men were tortured and women subjected to nameless ignominies. Infants were thrown up into the air and caught on the bayonets of soldiers. Thousands of them are starving.

They are completely in the power of a Government whose purpose is to root them up, branch and trunk. When the reports first came, we thought them exaggerated, but the words of reputable witnesses convince us that they were but too true.

There is no protection for them. They may be surprised at any hour by a band of soldiers who care neither for the life nor the honor of their victims. It is about time for the Powers to lash the Sultan into some semblance of decency. Nearly 2,000,000 human beings cry out for help, and it were a shame to turn a heedless ear to the cry.

One witness writes: If we turn to the condition of the peasant still in the village the picture is verily appalling. Neither by day nor night is he for a moment secure in his own life, as to the life and honor of his wife and daughters, as to his flocks and herds, etc. He must not only see his bread stolen from him, but he must witness the shame and torture of sister or daughter. The details, horrible and loathsome, cannot be expressed. The young men are eager to do battle against their oppressors, but they are without resources of any kind.

THE SITUATION AT ROME.

A despatch from Rome states that the Italian Government has just published documents containing communications which passed between Italy and the Vatican after the entry of the Italian troops into Rome in 1870.

We are told with a great flourish of trumpets that the communications are now made public for the purpose of showing how generous was the Italian Government toward the Pope, at the moment they were despoiling him of his last vestige of territorial possession. It is said that the Government exhibited throughout "a willingness to make every concession that would ensure the liberty and independence of the Pope, while the Vatican refused to accept any of the proffered concessions so as to maintain a pretext for complaint that the Pope had been deprived of his liberty." It is evidently in the fear that the public opinion of Europe will bring about the restoration of the temporal power of the Pope that the brigand Government is publishing the proofs of the great affection it entertained for the Holy Father while plundering him at the cannon's mouth.

We do not need to be told that King Victor Emmanuel and Count Cavour made great pretences of respect for the Holy See, and endeavored with honied words to cover their last act of spoliation with the offer of guarantees of the independent position the Holy Father

GRIM old Carlyle had one good quality—hedetested shams of every kind. He abhorred self-conceit, especially that species of it so prevalent in our day, and which betrays itself in the speeches and articles of those who are original enough to dispense with religion because forsooth it is incomprehensible. "Thy daily life is girt with wonder and based on wonder: thy very blankets and breeches are mir-

acles." With a savage, pitiless lash of sarcasm he whips the scoffers who go through life attired in the taudy garments of doubt.

CORRECT PRINCIPLES.

Some time ago a magazine writer ventured to give Edwin Arnold's philosophy as a panacea for social evils. He proved this very satisfactorily to himself, but the rounded periods, etc., fell harmlessly upon our ears. Sir Edwin Arnold is a word painter and nothing else. His religion of sweetness and light is humbug of the worst kind. How any man can deny God and continue to preach Him is passing comprehension.

What a man wants are principles that keep him firm, despite the vicissitudes of life—principles that render him loyal always to the God who awaits to judge him. This is the aim of all who understand that in their keeping is an immortal soul. There will be, we suppose, always twaddle about culture. We do not condemn it, provided it be of the right kind. But let it be a reality that will shrink from uncleanness in thought or action—that will wrap itself around every fibre and sinew of our being and guard us against falsehood and evil of any kind. Modern culture cannot do this. Its thin veneering is soon rubbed off by the friction of everyday life. Back of all true culture stands Christ; and when Arnold's admirers bring his system to the baptismal font of Christianity it will then, and then only, be able to give consolation and peace.

THE SCHOOLMASTER ABROAD.

From an item in the Barrie Advance it will be seen that it is not necessary to go among the half-breeds of Manitoba to find evidence that the Schoolmaster may be abroad even where there is supposed to be in operation a very fair and successful school system. The Advance says:

"The following, rudely marked on a piece of board, was fastened to the fence of a lot not a hundred miles from Orillia:—

"Notis.
"Any person ketching on these grounds, or cows, or wimin, will be libolul two fine herself in a skrape."
Here is another:
"Counclle:
"In account with—contractor, for Burying one cat on— street on the 27, 50c.
"By order of inspecter"

"Although these are not evidences of very extensive or accurate scholarship they by no means prove anything against our school system."

And yet a Winnipeg barrister had written a book to prove that the school system of Manitoba, established twenty years ago, when the country was scarcely yet opened for settlement, and when the settlers were few and just struggling for the necessities of life, did not succeed in rearing a highly educated generation, and therefore should be swept away without any regard to the wishes of the people who were doing all they could to educate their children under adverse circumstances.

We do not refer to such matters for the purpose of casting any injurious reflection on the Public school system of this Province, which we acknowledge to be as good as could be expected, as far as merely secular instruction is concerned, though sadly deficient in regard to the teaching of religion and morality. But it is useful that we should be reminded sometimes of our defects, and it may make some people less vainglorious, and more considerate for the difficulties under which others labor, when they learn that, after all, even in Ontario, with all the efforts made to bring the little red school-house within the reach of all, the school-master is still abroad in regard to many localities.

In connection with this subject we may also call attention to the fact that a correspondent of the Toronto Mail and Empire, in the issue of Sept. 21, expresses the hope that a movement which is to be soon inaugurated to apply a "refining process" to the teachers of the Province may be crowned with success. This writer says:

"At the present time rough, uncouth manners and glaringly bad English seem to be prominent features of nearly all the Public schools throughout the country. On visiting some of these I have been grieved to hear young children of refined and cultured parents shouted at and ordered about in a manner altogether out of place in such institutions. This may be necessary in some instances.

Still the incorrigibles should not be permitted to give the tone to the schools attended by them, nor is it a right state of things that children properly brought up by educated parents should frequently have

opportunities of correcting their teacher's lamentable mispronunciation of words, and violation of the simplest rules of grammar. This, in my opinion, has a tendency to lessen the respect due from pupil to teacher. However well children may speak on entering these schools, before the end of a month they will have caught the taint or have been laughed into the approved and accepted dialect of the 'toughs' in a manner that in some instances verges on persecution."

It is possible that this correspondent exaggerates the extent of the evil of which he complains, but there can be no doubt it exists to some extent, and sufficiently to make those who boast that the Public school system, with its absence of all, or nearly all, religious teaching, should be forced upon those who desire that their children be educated in their duties to God simultaneously with these branches which are necessary for their merely secular advancement.

We venture to say that if statistics on the subject were attainable it would be found that the most virulent opponents of Catholic claims to the right of freedom of education, whether in Manitoba or Ontario, comprise a very large proportion of those who have profited least by the Public school system, and who consequently should be more disposed to be tolerant of the convictions of others who differ from them.