

**The Catholic Record.**

Published Weekly at 481 and 483 Richmond street, London, Ontario.  
Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

REV. GEORGE R. NORTHGRAVES,  
Author of "Mistakes of Modern Infidels,"  
THOMAS COFFEY.

Messrs. L. K. 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.

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

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

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. But it appears that the *Mail* will not deal with Catholic Bishops according to this first principle of fair play. In its issue of the 12th inst., under the heading "Ecclesiastical Intervention," it raises a note of alarm that "it is a danger and a disgrace to the country that a body of (Catholic) Bishops should either force a public man into office, or conspire to keep him out."

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. The most the *Mail* can say in proof of its statement is that the cause of Mr. Meredith's non-appointment "is believed to have been the episcopal action under which, to quote the excellent letter of Principal Grant, a public man has been kept out of political position because of his views on a matter with which the State—in the premises—has nothing to do."

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* would have displayed more fairness if it had condemned the interference which was real, instead of pouring out its vials of wrath upon those whom it only supposes to have been guilty without having a particle of evidence to bear it out in its hypothesis.

The *Mail* says: "The electors, Catholic and Protestant, are quite able to select their rulers without ecclesiastical intervention." Why then does it approve of the intervention of Rev. Principal Grant? Even if it were to be admitted that the Bishops of the Dominion had united to prevent Mr. Meredith's appointment, it would be hard to prove that they have less right to interfere, on one side, than has Professor Grant to meddle on the other. We have yet to learn that Presbyterian divines have a monopoly of right to interfere in Dominion politics.

The *Mail* asks:

"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. His demand was that Catholics should use their own share of the school funds, for the support of schools to which they could conscientiously send their children; whereas Mr. Meredith's anti-Catholic crusades were undertaken to throw obstacles in the way of Catholics obtaining for Catholic school purposes their fair share of the Ontario school monies. From first to last during two provincial campaigns Mr. Meredith's aim was to raise petty annoyances in the way of Catholic school trustees, so as to divert from Catholic schools as much as possible of the taxes paid by Catholic ratepayers for education.

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. Hon. Mr. Costigan endeavored to secure for Catholics the right to use for Catholic education the money which Catholics themselves were paying,

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. The avowed object of this was to raise a difficulty in the way of sustaining Catholic schools, in the hope that they would thus be starved to inanition.

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. The Catholic body are quite ready to assume the responsibility for their conduct. They have no wish to transfer it to the shoulders of the hierarchy.

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. We have only to say that the reasoning public will need more than such a statement before holding the Bishops responsible for the *Mail*'s fancies or vagaries.

**LORD SALISBURY AND SIR W. VERNON HARCOURT.**

A British Prime Minister backed by a subservient majority in Parliament can do much which is beyond the power of ordinary men. He can control the manufacturing, agricultural and commercial interests of millions of British subjects, and even of those of other countries. He has much to say in constructing the map of the world, but there are matters which are above his might. Lord Salisbury, however, does not seem to be conscious that the continued progress of the Catholic Church is one of the things which he cannot impede. He might with more prospect of success attempt to stay the cataract of Niagara than to prevent the Church in Great Britain and Ireland from exercising that influence which her position demands; and when we find him pronouncing, as he did recently in his Exeter speech, that it is his policy to put an end to "Papal dominance," we know that he is engaged in a crusade which will bring upon him only defeat and disaster.

A hundred years ago the cry of no-Popery in the mouths of unscrupulous politicians was a very powerful means of moving the masses of the English people even to deeds of violence; and it was used with great effect by the half-witted Lord George Gordon. Even forty years ago Lord John Russell used it to enable him to pass through Parliament the celebrated Ecclesiastical Titles Bill, which he did not afterwards dare to put into effect. But since then a new and better educated generation has sprung up which is not to be frightened with such bugaboos, and Lord Salisbury ought to know that the use of such worn out artillery is more likely to do damage to those who use it than to those whom it is intended to injure. When we hear him so frantically telling the people of Exeter that Home Rule for Ireland means "Papal dominance through the medium of the Roman Catholic hierarchy," we must infer that he is now fully aware that the days of his own dominance are numbered, and that the coming election will sweep his Ministry out of existence. His Exeter ravings are nothing more nor less than the frothings of a man in the last throes of delirium.

It was once the policy of England to ignore the existence of Catholics in the three kingdoms, but they cannot be ignored now. Yet it is not true to say, as Lord Salisbury said, that the Catholic hierarchy has been hostile to England. 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 far 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."

Sir William's condemnation of Lord Salisbury's words are as opportune as they are strong. The Irish people have learned from the present attitude of the Liberals that the people of England have not now so much antipathy for Irishmen, as there was good reason to believe they entertained in the past. This new state of affairs has created a cordiality between the people of the two kingdoms which could not be expected to exist before; and it would be calculated to destroy this growing friendship if it were believed that Lord Salisbury spoke the sentiments of the English people in what we may regard as an after dinner speech at Exeter. Sir William Harcourt is in a position in which he can secure Catholic teaching while freeing the Catholic people even in part from this heavy burden, he is quite justified in making the arrangements he has agreed upon. The Fairbairn arrangement seems to us to be practically the same which has already been made in other places, where it is working satisfactorily. It has been tried in Poughkeepsie, and other parts of the State of New York, and a similar arrangement is in operation in parts of the dioceses of Portland, Savannah, Boston, Pittsburgh and Dubuque, with the full approbation of the Ordinaries of those dioceses.

It cannot be supposed for a moment that these prelates who have agreed to a modus vivendi under the States school laws have compromised religion, and we must say that we have no approbation for the attacks which have been made upon Archbishop Ireland for his efforts to relieve his diocesan from a heavy burden, while adhering to the principle of Catholic education.

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.

**THE MINNESOTA SCHOOL ARRANGEMENTS.**

A vigorous discussion has been going on for some time past in the columns of several Catholic journals of the United States in reference to the duty or right of the State to take part in the education of youth.

The immediate occasion of this discussion is the action of Archbishop Ireland, of Minneapolis, who gave permission to the priests of Fairbault and Stillwater to transfer the Catholic parochial schools of those localities to the Public School Boards to be conducted in accordance with the Public school law.

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. Catholic teaching is to be given to the children, but this is to be done outside of the legal school hours.

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. As there are about eight hundred thousand Catholic children attending the Catholic parish schools, at a cost of about \$15 for each pupil, the injustice to which Catholics are subjected annually amounts to about \$12,000,000. It cannot be denied that Catholics must feel strongly the necessity of religious education, whereas they are willing to tax themselves to this extent in order to secure the benefit of religious education to their children, and this is the amount of injustice annually inflicted upon them by the present Public school system. It is not surprising that they should wish to be relieved of this unjust burden, and the recent arrangements made at Fairbault and Stillwater are intended to give the desired relief, though the relief afforded meets but a small fraction of the injustice inflicted.

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. From the Catholic point of view, this compromise may not be all that might be desired. The school system of the United States cannot be regarded as just until the Catholic schools are recognized as being entitled to a fair share of all public moneys appropriated by the State to education, and that the rights of Catholics to teach the Catholic religion in their schools be fully admitted, and that the Catholic schools be recognized as being fully entitled to share in Public school funds in proportion to the amount of secular teaching given in them. But it must be borne in mind that it is a severe strain to be obliged to support two sets of schools, and if Archbishop Ireland finds that he can secure Catholic teaching while freeing the Catholic people even in part from this heavy burden, he is quite justified in making the arrangements he has agreed upon.

The Fairbairn arrangement seems to us to be practically the same which has already been made in other places, where it is working satisfactorily. It has been tried in Poughkeepsie, and other parts of the State of New York, and a similar arrangement is in operation in parts of the dioceses of Portland, Savannah, Boston, Pittsburgh and Dubuque, with the full approbation of the Ordinaries of those dioceses.

It cannot be supposed for a moment that these prelates who have agreed to a modus vivendi under the States school laws have compromised religion, and we must say that we have no approbation for the attacks which have been made upon Archbishop Ireland for his efforts to relieve his diocesan from a heavy burden, while adhering to the principle of Catholic education.

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. It appears, therefore, that the adverse criticism to which Archbishop Ireland has been subject has been undeserved; and as a matter of fact we find that his action has practically been approved by all the prelates who have hitherto expressed an opinion on the subject, amongst whom we may reckon all those Bishops and Archbishops who have admitted the principle in their dioceses. Bishop Keane, the rector of the Catholic University of Washington, has also endorsed the plan.

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. This is probably the best arrangement which could be made, but we have every confidence that it will be found to work satisfactorily. Indeed even in some Ontario school sections, notwithstanding that we have Separate school laws of which either Catholics or Protestants can avail themselves where they constitute a minority, the minority have frequently found it more to their advantage to work in harmony with the majority, under the Public school law, in a manner very similar to that adopted in Wisconsin; and when Catholics and Protestants are disposed to be mutually tolerant to each other this method has worked very satisfactorily. The town of Windsor has been a case in point, and there has been but little friction there on account of difference in religion.

It is stated that a number of Protestant ministers in Minnesota are en-

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 school laws leave to the local authorities in the first instance all details of school management, and it appears that the Attorney-General of Minnesota has referred the matter to the County Auditor as being within his jurisdiction. It is probable that this reference will settle the matter, and if this should prove to be the case, other districts are likely to follow the example of liberality and fairness set by the school officials of Fairbault and Stillwater. We may reasonably hope that this arrangement will be the prelude to a satisfactory solution to the school problem throughout the American Union.

**THE PRESBYTERIAN REVISIONERS 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. It was a task of no small difficulty to frame a new creed which should satisfy the one hundred and sixty-seven Presbyteries which demanded revision, without giving offence to the minority who think the old one with all its harsh Calvinism quite good enough for the present generation.

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 teaches the same doctrine which it propounded two centuries ago as the only revealed truth of God. The Assembly was evidently in a difficulty which it evaded by appointing a Revision Committee indeed, but hampered with the instruction that it must not change the Calvinistic character of the present creed; which is equivalent to saying that revision has come to be a necessity, but that it must be apparent and not real.

It is now stated that the Revision Committee have finished their labors, and that they have a modified creed ready for the consideration of the next Assembly. The atrocious Calvinism of the old Confession, which was the chief stumbling-block of clergy and laity alike, has not been very substantially changed by the revisers, but it has been concealed under a more specious form of words so as to be capable of a new interpretation which was not contemplated, certainly, by Dr. Tweiss and the one hundred and nine divines who framed the original "Westminster Confession of Faith."

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, which 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 his 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 pass 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 dishonoring 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