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.

MESSRS. LUKE KING, JOHN NIGH, P. J. NEVEN and M. C. O'DONNELL are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transact all other business for the CATHOLIC RECORD.

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

Approved and recommended by the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa, and St. Boniface, and the Bishops of London, 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.

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

London, Saturday, Aug. 27, 1892.

A NEW SALVATION ARMY TROUBLE.

About three years ago considerable excitement was aroused in the ranks of the Salvation Army by the statements of certain officers or officials of the organization who at that time complained of the arbitrary manner in which the internal affairs of the Army were conducted. Complaint was then made that General Booth and his family so managed matters that themselves were enriched at the expense of the branches throughout the world, while the subordinate officers who were doing the local work were kept on starvation wages, and in many instances no attention was paid to their representations and remonstrances. Some peculiarly heart-rending examples were related wherein this was the case. Such things are very likely to happen when too much authority is vested in the hands of one irresponsible man, which appears to be the case in regard to General Booth.

It is very possible that the complaints then made were exaggerated, for the General is usually spoken of as a man having his work of the reformation of the worst classes of society very much at heart. Nevertheless there is danger of great abuses where the entire control of so extensive an organization is in the hands of a single self-appointed head. This control might possibly be exercised discreetly by General Booth, but there is no guarantee that his successor will be free from suspicion; and if we are to believe the complainants, there have already been gross misappropriations of funds to a different purpose from that for which they have been subscribed. Thus it was said that for the sending away of certain missionaries to foreign lands, the amount necessary for the support of the same missionary had in some instances been subscribed by several persons, so that the extra subscriptions were thrown into the general fund of the society. This fund, together with all title deeds to property, is solely at the disposal of the General.

The complaints to which we have here referred were made by a small section of the Army, and were readily hushed up by the elimination of those who were discontented, but last week circumstances brought about a renewal of these complaints in a form which menaces the continued existence of the Army in Canada at least.

The cause of the present trouble was the dismissal of one of the Toronto officers, who is styled "Brigadier" Phillpot. The charge which led to his dismissal was that he had been disloyal to his superiors, in consequence of which he was commanded either to submit to be lowered to the rank of captain and to leave Toronto, or to quit the Army.

The disloyalty consisted in certain protests made by Mr. Phillpot last year to Commissioner Rees against the higher officers of the Army on lines very similar to the protests which were made three years ago. He objected to the extravagant mode of life of the higher officers, while many of the subordinates are in actual destitution, or in a state bordering thereon. Commissioner Rees, it is said, resented this action of the Brigadier as an infringement on the dignity which should surround the superior officers; and Commandant Booth, a son of General Booth, who has been for some months in Canada as head of the Canadian branch of the Army, has taken the matter up by summarily insisting that the disloyal Brigadier shall submit to one or the other of the alternatives which have been placed before him. The friends of the Brigadier state that when Commandant Booth came to this country he had a fixed impression that Mr. Phillpot was a disloyal subject and a dangerous man, and that it was his determination to remove him as soon as opportunity presented itself.

When the Brigadier received the communication by which he was to be lowered in rank he was on the point of addressing a meeting of the Army, and in his speech he intimated to the meeting that he intended to resign. There was much astonishment when this announcement was made, and much indignation was expressed when the particulars were made known. His colleagues, thirty-seven in number, drew up and signed a remonstrance to Commandant Booth, asking him to give Mr. Phillpot a fair trial before the officers of the Army, but their request was peremptorily refused. A deputation of officers after this called on Mr. Booth to urge their request; but they were at first refused the opportunity to see him. At last, however, after a long consultation with his counsellors, the Commandant consented to an interview. He spoke with much warmth, declaring that it would be lowering the dignity of his office and of the superior officers to make the explanations demanded in presence of the accused. "His word must be accepted at all times without hesitation or cavil, and must be taken in preference to that of accused persons under all circumstances."

An interview was afterwards had by the deputation with Colonel Mackenzie, who is Commandant Booth's chief confidant. The Colonel's answer was similar to that of his superior. The immediate result was the resignation of twenty-seven officers who sympathize with Brigadier Phillpot; and it is expected that nearly the whole Toronto Army will secede from General Booth's jurisdiction and form an organization of their own. The seceding officers have already rented a church for their own use, thus showing that they consider the breach final.

AS VIEWED BY CATHOLICS.

Here the question may occur to some, "How is the Salvation Army to be regarded by Catholics?"

We are free to admit that the Army has had considerable influence upon a certain class of nominal Christians to give up the practice of some habitual vices, especially that of intemperance, and we do not deny that General Booth's scheme for the amelioration of the worst classes in "darkest England" is a praiseworthy effort of philanthropy, which deserves to succeed better than it has done. But it must be remembered that true religion is not to be superseded by mere enthusiasm. The Catholic Church has not neglected to use the human methods which General Booth employs for the relief of the suffering and poor and the reform of the depraved, and she has hospitals, reformatories, orphanages, houses of refuge, and other institutions to meet these purposes, being limited only by insufficiency of resources from making such institutions as efficient as they ought to be. It is a well-known fact that such institutions were doing a great work before the English Reformation, at which time they were seized by Henry VIII. and subsequent monarchs to fill the royal treasury and to reward unworthy favorites of the crown. In spite of all these losses the Church continues to this day her good work in England, and similar institutions have been established wherever it exists; and we have no hesitation in asserting that in proportion to the means at command, such institutions are more efficient than those which General Booth has succeeded in establishing through the generosity of kind patrons who have contributed large sums toward carrying out his plans. But true religion does not consist solely in this kind of work. Its first object is the worship of Almighty God in the manner He has appointed for man to follow, and in this respect such organizations as the Salvation Army are by no means a fit substitute for religion. It has not the sacraments which Christ left to His Church as the channels of His grace. It has not the Sacrifice of the Mass, which is the great act of public worship which Christ has instituted. Enthusiasm and sensationalism can never supply these deficiencies. Catholics are well aware of all this, and they cannot attach themselves to such associations. It is to guard them against the danger of whatever is attactive in such organizations, to preserve them in the unity of faith, and to guard them against "being carried about with every wind of doctrine" that a hierarchy and priesthood were established by Christ in His Church to instruct mankind in His one true faith. (Eph., iv.)

The result of the new trouble in the Salvation camp cannot be foreseen at present; but it is expected that the immediate consequence will be the formation of a rival Army.

It may thus be seen that there is a germ of disorganization in all religious or semi-religious associations which are not based upon the firm rock on which, as on its foundation, Christ built His Church. There can be no true Christian unity which does not emanate from the centre of unity which is to be found only in the Catholic Church, and in the See of Peter.

We must add that on the present occasion the course followed by the higher officers of the society appears to have been exceedingly high-handed and arbitrary. We are not surprised at the dissatisfaction it has created. It is a curious fact that such are the vagaries of the human mind that many men are disposed to reject the legitimate authority of the successors of St. Peter, and yet are willing to submit to the absolute sway of the first pretender who presents himself. The "courts martial" of the "Salvation Army" are without appeal, and the judgments of the officers are as final as those of the Czar or the Shah of Persia.

ULSTER AND HOME RULE.

It is a very noticeable fact that since the British elections the Ulster Orangemen have become much more moderate in tone than they were previously. The Belfast convention, which was said to be representative of Ulster sentiment, was very outspoken in its professions that Home Rule will positively not be accepted by the Protestant minority of Ireland, and that they would rise in armed resistance rather than submit to it. Threats were freely uttered by leading Orangemen of the Colonel Saunderson and T. W. Russell stamp that the Queen's crown would be kicked into the Boyne rather than that Ulster should be ruled by the Catholic majority of the people of Ireland, and the speeches of Lord Salisbury and the Duke of Devonshire gave encouragement to the hypothesis that the English Tories would make common cause with those of Ireland in the threatened resistance.

It was among the things threatened that if Mr. Gladstone were sustained by a majority at the polls, drilling would be at once begun on a large scale to prepare the Ulstermen for the emergency, and it was even understood that negotiations were at one time in progress for the purchase of arms to enable the Ulstermen to begin operations at once on a large scale. Enthusiasm was lacking, however, and the arms were not bought for want of funds.

More than a month has elapsed since the results of the general election have been known, and there has been not the slightest concealment on the part of the Liberals regarding their intention of passing a Home Rule measure which will be satisfactory to Ireland. Even Mr. Justin McCarthy, having learned from personal communications with Mr. Gladstone the details of the Home Rule measure which is to be submitted to Parliament, has declared that it would be perfectly satisfactory and acceptable to Mr. Parnell if that gentleman were still living. Yet the Ulster Orangemen have shown no sign that they intend to put their noisy threats into execution. There is no appearance of any intended effort to line the ditches with Orange heroes to resist Mr. Gladstone and Home Rule. The truth is that the threats of resistance which were so ostentatiously uttered were merely intended as a ruse to influence the elections, but as they have failed in their purpose they will in all probability be now dropped. At all events there is now nothing to indicate that they will be renewed, and the battle for and against Home Rule will be fought in Parliament and not on the gory fields of actual combat.

The Ulster Orangemen have sense enough not to undertake a hopeless insurrectionary movement. It is said that history repeats itself, and this is certainly the case with regard to Orange threats in Ireland. Before the union the Orangemen were as noisy in their opposition to that measure as they are now in favor of it. They opposed it because they thought that their ascendancy over the Catholics of Ireland, which was then complete, would be destroyed by the absorption of Ireland which would be effected by that measure. But when it was passed they accepted it meekly; some of the noisiest of their anti-unionist orators even bartering their pretended patriotism by accepting office as the price for their acceptance of the proposition of the Government, and others taking their pay in hard cash.

Among the resolutions in which the union was condemned, that of the Dublin lodges in May, 1800, was remarkable. It was to the following effect:

"That we consider the friends of that abominable measure, the union of Great Britain and Ireland, as the greatest enemies to our most gracious sovereign — a measure which would destroy our existence as a nation, and eventually involve the rights and liberties, and even the lives, of the people of Ireland."

The Orangemen at that time took a view of the question which time has proved to be correct. But they had in mind a reason for their opposition quite different from a desire for the prosperity of Ireland, though this does not appear in the Dublin resolution.

At that time the Parliament of Ireland was entirely Protestant, and was for the most part composed of Orangemen, in accordance with the penal code then in force, by which Catholics were not only ineligible as members of Parliament, but were also disqualified from voting. Hence the Orange thought was that their ascendancy would pass away from them; and, further, there was, even in a Parliament so elected, a National sentiment sufficiently strong to have prevented them from accepting the union if they had not been purchased by the most unblushing bribery.

It is a curious spectacle to find the Orangemen now advocating the continuance of a system which they once condemned so strongly, but the same motive is at the bottom of their present attitude. They found that they were still dominant after the Union, and they see that Home Rule will destroy their dominancy. Hence their opposition to it. But if they find the prospect of the rule of the majority of the people of Ireland so odious, they might well imagine how odious is the rule of the minority as it has existed for three centuries. Whatever may be said of majority rule, minority rule is insufferable.

There is not the least danger of an uprising against Home Rule. The Orangemen know very well that it would be a hopeless attempt. The boast that they will ignore an Irish Parliament is but emply bluster, like all that to which utterance was given when the Anglican Church was disestablished. Protestant as well as Catholic Irishmen will soon find out that the autonomy of Ireland does not mean that their religious liberties will be interfered with; but with the returning prosperity of the country which is sure to follow self-government, it may be presumed that within a very short time the Irish Protestants will be the foremost friends of the new order of things.

THE PRIVY COUNCIL'S DECISION.

The text of the judgment of the Privy Council's Judicial Committee is at hand, as we announced last week, and it proves to be as full of surprises as we anticipated from the short account of its contents which was sent by cable despatches.

The judgment of the Court was unanimous, the judges present being Lords Watson, Hobhouse, Macnaghten Morris, Hannen and Shand. There were two cases appealed, *viz.*, the city of Winnipeg *vs.* Barrett on behalf of the Catholic schools, and the city of Winnipeg *vs.* Logan, on behalf of the Church of England schools of the Province. For the city of Winnipeg, the counsel were Sir Horace Davey, Q. C., Mr. Dalton McCarthy, Q. C., and Mr. Martin, Q. C. For the respondents, Attorney General Webster, Mr. S. Blake, Q. C., and Mr. J. S. Ewart, Q. C., besides whom Mr. F. C. Gore appeared for Mr. Barrett, and Mr. Ram for Mr. Logan.

On behalf of the Church of England, Mr. Logan was content to rely upon the argument advanced in behalf of the Catholic schools. Mr. Barrett's advisers preferred that they should stand alone, as they were not prepared to make common cause with Mr. Logan.

The judgment of the Supreme Court of Canada was set aside, and also another of the Court of Queen's bench of Manitoba, founded thereon, and the committee decided that the Manitoba Legislature has not exceeded its powers by the passing of the School Acts of 1890.

The question of what was the practice in Manitoba at the time it was established as a Province of Canada was easily settled, as the statement of Archbishop Tache on this point was accepted by all concerned as accurate and complete. According to this statement, the schools of Manitoba were denominational at the time of the union, some of them being controlled by the Roman Catholic Church, and others by various Protestant denominations. As far as Catholics were concerned, these schools were supported partly by fees received from the parents of the children, and partly by Church funds contributed by the people. There were no Public schools, in the sense of State schools. The Catholics supported the schools of their own Church for the benefit of Catholic children, and did not contribute to the support of any other schools.

The Privy Council Committee adjudge, on the basis of this statement, that if the condition of things thus described had even been legalized, Catholics would simply "have had by law the right to establish schools at their own expense, to maintain their schools by school fees or voluntary contributions, and to conduct them in accordance with their own religious tenets." They infer that as a consequence of this we must hold that the practice which is spoken of in the Manitoba Act, which guaranteed to denominations a thing which shall not be interfered with, goes no further than to this same extent. But they add that the establishment of a national system of education is not at all inconsistent with the right to maintain denominational schools, and that the Legislature has therefore the authority to establish such a system.

But as Catholics before now were not compelled to support a second set of schools, beside those in which their own children were educated, it is interesting to notice by what process of reasoning the judges think that they must do so now, and that still their rights remain intact.

The judges argue that the Legislature would have a very limited sphere in which to operate if the denominational system were to prevail to the exclusion of a non-sectarian system. They conclude that the legislative powers must therefore be more extensive than the denominational contention would make them out to be.

This method of reasoning by which the judges infer extensive rights from the narrow limits within which rights would be confined if another interpretation were given is expressly repudiated by them in another part of their judgment, where the application of the principle would have been favorable to the Catholic claim.

They state that it has been objected that if their decision be correct Catholics enjoy under the Manitoba Act only the rights which all men enjoy under the laws of nature. They answer virtually that such is really the case. The Manitoba Act gives no guarantee whatsoever that Catholics are to be protected.

Is it possible that a sectarian bias has led the judges to use this form of argument in one case, while they reject it as quite inconclusive in the other?

The reasoning by which the judges draw the inference that Catholics have no guaranteed rights under the Manitoba Act is supported by the fact that there was no law in existence granting Separate schools at the time of the establishment of the Province. The Dominion Parliament, in guaranteeing the rights conferred by law, could not have meant to give any guarantee whatsoever, and therefore they may not have intended to give any guarantee when they declared that the rights which were held by practice should be continued.

With due respect to the judges, we are of opinion that this reasoning is not conclusive. The words "in practice" were evidently inserted by the Parliament of Canada to cover the state of things which existed in Manitoba, precisely because the wording "by-law" did not cover the case, as it did when the British North America Act was passed in which the school question in Ontario and Quebec was dealt with. It is certain that both those members of Parliament who supported and those who opposed the clause were of opinion that this was the case, as the debate on the question proves; and even since the decision of the judges has been made public, the Hon. William Macdougall, who was one of its opponents, has publicly declared that the clause was universally understood in this sense. If so understood it was so meant. It appears to us that the words "by law" were introduced into the Manitoba Act, not for the purpose of showing that nothing was meant by the guarantee, but because it was desirable to preserve the wording of the British North America Act, and to extend its meaning so as to cover with more certainty the circumstances of Manitoba.

There may have been another reason for introducing the words "by law." It is very possible that our legislators were aware of the glorious uncertainty of the legal decisions, and they may have been of the opinion that the custom of the unorganized territory would be held as law when it became organized and they may for this reason have introduced the words "by law." It is, at all events, certain that the intention of Parliament was to confirm Catholics and Protestants alike in the possession of Separate schools and to exempt them from supporting schools to which they did not send their children. It was only in this way they could carry out the promises made by the Dominion Government to the people of Manitoba when the territory was opened up for settlement. We maintain, therefore, that if the law fails in expressing a guarantee, the omission should now be rectified by legislation, or by whatever means will secure the desired object. The opponents of Catholic education argue that because of the decision of the judges Catholics should let the matter rest; but we maintain that where interests so important are at stake, the decision makes it the more necessary to look for a remedy to the defect in the law.

We must add that we do not regard it as a very forcible argument when the judges reason that by virtue of the authority given to the Legislature of Manitoba to legislate on education, it should have more extensive authority than the rights of denominations would leave it if they were recognized. The duty of the State to the people is sufficiently fulfilled if proper education be assured in any way. It is therefore quite sufficient for the purposes of the State that it have the power to tax for school purposes those who do not sufficiently provide otherwise for the reasonable education of their children; but there is no justice in establishing a school system which takes from the people the power of coupling religious and secular teaching. The judges may say what they will, but this power is in fact taken away when a double tax is imposed on those who support denominational schools.

Catholics either in Manitoba or elsewhere have no objection to the establishment of a purely secular Public school system for those who prefer it, but they have a right to object against such a system being forced upon them.

It will be seen that we do not regard the Privy Council as infallible, though we admit that the opinions of the learned judges who compose the Judicial Committee are of considerable weight on merely legal matters. We shall have some further remarks to make on their decision in a future issue of the RECORD.

HON. E. BLAKE AND THE HOME RULE BILL.

According to the intelligence from England and Ireland, the Hon. E. Blake has already made a deep impression throughout Great Britain and Ireland by his eloquence and ability as a statesman of the highest order; and our readers will not be greatly surprised to learn that his name has been placed upon the advisory Committee, to which will be committed the task of preparing a Home Rule Bill.

The days of coercive administration are over, and Mr. John Morley has entered upon the duties of the chief Secretaryship for Ireland, relieving of the burden Mr. Arthur Balfour, the father of the worst of all the Coercion Acts under which Ireland has been deprived of liberty of the press, liberty of speech and almost liberty of thought. Mr. Morley is already at work preparing the Home Rule Bill, which will undoubtedly be passed by the House of Commons. Mr. Gladstone will preside over the work, which is especially his own, and a commtitee consisting of Chancellor Bryce, Justin McCarthy, and Hon. Edward Blake, are entrusted with the task of assisting in the framing of the measure, so as to make it fair and equitable to all classes.

Under such auspices the Bill is sure to be acceptable to Irishmen generally. It is not to be expected that it will be agreeable to those malcontents who are opposed to the self-government of Ireland in any form, and who wish to preserve the iniquitous rule of the minority; but all fair-minded Irishmen, whatever may be their creed, must come to admit that Home Rule will be an immense advantage to the country, when they see that every guarantee which a reasonable minority can expect will be given to the Protestants of Ireland, that under the new constitution their rights and liberties will be thoroughly guarded, so that it will be impossible for the Catholic majority to interfere with the religion of the minority, even if they entertained the desire so to do.

The speeches of Mr. Edward Blake during the campaign, and those which