

The Catholic Record.

Published Weekly at 45 and 456 Richmond street, London, Ontario.

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

REV. GEORGE R. NORTHGRAVES, Editor.

THOMAS COPPEY, Publisher and Proprietor.

Messrs. LUKE KING, JOHN NICH, P. J. REYNOLDS, and W. A. NEVIN, are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transact all other business for the CATHOLIC RECORD.

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

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.

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

London, Saturday, April 11, 1896.

THE MANITOBA CONFERENCE.

We never anticipated much fruit from the negotiations of the Dominion Commissioners, Sir Donald Smith and Hon. Messrs. Dickey and Desjardins, with the Manitoba Government with the purpose of arriving at an amicable settlement of the school question. Messrs. Greenway and his colleagues have from the beginning manifested so much doggedness in their treatment of the Catholic minority of that Province that we expected but little of a satisfactory result from the negotiations which have now finally closed, and our anticipations, such as they were, have been fully realized. While the negotiations were in progress, however, we obtained from the expression of our expectations in order that no word should escape us on behalf of the Catholic minority which should be regarded or interpreted as expressive of hostility while the olive branch was being extended. We were, besides, told by those who might be expected to know the real state of the case that the Greenway Government was disposed to make an arrangement which would be satisfactory by removing any real grievance which might be shown to exist. But in fact, since the Dominion Government announced its determination to pass a remedial measure, in default of proper action by the Manitoba Legislature, Mr. Greenway himself said several times publicly that he would be satisfied to have any reasonable grievance removed which could be shown to exist; but he took care also to assert as frequently, personally and through his organ, the Winnipeg Tribune, that there is really no grievance, and we interpreted his two statements by the light one of them throws upon the other.

It was pretty clear, even from the beginning of the negotiations, that Mr. Greenway had no intention to settle the difficulty, and the result has proved to demonstration that such was the case. From the beginning he declared that in his opinion nothing could be settled by a conference, and as he, or at least his Government, which amounts to the same thing, was one of the parties to the conference, it was very easy for him to bring it about that his prognostications should prove to be correct.

The proposals made by the Dominion commissioners were extremely moderate, yet they were such as would have been accepted by the Manitoba minority. It was proposed that in towns and villages wherein there are twenty-five, and in cities where there are fifty Catholic children, there should be a school-house, or at least a room for their use, and that a Catholic teacher should be employed for them. In these schools the (Protestant) prayers and religious exercises now prescribed by the Public School Act should not be enforced, and this last provision should extend to localities where a majority of the children are Catholics.

In these Catholic schools, text-books should be such as would not offend the religious views of Catholics, but the books should be satisfactory to the Advisory (Public School) Board.

On the Advisory Board and the Board of Examiners there should be Catholic representation, and Catholics should have assistance for the maintenance of a Catholic Normal school.

In all other respects the Catholic schools should be subject to the Manitoba School Acts, but two years should be allowed to enable those teachers who have not certificates to qualify before being subjected to the strict application of the present requirements of the law.

If these conditions had been accepted, the Commissioners promised, on the passing of the necessary legislation by the Legislature of Manitoba, that the Remedial Bill now before parliament would be withdrawn, and any rights and privileges claimed by the minority would remain in abeyance, and not be further insisted upon.

We have heard much during the discussion of this question, of unreasonable requirements on the part of

the Catholic minority, and also of their desire to maintain inefficient schools. It was in fact on this supposed unreasonableness of the Catholics that Messrs. Attorney-General Sifton and Dalton McCarthy laid most stress in their anti-remedial speeches, especially during the election campaign in Haldimand, but certainly there is not in the proposals of the Commissioners anything to justify such a statement.

The point on which the Catholics of Manitoba insist is that Catholic teaching be allowed for Catholic children, and not that they shall be allowed to have inefficient schools, and there is no good reason why the guarantees under which Manitoba entered into the Canadian Confederation should not be faithfully observed.

Messrs. Sifton and Cameron, on behalf of the Manitoba Government, objected to these proposals merely by a series of quibbles, to the effect that the Catholic schools as proposed by the Commissioners would be necessarily inferior, and that it is against the public interest that there should be any separation between children of different faiths.

The Commissioners' proposals were not immutable as to details, if the Greenway Government had shown any disposition to be conciliatory, but instead of this they complained that the Remedial Bill now before Parliament had not been held in abeyance. It is evident, therefore, that the sole purpose of the Manitoba Government in arranging for a conference at all, was to defeat the Remedial Bill, or to delay it for another year, and perhaps thus to prevent its becoming law.

Two alternatives were proposed by the Manitoba representatives, the first being the total secularization of the schools, an alternative which they admit not to be desirable, but the disgrace of adopting which they evidently wish to throw upon the Catholics. It is an alternative which infidels might welcome, but it is not what the Constitution guarantees to Catholics, and it is totally unacceptable.

The second alternative is to give power to the trustees of any locality to allow religious teaching by the clergy of any denomination for half an hour daily. Thus religious teaching by the teacher would be practically forbidden, and the school would be without such teaching whenever the clergy would be occupied elsewhere with their ordinary duties. Besides, the religious teaching of the schools would be subject to the mutable will of the trustees, who could secularize the schools whenever a majority of them might think proper.

It is easy to see that such proposals could not be accepted as a remedy for the grievance of which Catholics complain. The conference, however, will have this good result, that it will show that there is no resource now whereby justice is to be obtained except through remedial legislation by Parliament, and it will lead many members who have hitherto opposed the Remedial Bill to support it from this forward.

THE SALVATIONIST TROUBLE.

It is now announced that the real cause of the Salvation Army trouble which led to the dismissal of Mr. Ballington Booth, and finally to the establishment of a rival Army, was a matter of money, together with a plotting to supersede the commander so as to secure for another member of the family his lucrative position. This is, at all events, the account given to the public by Rev. J. G. Hallwood, who has been Mr. Ballington Booth's private secretary for a number of years. Mr. Hallwood says the dismissal is the result of a scheme devised by Mr. Herbert Booth, who wished to obtain the position. The opportunity of precipitating the matter was afforded by the publication of the life of Mrs. General Booth, in which Mr. Ballington Booth's work in America was not duly recognized, being passed over with very little mention.

The profits of publication were to go for the promotion of the general's great social scheme, but it was published on terms disadvantageous to the Army, though Mr. Herbert Booth was sent from England at great expense to negotiate the matter. The publication was not received with favor by the American Commander or his friends, owing to the slight thrown upon them, and there were in consequence no profits. For this the blame was thrown upon Mr. Ballington Booth, and he fell into disfavor with the general, and the result was his dismissal.

Mr. Hallwood also tells of the general's antipathy to American institutions, exemplified in his treatment of

the American flag on the occasion of his visit to this continent. He was expected to be his son's guest for two weeks, but he only remained two days, and among the decorations of the house which were prepared in his honor there was an American flag. As soon as the general perceived this he contemptuously tore it down with expressions of exasperation. This roused the American feeling against him, and there have been mutterings of rebellion ever since, which broke out by occasion of the dismissal of Mr. Ballington Booth and his wife, the result being the declaration of independence of English control in the new organization of "Volunteers," who follow the deposed Commander.

Mr. and Mrs. Booth Tucker have arrived from England, and they state that they have propositions to make to the late Commander which they hope may lead to a reconciliation with the general. The general, who was absent in India when the separation occurred, is said to be deeply grieved regarding it, but it is not at all certain, or even probable, that Mr. Ballington Booth will now return to the old Army on any conditions which may be offered.

THE GREGORIAN CALENDAR.

To the Editor of the CATHOLIC RECORD: Sir—The interesting article on "The Calendar" in your issue of March 28, suggests the following questions, which I should like to see answered in your columns:

- 1. Do Catholics of both the Latin and Greek rites in countries which have not adopted the new style follow the old style with regard to the celebration of Christmas and the following festivals?
2. Since the Council of Nice fixed so definitely the time for celebrating Easter, how can we account for so much disagreement among Catholics of later times with regard to this festival?
3. How could the use of an erroneous calendar affect the date on which Easter would be celebrated in accordance with the decree of Nice since the vernal equinox, and consequently the following full moon, being both astronomical events, must be independent of all calendars?
Enquirer.

In reply to these queries we have to say, as far as we are aware of the facts that:

1. In their religious observances, Catholics of both rites generally observe the new style in regard to the celebration of Christmas and other immovable feasts, though in Russia the old style is usually followed even by Catholics. In regard to the celebration of Easter, the Gregorian calendar or new style is usually followed in these countries, as the feast is made to follow the lunations, and there is thus very seldom any discrepancy between the Eastern schismatical and Catholic Churches.

2. The Council of Nice fixed definitely the time for the celebration of Easter, but we do not understand our correspondent's statement that there has been "so much disagreement among Catholics of later times with regard to this festival." Since the time of the Council of Nice there has been general uniformity on this point. The great disputes concerning the time of the celebration of Easter preceded the Council of Nice, which was in session A. D., 325. One of the principal ancient historians who recorded these disputes was St. Irenaeus, who wrote A. D. 170, but they were practically ended by the decrees of the Council of Nice.

When St. Augustine brought the gospel to England, A. D. 596, the Christian Britons celebrated Easter on a different day from that which the rest of the Christian world used, but this divergence had no connection with the ancient disputes regarding the date on which Easter should be celebrated. The Britons had been driven by the Saxon invaders to take refuge in the mountainous region of Wales, and during the one hundred and fifty years which had intervened between the usurped domination of the Saxons, and the arrival of St. Augustine, the British Christians, driven from their homes, and kept in a condition of constant terror by their Saxon conquerors, being unable to have intercourse with the continent, lost the method of computing Easter accurately in accordance with the decrees of the Council of Nice. At least we may presume that this was the cause of the divergence, inasmuch as the identity of the British Church in doctrine and discipline with that of the whole Christian world is indicated by the presence of British Bishops at the Councils of Arles in 314, Sardica (now Sofia in Bulgaria) in 347, and Rimini in 359. The British Bishops at these councils accepted all the decrees, and signed them, along with the other Bishops present; but it is not very extraordinary that soon afterward, whereas there were no

printed books to keep all knowledge within reach of every one, a state of one hundred and fifty years of warfare and non-intercourse with the continent, should have caused a divergence with regard to the exact date on which a festival should be observed, especially a festival which could be fixed only by accurate astronomical observation.

3. An erroneous calendar would not affect the date of the celebration of Easter, if the astronomical equinox were solely attended to in fixing the date of the festival. But if it were taken for granted that the erroneous calendar represented the astronomical fact, it is easy to see that the erroneous calendar would have an influence on the matter; and this is exactly what occurred in fact. The Gregorian calendar, however, effected the agreement between the solar and calendar years as closely as this object can be attained, inasmuch as a solar year does not consist of an integral number of natural days, or even of quarter days. If there were an integral number of quarter days in the solar year, the Julian calendar would have satisfied the conditions, but as this was not the case, the necessity for the Gregorian calendar became apparent during the lapse of centuries.

SHORT CREEDS.

"Shorter Creeds" is the panacea which within the last few years has been most generally suggested by earnest and really piously inclined Protestants as the means by which the divisions of Christendom are to be healed.

It has been for three centuries the boast of Protestantism that it gives to its adherents the fullest scope of liberty of belief. It proclaimed the private judgment of each individual to be the ultimate tribunal of appeal in all controversies of faith, and in the decision on what ought to be believed, so that within a very few years after Luther raised the standard of revolt, his followers had already divided themselves into a number of separate sects each of which had its own distinctive doctrines.

Luther's Reformation was only a few years established, when Frederic Staphylus enumerated thirty-four different sects. At the present day it is impossible to tell the number, but there are certainly about or nearly three hundred in the British Isles and the United States alone. The total number in Protestant nations probably reaches four hundred, and Protestant controversialists, even as early as the time of Jurien, were obliged to invent the theory of essential and non-essential Christian doctrines in order to be able to say with an appearance of plausibility that the sects constitute one religion, inasmuch as they agree in essentials, though differing in regard to non-essential doctrines.

Such a distinction has no foundation in Holy Scripture, which prescribes everywhere unity of faith in all the doctrines which Christ revealed and ordered His Apostles to preach throughout the world, "teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you," and "he that believeth not shall be condemned." (St. Matt. xxviii, 20; St. Mark xvi, 16.) It is a distinction injurious to God, since it gives to man the right to override and reject His teaching; and if such a theory could be admitted, it would justify that total abnegation of Christian doctrines which is becoming so prevalent at the present time, leaving not even the most important Christian truths untouched; nevertheless to this day there are found clergymen who glory in the fact that such liberty exists in their Churches, and who point to it with pride as a proof of the broadness and catholicity of those Churches, conveniently forgetting or pretending to forget that the catholicity which is characteristic of the Church of Christ is not an unfixeness of belief sufficient to comprise all sorts of contradictory doctrines, but a universality of one faith, in accordance with the words of Christ: "Teach all nations, . . . to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded," as we have already quoted. The catholicity of the Church is a universality which preserves her children from being "tossed to and fro and carried about with every wind of doctrine." (Eph. iv.)

These thoughts are called to our mind by recent utterances of the Rev. Dr. Charteris, Professor of Theology in Edinburgh, who has declared himself to be in favor of a shorter creed for the Presbyterian Church, so as to remove the objections now made to the Westminster Confession of Faith on points which he deems "non-essential." He does not wish the Church to be creedless, for he believes that it could not hold together without a creed, and that from the beginning Christ did not intend it should be without a creed. "But," he adds, "the primitive Church shows us that that creed ought to be very short, and only a statement of personal adherence to the living Redeemer the incarnate Christ." This is a creed which cannot be impugned on the plea that it is too long; yet short as it is it would be unacceptable to a large body of those who, following logically the primary principle of Protestantism, the supremacy of private judgment in all matters of faith, reject the doctrine here implied. Such are the Unitarians and Universalists, sects which have sprung mainly from Presbyterianism, having been driven out of that Church by its harsh doctrines concerning predestination and reprobation by absolute decree of God. While the doctor was about it, he might in his large charity have tried to frame his creed so as hold out some inducement to these errant sheep to return to the fold, but if he would shape his short creed with such a purpose in view, there would be no more of it left than there was of the huntsman's musket after he had lost stock, lock and barrel. The doctor admits also that the creed of Presbyterians as it is taught to-day is not honestly maintained: that is, that a great body of Presbyterians do not believe it. Of this fact we have been long aware, but we have been taken to task by Presbyterian journals for having mentioned the fact, which they strenuously denied. Dr. Charteris says on this subject: "I think we should have had a shorter creed in Scotland long ago, a better and more honestly maintained creed, if it had not been for our ecclesiastical divisions, and my main reason for wishing a reunion of Churches are: first, that we should be able to work upon a much Shorter Creed, and, second, that we would not waste so much Christian effort as we now do in Scotland, the resources of the united Church being set free for the work of extending the kingdom of Christ at home and abroad." It would appear, then, that the Rev. Dr. has a motive in desiring that the various Christian, or the Presbyterian, churches should reunite on some common basis, that is, that their work may be more effectual both at home and in the propagation of Christianity among heathen nations. He is not the only Protestant clergyman who has become painfully conscious that missionary work has been very greatly impeded by the divisions of Protestantism. Those divisions are the necessary consequence of the fundamental doctrine of Protestantism; and if their consequences are so disastrous, surely it is time for all to reflect that Christ must have provided a central authority in His Church to which all should willingly submit themselves, and that those who, under the lead of Luther, Henry VIII, and John Knox, rejected that authority, and set up a new religious faith under the standard of revolt, should seriously consider their position and respond gratefully to the cordial invitation of Pope Leo XIII. to return to the one fold out of which there is no salvation. Our Blessed Lord prayed for unity among His disciples, that they should be one, as the Father and He are one, and it is a perversity of pride and disobedience to break that unity which he so earnestly desired.

PARTY AND THE INTERESTS OF THE COUNTRY.

It is astonishing what a new light comes to certain members of Parliament regarding the legislation needed for the public welfare, according as they bask in the favor of the Government, or are left to freeze in the chilly shades of Opposition. Than Messrs. Wallace and McCarthy there were no more servile followers of the Government and the Conservative party, and the latter gentleman especially acknowledged so very recently as at the Massey Hall meeting in Toronto that he had followed his party leader even in wrong-doing. "When my leader was right," he said, "I was right too; and when my leader was wrong—well, I am afraid I followed him." (Laughter.) Yes, the P. P. A. who got up that meeting did not regard so shameful an avowal as anything else than a good joke. Such is their view of political morality.

Mr. Clarke Wallace, too, was one of the thick and thin supporters of the Government policy until a few days ago, clinging to his position as a member thereof, even while making buncombe speeches irreconcilable with that

policy for the purpose of making political capital among the Orangemen, on whom he relies as his chief mainstay; and his disagreement with the Government was announced to be only on the question of the Manitoba Remedial Bill. But circumstances have brought about some personal disagreements between Mr. Wallace and certain members of the Government, and it is surprising to find that now, in his estimation, the Government is always wrong in its policy! He is now found casting his vote against them as regularly as he cast it for them hitherto. Of course this is all through honest conviction as regards what the country needs, and not personal spite or disappointment! Surely these gentlemen cannot suppose that Ontario is so imbecile a province as to follow such leadership as theirs in through all the idiosyncracies which are the result of their personal spite and ambitions!

Of course they now pretend that they are acting for the public welfare; but Mr. McCarthy blundered out the admission when he left his party, that he became the leader of a third party because "I was not consulted, as formerly, in regard to certain Cabinet changes." North Simcoe and Cardwell may regard Mr. McCarthy as of so much importance that his personal vanity must be pandered to by every ministry under pain of incurring their displeasure, but if we are to judge of the general feeling in the Dominion by the reception given to that gentleman's motions in the House of Commons, outside of his own pocket constituencies, very little attention is paid to his views.

On Thursday, the 26th ult., there was in the House of Commons an illustration of what we have stated here. There was a motion by Mr. McMullen for the second reading of a bill to abolish the superannuation system as now applied to the civil service. It was a question on which the members divided according to their party associations. The Government opposed, and the Opposition supported the motion. Mr. Wallace, who very recently, even since his withdrawal from the Government, declared that he believed still in the Government's general policy, while opposing it on the school question, voted with the Opposition on Mr. McMullen's bill. But where were Mr. McCarthy and his third party when this matter was before the House? Have they a policy at all on matters of general interest to the public? It would appear not, for they were not present when the vote was taken, except Mr. Stubbs, the newly elected member for Cardwell; and it is not at all unusual for the same gentlemen to be absent when important matters are discussed, especially the leader of the party who, as a rule, lets the interests and welfare of the country and of his constituents take care of themselves, as far as he is concerned, for it is a common thing to see his place vacant when important matters are before the House. As regards the other members of Mr. McCarthy's party, they, too, left their leader in a very ridiculous plight from the same cause when his lengthy amendment which was to change the whole condition of affairs in regard to the Manitoba School Bill, was voted on. They must have been absent, since there was only Mr. McCarthy's vote recorded in favor of his amendment.

Surely the country would be in a sad condition if the Government were left to a McCarthy cabinet, unless it be the case that we would be all the better off if the Parliament were not to meet at all, and that thus we should be left without any legislation. Perhaps this is the view of the great third party; but if this be the case, why should they be so cautious to be present often enough to earn their Parliamentary indemnity?

EDITORIAL NOTES.

SOME person has sent us a copy of a paper published in Moncton, N. B., which is styled The Orange Truth. The publisher is Mr. Will L. Anderson. We would ask our friend to be good enough not to mail us any more of these papers. One is enough. The surprise is, not that Mr. W. L. Anderson publishes this paper, but that he should have a constituency who would read it. Its presence in a community would justify the appointment of an Anthony Comstock. Pity 'tis that Mr. Will L. Anderson would not engage in some respectable employment. Publishing misrepresentations under the name of truth is an execrable business.

The last official Year Book of France reports that the number of Protestants in France and Algeria is 639,825, of whom 10,789 are in Algeria. Of the

entire number and 540,480 of which are paid by the minister declared in the divinity of Church, which are the State.

We direct of Mr. J. which apply CATHOLIC by this gentleman. Freemen were in so willing to in the were inflicted more content his ably breach and him is larging for out they were be base whom his to remain

AS AN EVI- fested by ward Prot- that Mr. R- ed for the- ency of So- the Orang- he is no- There are- ist memb- Protestan- thoroughl- ing two c- considera- In the fac- how the c- keep up- they fear- ruled by g-

THE D- the Orang- land, is t- Orange n- whereby- sented in- as an exc- of Dublin- same wa- The statu- Catholics- city be- that ther- ation of- of Dublin- have a fa- thirteen- bers of- municipi- Protestan- while in- Catholic- and thes- tions. C- is notori- matter h- are treat- some fire- the passi- which oc-

Mr. W- opinion- newly-e- National- only ma- with a fa- a reunio- been he- The task- the divi- great di- Mr. Dill- enough- to effec- Dillon: "I u- ary obst- several- Dillon h- leader o- shake a- as nobo- move th- as fami- in Con- place is- can be- forms of- or Ball- over sar- as man- heart, i- the new- munici- country- lack of- patient- less as- pride in-

It is heresy York U-