

The Catholic Record.

Published Weekly at 481 and 483 Richmond street, London, Ontario.

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

REV. GEORGE R. NORTHGRAVES, Editor.

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

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.

London, Saturday, Feb. 20, 1892.

ECCLESIASTICAL INTERVENTION.

It is universally admitted as a principle in dealing with public men that they are not to be held responsible for an act when there is no evidence that they have committed it.

The public man here referred to is Mr. Meredith, and the point raised by the Mail is to the effect that the Catholic Bishops of the Dominion conspired against him to keep him out of the Dominion Cabinet.

It is scarcely necessary for us to say that this statement of the Mail has not a single fact for its foundation, and this is acknowledged in the very article to which we refer.

We may here remark that Prof. Grant's efforts to put Mr. Meredith into the Cabinet are real, while the efforts of the Catholic episcopacy to keep him out are purely imaginary.

The Mail says: "The electors, Catholic and Protestant, are quite able to select their rulers without ecclesiastical intervention."

What would our correspondent say if the Protestant clergy were to intimate to Mr. Abbot that Mr. John Costigan, who worked hard for Separate schools in New Brunswick, must be turned out of the Cabinet, or the Protestant vote in a body would be directed against the Government?

In reply to this query we may say that the Hon. John Costigan in supporting Separate schools for New Brunswick had no desire to do any injustice to the Protestants of that Province.

There is no comparison between the position of Hon. Mr. Costigan in supporting Separate schools for New Brunswick and that of Mr. Meredith in endeavoring to hamper with vexatious clauses the Catholic schools of Ontario.

while Mr. Meredith endeavored by trickery and unfair methods to secure for the Public schools part of the school funds to which the Catholic schools were in justice entitled.

It is not surprising that the Catholic electorate should have resented Mr. Meredith's injustice, but it is unfair to attribute to the Episcopate what is really due to the influence of the entire Catholic sentiment of Canada.

We have no desire to minimize the influence of the hierarchy in all matters which concern the interests of the Catholics of Canada, but we protest against the efforts of our adversaries to heap odium on the Bishops personally, when the result is really due to the fact that Catholic sentiment is a power which cannot be ignored while Catholics form 42 per cent. of the population of the Dominion.

It would be presumptuous on our part to undertake a serious defence of the hierarchy, when the only basis of attack is the statement of the Mail that something "is believed" about them.

LORD SALISBURY AND SIR WM VERNON HARCOURT.

A British Prime Minister backed by a subservient majority in Parliament can do much which is beyond the power of ordinary men.

The transfer has been made unconditionally, but it is understood that the schools shall be conducted by Catholic teachers, and shall be virtually under the management of the Catholic school commissioners, who are the American equivalent to the school trustees of the Canadian law.

In return for this placing of the schools under the control of the Public School Board the schools are to be placed on the same footing with the Public schools, in regard to participation in all aid granted by the State to Public schools.

This arrangement has been very severely criticised by a section of the Catholic press, some of whom term it a surrender of the Catholic principle, while others regard it as a wise step towards the solution of the school problem in the United States.

As our readers are aware, the Catholic schools in the United States are not recognized as having any legal status, but are supported solely at the cost of the Catholics in each parish, who at the same time are obliged to pay their taxes for the support of the Public schools.

Hostile to tyranny and oppression the Church has been, and will continue to be, but she has no hostility to England or the people of England; and a most satisfactory proof that this is the case is the cordial feeling which has arisen in Ireland since Mr. Gladstone and the Liberal party have shown their willingness to adopt a more friendly policy toward the Irish people than has been put into practice at all events for more than three, and we might say with truth for more than seven, centuries.

Sir William Vernon Harcourt very properly denounced Lord Salisbury's speech as "a bigoted and disgraceful escapade, worthy of a violent, drunken Orangeman;" and he added that "if the Premier had made such inflammatory remarks with reference to Canada or Australia, those dependencies would not remain for twenty-four hours in allegiance to the Queen, unless British claims on their loyalty were enforced by cannon and bayonet."

There are a few localities where the Protestants have been brought to recognize the magnitude of this injustice. Fairbault and Stillwater, in Minnesota, are the latest school sections where the Protestants have agreed to make an honest endeavor to make reparation, and a compromise has been made in the manner we have explained above.

The arrangements which have been made in all the cases we have here indicated have recognized that the parents have the right of securing a religious education for their children, while the right of the State is practically conceded to insist upon it that State assisted schools shall supply a minimum of secular education.

It seems to us that in all this the same principles are admitted which underlie the Catholic and Protestant Separate school systems of Ontario and Quebec, and which are found to work fairly towards all concerned.

The adoption of any particular arrangement between the ecclesiastical and civil authorities is rightly left to the discretion of the Bishops in their respective dioceses, and it cannot be doubted that in each case they will take such steps as suit best the special circumstances in which they find themselves placed.

We cannot believe that Archbishop Ireland would have approved of the Fairbault and Stillwater arrangements unless he were perfectly aware that under it there will be full liberty to educate the children in a thoroughly Catholic manner, and it is part of the understanding that if the present arrangement be not found satisfactory either party may retire from it.

It is stated that a number of Protestant ministers in Minnesota are endeavoring to set aside the arrangements which have been made there. It appears, however, that the arrangement is quite in accordance with the school laws, and that the effort to set it aside will be fruitless.

THE PRESBYTERIAN REVISERS AND THE POPE. We have before now made some commentaries on the changes which the Presbyterian Revision Committee propose to make in their Confession of Faith.

The General Assembly could not easily refuse so strong an appeal as was made to them to modify doctrines which neither the clergy nor the laity now believe; yet it was not easy to make the needed changes, and still keep up the pretence that Presbyterianism touched the same doctrine which it propounded two centuries ago as the only revealed truth of God.

It remains to be seen whether the attempt "to do it" and "not to do it" at the same time will pass muster with either of the parties who so warmly debated on the necessity of revision before the question reached the present stage.

One of the most important questions with which the revisers had to deal was the light in which the Pope is to be held before the next generation of Presbyterians. The old Confession of Faith says: "There is no other head of the Church but the Lord Jesus Christ; nor can the Pope of Rome in any sense be head thereof; but is that anti-Christ, that man of sin and son of perdition that exalteth himself in the Church against Christ and all that is called God."

It was evident to all thoughtful minds that in the enlightened nineteenth century such a doctrine as this cannot longer be claimed to be part of the divine revelation.

The Confession of Faith claims to be "the teaching of the Word of God," and the clergy make the solemn profession that all its teachings are derived from the Word of God, the following being the oath taken by the divines who composed it in 1643: "I, A. B., do seriously promise and vow, in the presence of Almighty God, that in this assembly, whereof I am a member, I will maintain nothing in point of doctrine, but what I believe to be most agreeable to the Word of God; nor in point of discipline, but what may make most for God's glory, and the peace and good of this Church."

We are, moreover, told that this Confession is the "only true Christian faith and religion, pleasing God, and bringing salvation to man, now is by the mercy of God revealed to the world by the preaching of the blessed evangel . . . as God's eternal truth, and only ground of our salvation."

If it be true, as Presbyterians pretend, that the authority of the Pope is a modern invention, if it was unheard of till the fifth or sixth century, how can it be made part of divine Revelation that the Pope is the Man of Sin,

the anti-Christ, the Son of Perdition, spoken of in the bible in terms of condemnation? It is evident that without the Pope Presbyterianism lacks one of its most important truths as "revealed to the world by the preaching of the blessed evangel."

It is not to be wondered at that the more reasonable section of the Revision Committee advocated that in the new Confession all reference to the Pope should be omitted, and it would have been a movement towards common sense if the committee had adopted the suggestion, especially as the Rev. Philip Schaff has informed his brothers in the ministry that this teaching of the Confession is founded on an "erroneous exegesis" of the passages of Scripture to which it refers.

But Presbyterianism could not afford to bathe the Pope by in silence. The committee, therefore, decided to pronounce dogmatically against the Pope's claim to be the divinely appointed head of the Church of Christ, but they virtually acknowledge that the interpretation they have hitherto given to the Scriptural texts referred to in the old Confession was a misrepresentation of Scriptural teaching, for they have resolved to leave this portion of the Confession out of their new creed, so that it is to be now:

"The Lord Jesus Christ is the only Head of the Church, and the claims of the Pope of Rome or any other human authority to be the Vicar of Christ and the Head of the Church Universal is without warrant in Scripture or in fact and is a usurpation dishonouring to the Lord Jesus Christ."

This is indeed quite a change from what Presbyterianism has hitherto taught us about the Pope. He is no longer anti-Christ, no longer the son of perdition; but we are told that he is a usurper, and that any one who claims authority over the whole Church of Christ must necessarily be a usurper!

A more puerile statement could scarcely be imagined, if it were the purpose of the committee to say something pre-eminently puerile. Did Christ intend that there should be in His Church a central authority at all? If not, where is that Church authority which is to be obeyed under penalty that the disobedient are to be reputed as heathens and publicans?

Have not the Presbyterians themselves a central authority to whom all must yield obedience? Do not the Presbyteries and the General Assemblies claim the right to judge heretics and cut them off from the fold of the Church, and to inflict punishment on those who obstinately offend either by teaching false doctrine or violating Church discipline?

No organization can fulfil its end unless it have a central authority and Presbyterians practically admit this from the fact that they have invented such authorities which they call Presbyteries, Moderators, etc. Surely if a divinely appointed authority be necessarily a usurpation, one that is of human institution is doubly so.

We may be told that it is the universality of the Pope's claim that constitutes the usurpation. Herein, certainly, there is a radical difference between the authority of the Pope and that claimed by Presbyterian Moderators. But the reason why the Moderators do not claim universal authority is because their authority will not be accepted beyond the pale of their local Church, whether it be the Church of a district or of a nation. We believe that no one will pretend that there is any passage in Holy Writ which defines that the Church of Christ is to be confined to the limits of any particular nation. The central authority of the Church must therefore be universal, and the only plea on which the local authorities of Presbyteries and Moderators can be excused is that the Church has become split into sections which refuse to recognize each other as portions of one Church. The pretence of the new Confession that a universal authority in the Church is anti-scriptural is therefore but a lame apology for the disorganized condition in which Protestantism exists because it cannot organize itself into one body.

But nothing is more clear from Holy Scripture than that Christ established a central authority to rule the whole Church. Our Lord knew the need of a visible head in His Church to preserve unity. For this reason He constituted his Apostles as His first ministers and dispensers of His mysteries, and St. Peter was made the centre of ecclesiastical unity when Christ built His Church upon Him as upon its foundation: "Thou art Peter (the Rock), and on this Rock I will build my Church." For Peter he prayed

deavoring to set aside the arrangements which have been made there. It appears, however, that the arrangement is quite in accordance with the school laws, and that the effort to set it aside will be fruitless.

THE PRESBYTERIAN REVISERS AND THE POPE. We have before now made some commentaries on the changes which the Presbyterian Revision Committee propose to make in their Confession of Faith.

The General Assembly could not easily refuse so strong an appeal as was made to them to modify doctrines which neither the clergy nor the laity now believe; yet it was not easy to make the needed changes, and still keep up the pretence that Presbyterianism touched the same doctrine which it propounded two centuries ago as the only revealed truth of God.

It remains to be seen whether the attempt "to do it" and "not to do it" at the same time will pass muster with either of the parties who so warmly debated on the necessity of revision before the question reached the present stage.

One of the most important questions with which the revisers had to deal was the light in which the Pope is to be held before the next generation of Presbyterians. The old Confession of Faith says: "There is no other head of the Church but the Lord Jesus Christ; nor can the Pope of Rome in any sense be head thereof; but is that anti-Christ, that man of sin and son of perdition that exalteth himself in the Church against Christ and all that is called God."

It was evident to all thoughtful minds that in the enlightened nineteenth century such a doctrine as this cannot longer be claimed to be part of the divine revelation.

The Confession of Faith claims to be "the teaching of the Word of God," and the clergy make the solemn profession that all its teachings are derived from the Word of God, the following being the oath taken by the divines who composed it in 1643: "I, A. B., do seriously promise and vow, in the presence of Almighty God, that in this assembly, whereof I am a member, I will maintain nothing in point of doctrine, but what I believe to be most agreeable to the Word of God; nor in point of discipline, but what may make most for God's glory, and the peace and good of this Church."

We are, moreover, told that this Confession is the "only true Christian faith and religion, pleasing God, and bringing salvation to man, now is by the mercy of God revealed to the world by the preaching of the blessed evangel . . . as God's eternal truth, and only ground of our salvation."

If it be true, as Presbyterians pretend, that the authority of the Pope is a modern invention, if it was unheard of till the fifth or sixth century, how can it be made part of divine Revelation that the Pope is the Man of Sin,

the anti-Christ, the Son of Perdition, spoken of in the bible in terms of condemnation? It is evident that without the Pope Presbyterianism lacks one of its most important truths as "revealed to the world by the preaching of the blessed evangel."

It is not to be wondered at that the more reasonable section of the Revision Committee advocated that in the new Confession all reference to the Pope should be omitted, and it would have been a movement towards common sense if the committee had adopted the suggestion, especially as the Rev. Philip Schaff has informed his brothers in the ministry that this teaching of the Confession is founded on an "erroneous exegesis" of the passages of Scripture to which it refers.

But Presbyterianism could not afford to bathe the Pope by in silence. The committee, therefore, decided to pronounce dogmatically against the Pope's claim to be the divinely appointed head of the Church of Christ, but they virtually acknowledge that the interpretation they have hitherto given to the Scriptural texts referred to in the old Confession was a misrepresentation of Scriptural teaching, for they have resolved to leave this portion of the Confession out of their new creed, so that it is to be now:

"The Lord Jesus Christ is the only Head of the Church, and the claims of the Pope of Rome or any other human authority to be the Vicar of Christ and the Head of the Church Universal is without warrant in Scripture or in fact and is a usurpation dishonouring to the Lord Jesus Christ."

This is indeed quite a change from what Presbyterianism has hitherto taught us about the Pope. He is no longer anti-Christ, no longer the son of perdition; but we are told that he is a usurper, and that any one who claims authority over the whole Church of Christ must necessarily be a usurper!

A more puerile statement could scarcely be imagined, if it were the purpose of the committee to say something pre-eminently puerile. Did Christ intend that there should be in His Church a central authority at all? If not, where is that Church authority which is to be obeyed under penalty that the disobedient are to be reputed as heathens and publicans?

Have not the Presbyterians themselves a central authority to whom all must yield obedience? Do not the Presbyteries and the General Assemblies claim the right to judge heretics and cut them off from the fold of the Church, and to inflict punishment on those who obstinately offend either by teaching false doctrine or violating Church discipline?

No organization can fulfil its end unless it have a central authority and Presbyterians practically admit this from the fact that they have invented such authorities which they call Presbyteries, Moderators, etc. Surely if a divinely appointed authority be necessarily a usurpation, one that is of human institution is doubly so.

We may be told that it is the universality of the Pope's claim that constitutes the usurpation. Herein, certainly, there is a radical difference between the authority of the Pope and that claimed by Presbyterian Moderators. But the reason why the Moderators do not claim universal authority is because their authority will not be accepted beyond the pale of their local Church, whether it be the Church of a district or of a nation. We believe that no one will pretend that there is any passage in Holy Writ which defines that the Church of Christ is to be confined to the limits of any particular nation. The central authority of the Church must therefore be universal, and the only plea on which the local authorities of Presbyteries and Moderators can be excused is that the Church has become split into sections which refuse to recognize each other as portions of one Church. The pretence of the new Confession that a universal authority in the Church is anti-scriptural is therefore but a lame apology for the disorganized condition in which Protestantism exists because it cannot organize itself into one body.

deavoring to set aside the arrangements which have been made there. It appears, however, that the arrangement is quite in accordance with the school laws, and that the effort to set it aside will be fruitless.

THE PRESBYTERIAN REVISERS AND THE POPE. We have before now made some commentaries on the changes which the Presbyterian Revision Committee propose to make in their Confession of Faith.

The General Assembly could not easily refuse so strong an appeal as was made to them to modify doctrines which neither the clergy nor the laity now believe; yet it was not easy to make the needed changes, and still keep up the pretence that Presbyterianism touched the same doctrine which it propounded two centuries ago as the only revealed truth of God.

It remains to be seen whether the attempt "to do it" and "not to do it" at the same time will pass muster with either of the parties who so warmly debated on the necessity of revision before the question reached the present stage.

One of the most important questions with which the revisers had to deal was the light in which the Pope is to be held before the next generation of Presbyterians. The old Confession of Faith says: "There is no other head of the Church but the Lord Jesus Christ; nor can the Pope of Rome in any sense be head thereof; but is that anti-Christ, that man of sin and son of perdition that exalteth himself in the Church against Christ and all that is called God."

It was evident to all thoughtful minds that in the enlightened nineteenth century such a doctrine as this cannot longer be claimed to be part of the divine revelation.

The Confession of Faith claims to be "the teaching of the Word of God," and the clergy make the solemn profession that all its teachings are derived from the Word of God, the following being the oath taken by the divines who composed it in 1643: "I, A. B., do seriously promise and vow, in the presence of Almighty God, that in this assembly, whereof I am a member, I will maintain nothing in point of doctrine, but what I believe to be most agreeable to the Word of God; nor in point of discipline, but what may make most for God's glory, and the peace and good of this Church."

We are, moreover, told that this Confession is the "only true Christian faith and religion, pleasing God, and bringing salvation to man, now is by the mercy of God revealed to the world by the preaching of the blessed evangel . . . as God's eternal truth, and only ground of our salvation."

If it be true, as Presbyterians pretend, that the authority of the Pope is a modern invention, if it was unheard of till the fifth or sixth century, how can it be made part of divine Revelation that the Pope is the Man of Sin,

the anti-Christ, the Son of Perdition, spoken of in the bible in terms of condemnation? It is evident that without the Pope Presbyterianism lacks one of its most important truths as "revealed to the world by the preaching of the blessed evangel."

It is not to be wondered at that the more reasonable section of the Revision Committee advocated that in the new Confession all reference to the Pope should be omitted, and it would have been a movement towards common sense if the committee had adopted the suggestion, especially as the Rev. Philip Schaff has informed his brothers in the ministry that this teaching of the Confession is founded on an "erroneous exegesis" of the passages of Scripture to which it refers.

But Presbyterianism could not afford to bathe the Pope by in silence. The committee, therefore, decided to pronounce dogmatically against the Pope's claim to be the divinely appointed head of the Church of Christ, but they virtually acknowledge that the interpretation they have hitherto given to the Scriptural texts referred to in the old Confession was a misrepresentation of Scriptural teaching, for they have resolved to leave this portion of the Confession out of their new creed, so that it is to be now:

"The Lord Jesus Christ is the only Head of the Church, and the claims of the Pope of Rome or any other human authority to be the Vicar of Christ and the Head of the Church Universal is without warrant in Scripture or in fact and is a usurpation dishonouring to the Lord Jesus Christ."

This is indeed quite a change from what Presbyterianism has hitherto taught us about the Pope. He is no longer anti-Christ, no longer the son of perdition; but we are told that he is a usurper, and that any one who claims authority over the whole Church of Christ must necessarily be a usurper!

A more puerile statement could scarcely be imagined, if it were the purpose of the committee to say something pre-eminently puerile. Did Christ intend that there should be in His Church a central authority at all? If not, where is that Church authority which is to be obeyed under penalty that the disobedient are to be reputed as heathens and publicans?

Have not the Presbyterians themselves a central authority to whom all must yield obedience? Do not the Presbyteries and the General Assemblies claim the right to judge heretics and cut them off from the fold of the Church, and to inflict punishment on those who obstinately offend either by teaching false doctrine or violating Church discipline?

No organization can fulfil its end unless it have a central authority and Presbyterians practically admit this from the fact that they have invented such authorities which they call Presbyteries, Moderators, etc. Surely if a divinely appointed authority be necessarily a usurpation, one that is of human institution is doubly so.

We may be told that it is the universality of the Pope's claim that constitutes the usurpation. Herein, certainly, there is a radical difference between the authority of the Pope and that claimed by Presbyterian Moderators. But the reason why the Moderators do not claim universal authority is because their authority will not be accepted beyond the pale of their local Church, whether it be the Church of a district or of a nation. We believe that no one will pretend that there is any passage in Holy Writ which defines that the Church of Christ is to be confined to the limits of any particular nation. The central authority of the Church must therefore be universal, and the only plea on which the local authorities of Presbyteries and Moderators can be excused is that the Church has become split into sections which refuse to recognize each other as portions of one Church. The pretence of the new Confession that a universal authority in the Church is anti-scriptural is therefore but a lame apology for the disorganized condition in which Protestantism exists because it cannot organize itself into one body.