

The Catholic Record.

Published Weekly at 454 and 456 Richmond Street, London, Ontario.

Price of Subscription—\$1.00 per annum.

LONDON, SATURDAY, JUNE 2, 1906.

AN IMPORTANT EVENT.

We congratulate the Bishop of Hamilton and the priests and people of that city on the magnificent celebration which took place last week in honor of the Golden Jubilee of St. Mary's cathedral.

It was a splendid outpouring of Catholic faith and Catholic devotion, which must have been particularly pleasing to His Excellency Mgr. Sbarretti, the Papal Delegate, who honored the occasion by his distinguished presence.

The devil has been trying this for over eighteen centuries, without success. Perhaps Colonel Samuel will succeed better in the diabolical work. But the Pope and the Catholic people do not appear to be in any very great dread of Colonel Samuel's efforts.

After speaking of some other matters, the colonel whistled "the Protestant Boys" amid uproarious applause. He is evidently a greater adept at whistling than at statesmanship.

There was reference made to Samuel as "the hero of South Africa." It is news to us that the Colonel did any heroic work in South Africa, except to write some "letters from the battlefield," which were full of exaggeration and Col. Hughes.

He asked, indeed, as we understand, for some small command in the South African army, but did not get it, and like the great Achilles, he sulked to such an extent that he was not in any battle at all.

In a recent discussion in parliament Col. Hughes suggested the adoption of wind breaks for the National Rifle Association, and the Montreal Gazette says: "Sir Wilfrid was heard to murmur something to the effect that it would be a good thing if wind breaks could be put on certain members of the house."

A HERESY TRIAL.

The trial of Rev. Algernon S. Crapsey, D. D., a minister of the Protestant Episcopal church of America, for heresy, terminated on Tuesday, May 15th, at Rochester, four out of the five judges appointed to investigate the case having agreed upon a verdict to the effect that his teaching does not conform to the doctrine of the Apostles and Nicene Creeds, which are received and proclaimed by the church as part of its belief.

The Rev. Selden S. Brown, Chancellor of the Diocese of Western New York, served personally on the recalcitrant clergyman a copy of the verdict reached, which declares that after due investigation of the charges laid against Rev. A. Crapsey, the judges find that he has publicly denied in writings which he has published

1st. The doctrine that our Lord Jesus Christ is God and the Saviour of the world, as taught by the Protestant Episcopal church in the United States of America.

2ndly. The doctrine that our Lord Jesus Christ was conceived by the Holy Ghost as taught in the creeds above mentioned.

3dly. The doctrine of the Virgin birth of our Lord Jesus Christ.

4thly. The resurrection of our Lord and Saviour from the dead.

5thly. The doctrine of the Blessed Trinity.

For many years past, prominent pastors or presbyters of the church of England and the American Protestant Episcopal churches of the United States have been growing more and more bold in the denial of the most prominent and fundamental doctrines of Christianity, shielding themselves under the pretence that these doctrines are among the non-essentials of Christian religion and proclaiming that in the exercise of their right of private judgment, which has been from the beginning the boast of all Protestants, they should be permitted to teach just such doctrines as they might draw from their reading of Holy Scripture.

The doctrines under consideration are, indeed, of the very essence of Christianity, and we confess that we are pleased to find that, in one diocese at least of the Protestant Episcopal church, it will be insisted upon that these most fundamental doctrines will continue to be taught so long as the present authorities of that church remain at the helm in Western New York. But there is no guarantee that the decision in Dr. Crapsey's case will be permanent. It is not very long since a prominent Unitarian minister was allowed to participate in the Lord's Supper on a particularly solemn occa-

sion, even in presence of the Bishop of Massachusetts. Only a few years ago the secession of Dr. Briggs from the Presbyterian church taught publicly nearly the same things for which Dr. Crapsey has been just condemned, and yet Dr. Briggs was soon after this ordained as a presbyter of the Protestant Episcopal church, without being required to recant his errors. Canon Hanson of London, England, together with a large proportion of the church of England clergy, recently made a public profession of their belief that the ministers of that church should no longer regard the facts related in the New Testament as the basis of Christian faith.

This utterance sweeps away the history of the birth of Christ by a spotless virgin, of the miracles whereby Christ proved His divine mission, and of His sufferings, death and burial, of His subsequent resurrection and ascension, and of the descent of the Holy Ghost upon the Apostles in the form of tongues of fire, upon all of which events the truths of Christianity were made manifest by the Apostles to all the first converts to Christianity, in Jerusalem and its neighborhood especially.

Against the teachings of these practical Deists, the church of England has taken no action, while the unfortunate Dr. Crapsey, who finds himself surrounded by a somewhat more orthodox body of fellow-clerics, must submit to a decree which will necessarily result in his excommunication, unless he repudiate the doctrines which his fellow churchmen exploit without hindrance in New York and London.

And is this the state of affairs which has been brought about by the "Great and glorious Reformation of the sixteenth century?"

Christ declared that even Beelzebub's kingdom, divided against itself, cannot stand, so we are left in perplexity to know how the Pan-Anglican spiritual kingdom can stand under the continual blows which High, Low, and Broad church teachers are aiming at one another.

It is a strange feature of the case that Bishop Burgess of the Protestant Episcopal diocese of Long Island has made a public announcement of his opinion that this heresy trial was a mistake. He said:

"What shall be the attitude of the church toward those who hardly recognize the right of the church to dogmatic teaching, and who doubt the facts asserted in the creeds. Let me say, therefore, that it should be one of toleration. We do not wish to multiply heresy trials. The church is entrenched in her own fortress. Sometimes the twilight will seem to many a thoughtful churchman almost to have become night, and his hold on one or the other of the Christian verities may have been relaxed."

Taking all the facts together, the Protestant Episcopal church of the United States has fallen into as difficult a labyrinth of error as its mother church in England.

THE ENGLISH EDUCATIONAL BILL.

The Educational Bill which was recently debated by the Imperial Parliament for England has been gladly accepted by the non-Conformist body, on the plea that it exempts them from paying taxes for the support of schools in which no religion should be taught; but the actual meaning of which is that the whole nation of children should be taught in schools which teach the religion of a minority of the people, which is the non-Conformist religion.

According to this new scheme, nothing in the nature of religion is to be taught except twice in the week after school-hours, and by teachers other than those employed to teach the schools. Besides, the schools under these clauses must admit pupils of all ages who apply for admission, so long as there are vacant seats in the school-room. It is evident that, under this arrangement, Catholic or denominational teaching will be impossible, even though the school has been built solely for Catholic children.

It is evident that Catholics are in the right in saying that the Catholic and Anglican schools are practically taken out of the hands of their true owners to be given up to the control of the non-Conformists who desire to have no religious teaching beyond the reading of the Protestant bible.

It needs no great cleverness to understand that such a law can have no attraction for Catholics, as it insists upon the handing over of the schools which Catholics have erected for Catholic education to non-Catholic or non-Conformist school-boards to be controlled by them, if any apportionment is to be assigned to them by the government; and under this arrangement, the legal schools of England have all become non-Conformist schools perforce. Even Mr. David Lloyd-George, the president of the Board of Trade, a member of the Government, in his speech in favor of the passage of the Bill, did not hesitate to speak as offensively in its support as we might ex-

pect certain members of the Grand Orange Lodge to do at the Canadian meetings of that Lodge. He declared that there are four logical positions in which the government might stand in the changes proposed to be made in the school system. It might adopt 1st a purely secular school system; 2ndly, it might be frankly denominational all round; 3dly, it might be based upon a common religious syllabus; and 4thly, it might be assumed that there cannot be a common standing point for Catholics and Protestants. He had come to the conclusion that the last mentioned is the only solution of the case which would prove satisfactory in England, and it had been the system adopted by the government in the present Bill. This solution, he said, is the only one the British Government could consistently adopt in the circumstances in which it finds itself placed. It had been said that the same right of religious teaching should be given to every denomination, but the assumption of those who advocated this solution is that none have dogmas to teach except the church of England—an assumption with a strong touch of arrogance in it. The speaker declared confidently the excellence of such a law, and quoted Germany, Holland, and Quebec as having adopted the very solution which lies at the bottom of this Bill. Surely Mr. Lloyd-George falls here into a grievous error. Every Canadian knows that the Protestant minority of Quebec has entire control of its own schools, except in the one respect—a thing which has not been attempted in regard to the Catholic minority under the Birrell Bill. On the contrary, the Birrell Bill sweeps away Catholic schools as completely as was done by the Greenway school Acts in Manitoba. And, further, some slight concessions have been granted to Catholics in Manitoba, such as are not contemplated at all under the Birrell Act, which is practically an act of confiscation, with the penalty annexed that if Catholics object to such confiscation, they will be obliged to give up all aid from the government.

In Germany, the school system gives the fullest liberty to Catholics and Jewish schools to be conducted by teachers of their own faith, the Kaiser himself being fully and personally of the belief that no school system is of any value which does not amply provide for the religious teaching of the pupils.

But Mr. David Lloyd-George has not specially in view the purpose of crushing the Catholics of England by the new school act. He equally aims at the Anglican body, and at those Methodists who to the present moment have had voluntary schools under the control of these religious bodies. These schools are all to be practically closed, or handed over to School Boards which will teach only such religion as is desired by the non-conformists. There must be no more denominationalism taught.

The non-conformists are stronger in the present Parliament than they have ever been before in a legally constituted House of Commons, that is to say, they are stronger than they have been since the "Rump Parliament" which decreed the execution of King Charles I, a Parliament from which all friends of the British monarchy had been violently ejected.

Until 1870, in which year the Franco-German war broke out, there was no national system of education established. The churches attended to the matter of education, and the only churches which did this systematically were the Anglicans, Catholics and Jews. The Methodists had also their voluntary schools, but only to a limited extent, as their voluntary schools numbered only a little more than half the number which were maintained by the Catholics.

In 1870 Hon. Mr. Foster introduced a national system whereby the Board schools supplemented the Voluntary system then in existence under the patronage and control of the clergy. It was not Mr. Foster's intention to do away with religious schools, but to furnish board schools wherever the Voluntary schools were insufficient to do the whole work of educating the children. This advantage was, however, given to the Board schools that they were authorized to tax the people for their maintenance, whereas the school-committees conducting the Voluntary schools were not given this power. The incongruity of this was soon found out in the carrying out of the law, and a demand was made to give the Voluntary schools the powers of Board schools. Some concessions were made from time to time in the direction of putting the voluntary schools on the same legal basis as the Board schools, but not until 1902 was a decisive step taken to this effect. Mr. Balfour's government introducing a law for this purpose outside the metropolis. In 1903 this law was applied to the city of London; and the non-Conformists, who had made no objection to these amending laws, now began to find fault with the government for its passage of laws

putting the Voluntary schools under the same regulations with the Board schools. Their wish was to destroy the Voluntary schools entirely. Some allowed their property to be sold under the auctioneer's hammer, and others themselves to be sent to prison rather than yield the point, and such were called "Passive Resisters." Most of the leaders of these Resisters were non-Conformist clergymen.

Notwithstanding all this the law was passed, but the non-Conformists kept up the agitation down to the present time, taking advantage of the great landslide of the recent elections.

But we do not believe that this landslide justifies the action which the government have taken. There were numerous other issues which had force in the decision given by the voters at the last election, such as the tariff issue, Home Rule, etc.

Home Rule for Ireland had a prominent place in the final verdict. There is no doubt that of the Liberals elected a great many owe their election to the Irish Catholic vote in England, on the Home Rule issue, and this vote was certainly not given them for the purpose of inducing them to pass an unjust educational law against the Catholics of England. After passing such a law, the Campbell-Bannerman Government may well expect a reversal of the judgment already given by the electorate, unless they hasten to remedy the grievance they have created.

We would scarcely have suspected that the new Liberal government should pass so illiberal an act as the present one to satisfy a mere minority of the nation, for certain it is that a great majority of the people are in favor of religious teaching in the schools, as they send their children to them. But even if a minority desired religious schools, their wishes should be respected, as would be the case if the government really intended to give satisfaction to all.

The school systems of Ontario and Quebec, which recognize the rights of minorities, give complete satisfaction in these provinces, notwithstanding the fact that in Ontario the separate school law was originally bitterly opposed by the Orange element, and others who have always opposed the concession of any favors to Catholics. But when Protestants in Ontario and Catholics in Quebec discovered in fine that the denominational schools inflicted no hardships on their children, Protestant or Catholic, they willingly accepted the situation, and were even content since Confederation to improve Catholic schools by placing them in a position nearly equal to the Protestant or Public schools of the province. The same would occur in England under similar circumstances, if the laws of 1902 and 1903 had not been interfered with by the new British government.

But Mr. Lloyd-George is not contented with arguing in favor of a godless system of religion; he must even attack religion itself in his advocacy of that system. He said in this connection:

"What is occurring in England is part of a general movement which has occurred in every democratic country in the world. There are three democratic countries in the world—America, France and England. What is taking place in these countries shows that democracy has come to the conclusion that clericalism is its enemy. There is no use in saying there is hatred of a special church. It is the instinct of three great democratic peoples moving towards what they believe is liberty of conscience."

It is true, the speaker added: "The people have made up their minds to stand and rally round the Bible, which they are anxious should be placed in the hands of the children; but that no ecclesiastic or politician shall be allowed to interfere between a child and the great book which has saved England from darkness in the past, and which will continue to illumine the gloom that may oppress her in the future, and principles which will perhaps help to bring about a better state of things than their parents had enjoyed."

Mr. Lloyd George may be honestly of this opinion, but we do not believe he will force it upon the people of Great Britain. His disguised atheism will not be blindly accepted, and it is our belief indeed that the education law will be the first nail in the coffin of the new government, unless they heed the warning voice which has been raised against the godless measure they have forced upon the British people.

THE BIRRELL SCHOOL LAW.

The Hibbert Journal for April has an article by the Anglican Bishop of Carlisle under the title "Mr. Birrell's Choice," dealing with the possible attitude of the church of England in regard to Mr. Birrell's School Act.

He points out to the government and the members of Parliament that the lion of denominationalism is in the way of the proposed solution of the educational problem. It is, he says, "a strong and loud lion; it is also a lion not without nobleness of mien and courage; but even at its best, denominationalism is departmental, and not universal religion. In its essence, it is

sectarian and not Catholic Christianity." He shows that the Nonconformists are not so free from denominationalism as they would have us believe, and he admits that the church of England has also its denominationalism, being determined to teach the doctrines of the church in the schoolroom without being restricted by vexatious laws prohibiting the teaching of any specific religious system. The church will not ask permission to teach it as something prohibited to be taught, and therefore to be taught only surreptitiously. He says: "I will not sacrifice on the altar of my denominational doctrine, however sacred and sublime to me, the spiritual hope of the nation and the religious training of hosts of children whose only opportunity of learning of God and their own divine origin and destiny is in the day school. To do otherwise is, in my judgment, not only a great national betrayal, but a moral and spiritual infanticide on a stupendous scale."

We cannot doubt that the new School Bill which has been the standard around which the non-Conformists have rallied, will have to be modified in order to become a nationally acceptable measure, and even the present government will probably be forced to modify it to make it acceptable to Anglicans and Catholics, and to make it the basis of a national system of education.

A REMARKABLE MISSION.

During the past half century of Catholic life in London many notable missions have been given by different orders of priests, for the most part those of the Society of Jesus. It may with perfect truth be said that seldom before in the history of our city has there been a more remarkable outpouring of Catholic faith and love than during the missionary exercises given in St. Mary's church during the past two weeks by two of the most prominent and eloquent priests of the Jesuit order, Rev. Fathers Rosswinkel and Donohoe.

Rev. Father McKeon, the zealous pastor, and his energetic assistant, Rev. Father Tobin, have cause for much thankfulness because of the splendid results of these religious exercises, at all of which, from early morning until late at night, crowds of devoted Catholics were present. Not a few non-Catholics took advantage of the occasion to hear Catholic truths propounded from an authoritative source. Indeed it must have been a revelation to many of them to find out by practical experience to what an extent they had been misled regarding Catholic faith by those whose intolerance and bigotry are so frequently displayed in press and pulpit.

All honor to the great Jesuits for their noble work and all honor to Fathers McKeon and Tobin for the splendid evidence of religious growth in the east end of the city.

THE WESTMINSTER CONFESSION.

The creed of the Presbyterians is contained in the Westminster Confession. The Rev. Dr. Samuel T. Carter, a Presbyterian minister of New York, writes to the General Assembly of that denomination, which met at Des Moines, Iowa, on May 18:

"Many years ago, when I was ordained to the ministry of the Gospel, I declared in the most solemn manner that I believed the Westminster Confession to be the truth of God. I now, in an equally solemn manner, declare that I do not believe it to be the truth of God; that I utterly reject it as a setting forth of the character of the Heavenly Father. There never was, and there never will be, such a God as the God of the Westminster Confession. It is an idol of man's invention as truly as any worshiped in Delhi, Peking or Africa. I believe that the great and true God is infinitely and exclusively good and gracious; I believe that the Westminster Confession darkens and denies the great love of God, and should not be retained as a confession by any church to-day, and that our church is false to its greatest duty of being a true witness for God so long as it retains this confession."

Dr. Carter is right—the Westminster Confession would make God out a bitter, malignant, unjust, cruel and vindictive character. It ought to be a damned.—Catholic Columbian.

The Presbyterian Record at last acknowledges that the story it published some time ago about the selling of insurance policies against purgatory by missionaries in the Province of Quebec was a pure fabrication, though received and published by it in good faith. We should have thought more of this acknowledgment if it had been made with the "commendable readiness" which our Pictou friend speaks of, by the painful dentistry of its London namesake, and yielded so ungraciously to the Montreal magazine, does not inspire us with much confidence in its professions of good faith.—Antigonish Casket.

All mankind is in love with life. Yet a great portion is given to habits which tend to destroy it. How could our inconsistency be made plainer? We are not glad enough, do not rejoice enough. Therefore are we heartless and unthankful, weak and complaining.