

**The Catholic Record.**

Published Weekly at 484 and 486 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, 484 and 486 Richmond Street, London, Ontario. P. J. NEVES and W. A. NEVES, are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transact all other business for the CATHOLIC RECORD.  
Rates of Advertising—Ten cents per line each insertion, single measurement.  
Approved and recommended by the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa, and St. Boniface, and the Bishops of Hamilton, 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, Feb. 9, 1895.

**ANGLICAN CHURCH HISTORY.**

Our attention has been called to a lecture delivered in St. James' Anglican Church, Guelph, by the rector, Rev. A. J. Belt, upon the History of the Reformation, and especially of the Church of England.

It is difficult to tell from Rev. Mr. Belt's address, to what section of the Church of England he belongs, whether High, Low, Broad, or Erastian, for his lecture is, we presume designedly, somewhat nondescript in regard to doctrine. There are claims put forward which would seem to indicate that the lecturer should be ranked among the highest of the Ritualists, as the presence that the Church of England is one with the ancient Church which existed before the Norman invasion, and that the English Reformation was "not a question of crosses and vestments, of lights and vestments. It was first of all a demand for the freedom of the Church of England from a foreign yoke. . . . It was an appeal for reverting to the teachings and practices of the primitive Church, the principles on which it was carried on being, 'Let the old customs prevail.'"

It would seem that none but a follower of Dr. Pusey's celebrated Tractarian movement would dare to appeal thus confidently to the teachings of the early Christian Church; for it was by the study of these teachings, and the discovery that they agree with the teachings of the Catholic Church, that the High Church party introduced into the Church of England those very practices of which the Rev. Mr. Belt speaks so flippantly as "a question of crosses and vestments, of lights and vestments."

But, on the other hand, this very flippancy would show that the rector is decidedly of Low Church sentiments, else why would he make light of a matter which his own Bishop, and many of his fellow clergy, look upon as being of the highest importance?

The Rev. Mr. Belt makes light of the questions of crosses and vestments—but he should know that even Low Churchmen regard these questions as being so momentous that they are at the present time ready to read their Church asunder rather than let it rest in its present position. To this effect did Canon Farrar of London declare himself when recently he put himself forward as the new standard-bearer and champion of the Low Church party. The Rev. Mr. Belt, therefore, is evidently nondescript in his behalf. He has nothing in common with either of the great parties which now divide his Church and make its synodical assemblages hideous with their broils and bickerings, not only on the subjects of crosses, vestments, etc., but also in regard to the doctrines which ought to be taught to the people.

The Rev. Mr. Belt has nothing in common with either, yet, strange to say, neither has he any opinion discordant with either of these parties; but he declares in his simplicity that "the English Church," that is to say, this agglomeration of warring parties with all their discordant views, "was, and is, ready to abide by the practice of the early Church." This is equivalent to saying that the primitive Church, like the Church of England of to-day, taught every variety of doctrine, from the extreme Rationalism and anti Scripturism of Bishops Hoadly and Colenso, to the Ritualism and Monasticism of Bishop Temple and "Father" Ignatius—an absurdity too patent to need serious refutation.

The Church of England has really no fixed creed, inasmuch as its accepted creeds are tortured into every conceivable meaning, and there is no authority now which dares, or is able to settle their real meaning on any one of the points so vehemently disputed. Indeed it is the boast of many of the clergy and Bishops that the creed of the Church is broad enough to include any Englishman, whatever may be his belief. It is not

necessary for us to discuss the question here whether it be expedient or not that a Church should have so flexible a creed as this, but we mention the facts of the case to show how preposterous is the Rev. Mr. Belt's pretence that the Church of England bears any resemblance either to the Primitive Christian Church, or to the Church as it existed in England before the Norman conquest.

On many other points, Mr. Belt's statements are as unreliable as those we have already indicated. It would occupy more space than we could give the subject in the present issue to refute at length all the errors into which the lecturer floundered; we shall therefore confine our present remarks to the consideration of his statement that it was William the Conqueror who introduced into England the doctrine of the supremacy of the Pope over the Church of Christ, and for the first time subjected the Church in England to the authority of the Pope.

We must here premise that Mr. Belt's statement ill accords with the claims of many of his brethren, who profess that the Church of England of modern times is one and the same with the pre-Reformation Church in England. Thus at the last Pan-Anglican Council the Archbishop of Canterbury proclaimed himself to be the successor of St. Augustine in the continuity of one Church.

The very fact of such diversity of claims is enough to show that some Anglican clergymen are willing to grasp at any theory which will give a plausible color to their claim to possess Apostolicity of Episcopal succession, but as these theories are all contradictory to each other, they disprove and refute each other, and are equally valueless.

To meet the Rev. Mr. Belt's argument we shall adduce only a few testimonies, but these few are conclusive as showing that the doctrine of the Pope's Supremacy was recognized in England by the Episcopate of ages past, just as it was throughout the world, as Mosheim himself confesses when treating of the third century. (See Ecc. History.)

England was part of the universal Christian Church from the time of the introduction of Christianity by missionaries who were sent by Pope Eleutherius in 183 to baptize King Lucius, and establish the faith of Christ in Britain.

Venerable Bede, who belonged to the Saxon period, gives full particulars of this event, which is also recorded fully by the earlier British writer, Gildas. It is recorded also by Bede and Gildas, and other early writers, that Bishops from Britain sat in Council with other Bishops from all parts of the world, at Arles in 314, at Sardica in 347, and at Rimini in 359. These Councils were thoroughly orthodox, and their acts, acknowledging the authority of the Holy See of Rome, are extant. These acts were signed by the British as well as by the other Bishops present. It will suffice to quote here the words of the Council of Sardica, which are a sample of what occurred on the other occasions referred to:

"If any Bishop thinks he has been in any cause misjudged let us honor the memory of the Apostle Peter, and let those that have judged the cause write to Julius, Bishop of Rome, that by the neighboring Bishops of the Province the judgment may be renewed, and he furnish judges." (Labbe's Councils.)

The British Bishops constantly referred to Pope Eleutherius as being the father of their Church, and from him they claimed their jurisdiction; but amid the troubles and wars of the Britons, who were driven by the Pagan Saxons to the mountains of Wales and neighboring counties, the intercourse with Rome was for a time interrupted, until the conversion of the Saxons by St. Augustine. But St. Augustine himself was commissioned also by a Pope, and from the Pope he and his successors got their jurisdiction as Archbishops of Canterbury. The authority of the Pope always continued to be recognized, as we find by the writings of Venerable Bede, though it is not to be denied that, from time to time, under both Saxon and Norman rule, there were occasional manifestations of discontent against measures taken by successive Popes. Such manifestations no more prove that England was independent of the Pope in ecclesiastical matters than do occasional family broils indicate that parental authority is never recognized.

We shall make further remarks on Rev. Mr. Belt's lecture in a future issue.

Patrick J. Donovan, son of the late Cornelius Donovan, has returned to St. Jerome's College, Berlin. It is Patrick, not Edward as appeared in our report of the late Inspector's death taken from the Hamilton Times, who is studying for the priesthood.

**POLYGAMOUS CHRISTIANITY.**

It is well known that, years ago, Bishop Colenso, the Anglican Bishop of Natal, gave permission to his Zulu converts to retain as many wives as they had in Heathenism when they embraced Christianity, but his course both in this respect and in regard to his attacks on the truth and inspiration of Holy Scripture were repudiated by the ecclesiastical authorities of the Church in England. This repudiation did not affect his standing as a Bishop, however, as it was decided by the Privy Council that the English Church authorities had no control over him, and he retained his Bishopric till his death, sustained by the law of the land, which is the high tribunal in the Church.

It is not so generally known that at a meeting of the Church of England synod, held at Umata recently, under presidency of the Bishop of St. John's, it was laid down as a rule that chiefs having several wives may be admitted to baptism and the Lord's Supper without putting aside any of their wives. The wives also may be admitted to these sacraments. Thus Bishop Colenso's ethics have triumphed in the Church, in Zululand at least.

It is no wonder that the chiefs, who find that they are not obliged to change their Heathenish modes of life, find it a quiet and easy matter to become Christians after the fashion of the missionaries who have invented these new methods of leading a Christian life, and it is said that much of the recent boasted of Protestant success in Christianizing the savages of South Africa is attributable to the easy code of morals to which the converts are expected to conform themselves.

It is some time since these facts were made known, but they were strenuously denied by the Protestant press, not from any positive information which they possessed on the subject, but because the thing seemed too preposterous for belief. We are, however, informed by a recent issue of the Liverpool Catholic Times that the Very Rev. Father Monginoux, of the Oblate Fathers, Prefect Apostolic of Basutoland, has written a letter which states positively that "in order to gain over the chiefs and headmen, who are the worst polygamists in the Kafir nations, the Anglican missionaries are actually receiving into their Church, baptizing, and admitting to the communion, the women who belong to these chief men, and also the chiefs themselves when they can be induced to call themselves Christians."

Father Monginoux says: "I do not call them wives, because even in the eyes of the polygamists themselves, there is one woman in each household who is the wife."

The Anglican missionaries have thus put the glamour of sanctity over polygamy, and in many villages there are chiefs receiving the sacrament of the Communion with their numerous wives. Thus in East Griguland one chief has been admitted to the Church who receives the sacrament regularly along with his nine wives. Another instance is given of a chief who was received into the Catholic Church when he was sick. He had two wives, but he was told that he must put one of them away in order that he might be a Christian. He did this for a time; but when he was restored to health he returned to his two wives. He was then rebuked by the priest, and continuing to live with both his wives, he was cut off from the Catholic Church. This man has been received into the Church of England, and is admitted to Communion at Easter and Christmas.

This question of admitting polygamists to receive Christian sacraments appears to have been long under consideration by Protestant missionaries in Africa, but it does not appear that any decisive action in this direction has been taken officially by any Protestant Church except the Church of England. It appears, however, that the missionaries of other Churches are left very much to their own discretion as regards the question of admitting such converts. The Rev. Josiah Tyler, a missionary of the American Board of Foreign Missions, relates in his "Forty Years Among the Zulus" that it was an occasional occurrence for polygamous converts to apply for admission into the Church. He gives a striking instance of this which occurred at one of the South African villages, where a man of considerable intelligence and of reputed good character came with his two wives, each of whom had four children, and asked permission to build on the mission reserve, and to be instructed in Christianity.

The only difficulty in the way of his admission to the Church was the fact of

his having two wives, both of whom desired to become Christians with him, but neither would give him up as a husband.

Mr. Tyler himself expresses the opinion that it is not proper to receive polygamous converts to the Church fellowship, and he explained to the intending convert that polygamy is an evil "not in accordance with the teachings of the gospel." He advised the Zulu, therefore, to pray fervently for the guidance of the Holy Spirit, assuring him that if he did so he would receive divine direction. He acted on this advice, but whatever may have been the result of his prayers, he retained both wives, and we are informed that "he grew in Bible knowledge and stability of Christian character."

It may be presumed that even though Mr. Tyler may not have admitted him to full communion as a Christian, he found some other minister more flexible on this point. At all events, it is certain that other missionaries beside those of the Church of England have admitted polygamists to the Church, and there is nothing to prevent them from so doing where every one is left to his own fancies for his Christian ethics.

We may ask what is to prevent Mormonism in America from being now recognized as one of the Christian (Protestant) denominations, when polygamy is to be allowed in the land of the Zulus? Surely Christianity is the same for America as for South Africa.

**IRELAND AND HOME RULE.**

There is great jubilation in the Tory camp in England and Ireland because of differences of opinion between members of the Irish Nationalist party, and they have been for some time past busy proclaiming that the question of Home Rule for Ireland is now a dead issue. Mr. Smalley, the London correspondent of the New York Tribune, is also delighted at being able to assert the same thing day after day in the columns of that journal, which, though once regarded as an independent American journal, representing the opinions of a large section of the American people, has so deteriorated as to have become the New York organ of Irish landlordism, as far as its treatment of Irish questions is concerned.

We are gratified that we are able to announce that the Home Rule question is far from being a dead issue. It is true that the necessities of the position at present existing have deferred its consideration. It was the present Parliament which undertook to settle it by means of a bill which would have been satisfactory to the Irish people, and as far as the popular House of Parliament is concerned, Ireland has nothing to complain of; but, as our readers will all remember, that bill was burked by the House of Lords, which took special pains to roll up a heavy and unprecedented majority against it—a majority of 400. But in thus acting the Lords have overreached themselves, and by recording such a majority against the measure, instead of making it a dead issue, they have raised the question of their right to thwart the wishes of the people of the three kingdoms. Are they to be allowed to repeat this mode of action at pleasure? The Liberal party with one voice answers in the negative, and it is well known that as the Liberals speak, so speaks the country in the long run. There may be a delay of a few months, or a few years; but when the Liberal party makes a definite pronouncement of policy, that policy must in the end prevail.

In regard to Home Rule the policy of the Liberals is settled. The latest utterances of the members of the Cabinet have been as unmistakable as they were during the general election campaign, when the whole question at issue was that of Home Rule. Lord Roseberry, the Earl of Ripon, the Earl of Kimberley and Earl Spencer have all spoken recently and clearly on the matter, and the burden of their announcement has been to the same effect—that the question has not been, and will not be shelved.

A few weeks ago a certain Liberal member of the House of Commons, Mr. McEwan, of Centre Edinburgh, put it as a conundrum to his constituents: "Is Irish Home Rule dead?" and his own answer to the query was an affirmative. Commenting on this, Mr. Smalley said gleefully in his New York paper:

"This, of course, absolves the House of Lords of all blame for rejecting that Bill, and cuts the ground from under that agitation which is based on the alleged iniquity of that rejection."

This Tribune correspondent has undoubtedly a vigorous pen, but his con-

clusions are drawn this time from very insufficient premises.

Though Mr. McEwan is in general a supporter of the Liberal party, he is very far from being the dictator of its policy. He has, in fact, but little ability, and still less influence in the party of which he is one of the most slippery and unreliable supporters, having voted ineffectually against his party on several occasions when all its available strength was needed to carry through its measures of reform with prestige. A member who does thus at a critical moment is regarded with suspicion by his party, and this is precisely Mr. McEwan's position. We may well contrast his language with that of the men whom the Liberals respect, and whose words are uttered under the consciousness of a responsibility in which the whole party is involved. Thus a few weeks ago Earl Spencer said:

"We are told by our opponents that the question of Ireland is shelved, and no longer a part of the Liberal programme. So far is this from being the case, I assert that the Liberal party are pledged up to the hilt in favor of Home Rule, and if that party were ever to give up that pledge, I for one would no longer co-operate with them. I should feel myself dishonored, and that I ought to be driven from the society of honest politicians if I abandoned my pledges. But there is no danger of the Liberal party trying to escape from its pledges to the Irish."

To similar effect spoke the Marquis of Ripon, also a member of the Government:

"I am as strong a Home Ruler as ever I was at any period of my life. I look upon our pledges to the people of Ireland as pledges of honor which we are bound to fulfil. I will be no party to any policy and no member of any Government which does not honestly fulfil those pledges."

In presence of these statements and others to the same effect by Lord Roseberry, Mr. Morley, and other prominent Liberals within and without the Government, Mr. Smalley's inferences deduced from the fantasies of an unimportant individual member, even though he be nominally a Liberal, are of but little significance.

At the present moment it would be useless to bring before the House for the second time the Home Rule Bill. It would be again rejected by the Lords, and therefore the Liberals intend to deal so effectually with the Lords that they will not again have the opportunity of treating it as they did before.

It has been announced, over and over again, by the Liberal leaders that at the next election the issue will be the curtailment of the Lords' power. The constitution must be respected, but the time has come when that portion of the constitution which gives the Lords equal power with the Commons must be reformed. The Parliament must be popularized, and Home Rule will follow quickly enough.

It is possible that the Liberals may not win the next general election, for we all know how readily popular opinion veers with every gale, when it depends upon a bare majority; but it is certain that the day is at hand when there will be an overwhelming majority of the British public in favor of justice to Ireland.

The differences of opinion among Irish Nationalists may delay the consummation, but they cannot put it off indefinitely, for whatever may be their differences, there is no true Irishman who does not yearn for the day of relief which must bring peace and prosperity to the nation with it.

It cannot be expected that the opinions of Irishmen shall be uniform on all subjects. There is no country in the world where such unity as this exists, and we do not pretend that Irishmen are differently constituted from the rest of mankind. We have not unity of opinion in Canada; yet the Dominion governs itself with sufficient success for all practical purposes, and Ireland will be able to govern itself also, in spite of disagreements on some subjects. But it is nevertheless to be regretted that at the present moment, when unity is so important, there should be a disagreement on vital questions. We are glad to say, however, that though the dissensions between Nationalists and Parnellites still exist, and there is considerable rancor manifested between these two parties, the differences between the Nationalists proper are very likely to be healed soon, and that at the worst they have not resulted in a disruption of the party.

We publish this week the Encyclical letter of His Holiness Pope Leo XIII. to the Archbishops and Bishops of the United States. This is the only complete report of the document which has yet appeared in any Canadian paper.

**THE MANITOBA SCHOOL QUESTION.**

It was announced some weeks ago that the Privy Council had reached the conclusion that the appeal of the Catholics of Manitoba against the Acts of the Provincial Legislature abolishing Separate schools in that Province had been sustained, to the extent that it is decided that there is a case for the Catholics to appeal to the Governor General in Council for redress against injustice inflicted upon them by the Manitoba School Acts of 1890.

On the 29th ult. judgment was rendered by the Judicial Committee of the Council, fully bearing out the prospective statement, the decision being to the effect that the Catholics have a case on which the Dominion Government has authority under the terms of union to set aside the Manitoba Acts under which injustice has been inflicted on the Catholic minority.

It will be remembered that in 1892 there was a decision by the Privy Council which does not seem to be entirely consistent with the present one. It was then settled that the Province has the exclusive right to legislate on the subject of education, provided that no religious denomination were deprived of rights enjoyed at the time of the union, and, further, that the Acts of the Provincial Legislature had not deprived the Catholic body of any rights so enjoyed. As a consequence of this, it was decided that it is within the power of the Manitoba Legislature to pass the Acts in question.

We have constantly held that this decision of the Privy Council dealt harshly and unjustly with the Catholic minority, and we are still of that opinion. Before the union Catholics and Protestants alike enjoyed the privilege of having Separate schools; and as both received equally their fair share in all public school funds apportioned for educational purposes, it appeared to us a very poor subterfuge to assert, as that decision did practically, that Catholics had no rights or privileges under the former Government of the Territory, and that therefore no rights were taken from them under the recent legislation of the Province. The decision appeared to us the more preposterous as it was provided in the Dominion Manitoba Act that not only rights guaranteed by law, but also those which existed by custom, should continue under the Union.

This provision was especially intended by the Canadian Parliament for the protection of the minority in educational matters, and at the time the minority was Protestant. Perhaps this was one reason why it was so unanimously passed by Parliament; but as soon as Manitoba had a decidedly Protestant majority, the guarantee was thrown to the winds, and the Catholic schools were at once abolished as far as regarded their legal status.

We may well imagine that if the case had been reversed, and that the Catholic majority in Manitoba, while it existed, had attempted to deprive the Protestant minority of their schools, the whole country would have raised an outcry against such an outrage and breach of faith, yet Catholics were expected to submit passively, and leave matters as they were: such being the advice given them by the non-Catholic press.

Great credit is due to the Catholics of Manitoba, and especially of Winnipeg, that they have persevered in seeking justice, and the recent decision has crowned their efforts with success.

We were told that the decision of the Privy Council in 1892 had settled the matter finally, and that it was useless to push it further. The CATHOLIC RECORD frequently called attention to the fact that there still remained an appeal to the Governor-in-Council to repair the injustice, and it is on this point that the Privy Council has just given its decision, to the effect that the Catholics of Manitoba may look to the Dominion Government and Parliament for redress, if it be refused by Manitoba itself.

When the Manitoba School Acts of 1890 were passed it was within the power of the Governor-General to disallow them. This would undoubtedly have been an extreme measure, inasmuch as the Provinces are very jealous of interference with their legislation on the part of the Dominion Government; yet we are satisfied that the circumstances were such as would have justified such interference. It was the evident intention of Parliament in passing the Manitoba Act that the majority in the Province should be restrained from imposing upon the minority a system of education which should do violence to their religious convictions, and it was supposed at the