

The Catholic Record.

Published Weekly at 44 and 46 Richmond Street, London, Ontario. Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

Catholic Record

London, Sat., Nov. 16th, 1889.

PASTORAL LETTER

His Grace the Most Rev. John Walsh, D. D., Archbishop-elect of Toronto, To the Clergy, Religious Communities and Laity of the Diocese of London.

John Walsh, by the grace of God and the appointment of the Holy See, Archbishop-elect of Toronto, To the Clergy, Religious Communities and Laity of the Diocese of London: greeting and benediction in the Lord.

DEARLY BELOVED BROTHERN

The time is come when, acting in obedience to the Vicar of Christ, we must sever the ties that bind us to this diocese, and say adieu to you all. For twenty-two years we have labored together in respective spheres for the glory of God and the progress of our holy religion.

The ties that bind us to the diocese of London are the most sacred and most intimate. We have spent the best part of our sacerdotal life amongst you.

All this makes it evident how Mary the Mother of God preserved her virginity, and it cannot be supposed that she yielded it afterwards.

The flight of the Holy Family to Egypt, to escape Herod's murderous intentions, endured at all events two years; yet on their return there was no other child than Jesus in the family; for just as the Angel of God had directed Joseph, "take the Child and His mother and fly into Egypt," He directs him to return after Herod's death: "take the Child and His mother and go into the land of Israel."

prayers to our blessed Lord, that He, in His bounty and goodness, may send them a Bishop according to His own heart. For this reason we request of the clergy to say the *Oratio de Spiritu Sancto* in the Holy Mass, wherever the Rubric permit, until the appointment of our successor.

This letter shall be read on the first Sunday after its reception in the churches of the diocese of London, and at chapter in its religious communities. Given at London on this, the first day of November, Feast of All Saints, A. D. 1889.

JOHN WALSH, Archbishop elect of Toronto, Vicar of the Holy See, Secretary ad hoc.

"THE BROTHERS OF JESUS."

A Congregationalist clergyman, Rev. J. Wood, of Ottawa, writes a letter to the Ottawa Free Press, denigrating the notorious Justin D. Fulton, yeoman Doctor, for his infamous aspersions against the Blessed Virgin Mary. It will be remembered that the "doctor's" ribald remarks brought the censure of the Bishop of Ochester upon his diocese, and Mr. Gregory, who presided at the meeting at which Fulton said "the Virgin Mary was not much of a virgin anyway."

Rev. Mr. Wood, however, maintains that Mary had other children, "the brothers and sisters of our Lord, born, doubtless, after Him." He holds, an ancient heretic, shocked the pious sentiments of the Catholic world in the fourth century by maintaining this error, but he was thoroughly refuted by St. Jerome. The excellence of virginity or celibacy is proved by numerous passages of Holy Writ, but we shall here refer only to Apoc. (P. Bible Rev.) xiv, 3, 4, where one hundred and forty-four thousand salutes are spoken of "who are virgins. These follow the Lamb (Jesus Christ) whithersoever He goeth. These were purchased from among men, the first fruits to God and to the Lamb. And in their mouth there was found no lie; for they are without spot before the throne of God."

It is undoubtedly on account of the special merit of virginity that Christ chose to be born of a virgin. His birth of a virgin is the theme of prophecy, so important a feature is it in the work of salvation. The birth of Christ is foretold by Isaiah, vii, 14: "The Lord Himself shall give you a sign. Behold a virgin shall conceive and bear a son, and His name shall be called Emmanuel: that is, 'God with us.'" This is positively declared in St. Matt. i, 22, 23, to refer to Mary, who, though married to St. Joseph, remained a Virgin, so that the commission given by God to the Angel Gabriel was that he should go "to a virgin coupled to a man whose name was Joseph of the house of David, and the virgin's name was Mary." (St. Luke i, 27) The angel announced that she should bear a son, whereupon she herself testified to her own virginity (verse 34), and not until she was assured that her virginity would be preserved in the birth of Jesus did the Holy Virgin accede to the angel's message, saying, "Behold the handmaid of the Lord, be it done to me according to thy word."

The flight of the Holy Family to Egypt, to escape Herod's murderous intentions, endured at all events two years; yet on their return there was no other child than Jesus in the family; for just as the Angel of God had directed Joseph, "take the Child and His mother and fly into Egypt," He directs him to return after Herod's death: "take the Child and His mother and go into the land of Israel;" and Joseph "took the Child and His mother, and came into the land of Israel." (St. Matt. ii, 13, 21). When Christ was twelve years of age, the Holy Family went on the customary festival pilgrimage to Jerusalem, and on their departure to return to their home at Nazareth, Jesus remained in Jerusalem, Mary and Joseph missing Him "sought Him among their kinsfolk and acquaintances." There is no sign here that there is a large family as Rev. Mr. Wood maintains. They do not enquire of the brothers and sisters of Jesus where they last saw Him, but of their relatives and acquaintances. Indeed, a large family

would have been a serious obstacle to their pilgrimage, nevertheless that pilgrimage had been made to Jerusalem "every year at the solemn day of the passch." This shows the plety of the holy couple; but it also points to the fact that they were not numbered with the obstacles which a large family would have thrown in the way of their making the annual journey.

All their love was centred in their one charge, Jesus, who "waxed strong, full of wisdom: and the grace of God was with Him." (St. Luke, 40-47.) And Mary, on finding Jesus in the temple, does not say to Him, "Thy father and I and Thy brothers and sisters have sought Thee," but "Thy father and I have sought Thee sorrowing."

Rev. Mr. Wood quotes St. Matt. xiii, 55, 56; St. Mark iii, 32; Gal. i, 19, to prove that Jesus had brothers and sisters. The Jews exclaimed, according to St. Matthew, "How came this man by this wisdom and miracles? Is not this the carpenter's son? Is not His Mother called Mary, and His brethren James and Joseph and Simon and Jude: and His sisters, are they not all with us?" St. Mark tells us that "His mother and His brethren came. . . and sent unto Him," and elsewhere their names are given as by St. Matthew. (See St. Mark vi, 3.)

On this authority Mr. Wood says that "we (Protestants) do not believe, as Roman Catholics, and some Anglicans do, in her perpetual virginity."

His admission that some Anglicans believe with Catholics on this subject, shows that not all Protestants make an article of faith in the temporary character of the Blessed Virgin's virginity. Let us add what another Protestant says, namely, Calvin, and we shall have the answer to Mr. Wood. Calvin says: "According to the custom of the Hebrews, as we have said elsewhere, all relatives are called brethren. Haldidius, therefore, shows gross ignorance in saying that Mary had several sons, because in some places the brethren of Christ are mentioned." (Gospel Harmony.) Grotius, a commentator well known among Protestants for his learning, says: "Those whom the Gospel calls Christ's brethren, were His cousins. This mode of speech, common among the Hebrews, was also in use among the Greeks, and even the Romans." (Annotations on Matthew.)

The mother of James and Joseph, above styled the "brethren of Jesus," was by the cross when Jesus was crucified, and she was also named Mary. She is called in St. John xix, 25, Mary of Cleophas (that is, the wife of Cleophas), and sister of the Mother of Jesus. She is mentioned again in St. Matthew xxvii, 56, and there she is called "the mother of James and Joseph." The same designation is given to her in St. Mark xv, 40, where James is called "James the less." In Jude's Epistle i, 1, the writer calls himself the brother of James. Jude was, therefore, also the son of Cleophas, and the mother of James, Joseph, and Jude was the Blessed Virgin's sister. Concerning the fourth brother, Simon, Eusebius states that Hegesippus, a contemporary of Simon and a Jew by birth, relates that he succeeded his brother James as Bishop of Jerusalem (History of the Church, B. 8.)

Rev. Mr. Wood evidently does not know as well as Calvin and Grotius did, what is said in Scripture and history about these "brethren of Jesus." He would act more wisely if he would keep silence till he knows something of the subjects on which he desires to exhibit his knowledge.

WHAT DO THE JESUITS TEACH.

The able letters of the Rev. Father J. J. Egan, of Thornhill, in reply to Rev. W. W. Percival, the Presbyterian minister of the same town, have been published in pamphlet form under the title: "What do the Jesuits teach?"

The pamphlet contains the whole controversy between the two gentlemen, without note or comment. It originated from an anti-Jesuit discourse delivered by Mr. Percival, in which he stated that Jesuits do teach the doctrine that "the end justifies the means." It was, of course, an easy matter for Father Egan to show that the Jesuits have no special doctrines of their own, but that they teach only what the Catholic Church teaches, and as the Catholic doctrine is not as Mr. Percival represents, the Jesuits do not teach the doctrine in question. Mr. Percival gave the same excuse that he had merely called attention to an article in the Mail in which proofs were given that the Jesuits teach the doctrine. He had not asserted it. But Father Egan points out that he had quoted the Mail not to repudiate, but to endorse it, and thus he holds the former to the statement.

The controversy became enlarged as it proceeded, and on Rev. Mr. Percival's part, the usual calumnies against Catholics were repeated, the refutation by Father Egan being very convincing. Father Egan, however, carries the war into Africa and shows some of the enormities of Presbyterianism. Amongst others, he quotes the Westminster Confession in regard to the toleration of other denominations. Toleration of a false religion is declared in the Larger Catechism to be a sin against the Second Com-

mandment of God. Presbyterians are therefore bound by their religion to persecute other denominations. He adds: "Presbyterians are in a bad fix in this country. The second commandment forbids them under pain of sin to tolerate a false religion and the Confession requires them to persecute all who do not belong to the Kirk, the Church of our Common Lord, but the constitution of the country require them to tolerate all religions and let the Church of our Common Lord take care of itself."

He also shows the absurdity of the Presbyterian doctrine of Forordination whereby God is made the author of all sin. The publication of the controversy in pamphlet form is timely, as it affords the Catholic public an opportunity to become familiar with the reasons advanced by the learned priest for the faith that is in them.

We feel constrained to add that when polemical subjects are treated, great care should be taken that they pass through the press in unimpeachable form. We regret to observe that a number of errors are to be found in the little volume before us, the correction of which would have considerably increased its value.

THE BIGOTS AGHAST.

With great jubilation the Mail and other anti-Catholic journals announced the success of Mr. Dalton McCarthy's coup d'etat in Manitoba. Catholics were warned that they must submit to the Orange and Ministerial ascendancy party or take the consequences, which would be disastrous. The Manitoba agitation against Catholic schools and the dual language was pointed to as the first of a series of results which are to come from especially French Canadian and Jesuit folly in asserting their right to govern themselves in local matters without consulting Ontario. But circumstances have unexpectedly cropped up in Manitoba which remind us of the query of Archie Armstrong to King Charles the L's jester to Archbishop Laud when the latter heard of the outbreak in St. Giles' Church, Edinburgh, when an attempt was made to force the English liturgy on the Scotch: "Wno's fool now, my Lord," said Archie.

We were told that all Manitoba was in arms against Catholic separate schools; that every newspaper of the Province, except the Winnipeg Free Press, supports the Greenway policy to abolish them and to institute a system of purely secular education. Indeed it seemed very like truth that this was the case, but like a bomb thrown into camp came the synodal address of the Anglican Bishop of Rupert's Land, to which we made reference last week. Since then the text of the address has come to hand, and though the general tenor was precisely what we then stated, on some points he was much more positive than we supposed from the very short summary which had reached us: and since, there is such a reaction in Manitoba feeling that it is very doubtful that Mr. Greenway's programme can be carried out.

The proposal of the Greenway Government to secularize the schools His Lordship unhesitatingly condemns in the strongest terms. He showed the evil effects of an education which keeps out of view those divine teachings which are the real foundations of morality—"an education that is to take no notice of that to which we owe our modern civilization and from which we receive the hope of our life, our Christian faith." He believes "that such an education will, in the end, be a poor one, both for the individual and the nation, for the Bible reiterates, 'the fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom.'" He illustrated this by relating an occurrence in Australia where the system is secular: "An inspector asked a child why parents should be obeyed. The child referred to the divine sanction of the fifth (fourth according to Catholics), commandment. The inspector replied that he could not give any marks; the answer should have been 'because they feed, clothe and educate me.'" He said "that even some Materialists are trembling for the probable result."

The Bishop thinks that there could be "a scheme which would give a very adequate amount of religious teaching which would be acceptable to all the religious bodies;" and he would prefer that this should be done, that there might be no need of separate schools. We stated before the reasons on account of which this compromise is impracticable. It would be Christianity with Christ practically left out. It would be an offer of salvation with the means of salvation kept in the background. It would be Christianity reduced to Deism. The Bishop himself, however, acknowledges that he has no hope that such a compromise would be acceptable to Catholics. We must infer that he is prepared to support Catholics in their demand that the constitutional rights they now enjoy shall be respected, for he says positively: "In that case I simply say that I should infinitely prefer that the Roman Catholic Church should continue to have separate schools under satisfactory con-

ditions, to our schools being without religious instruction."

It may be taken for granted that, if separate schools for Catholics were abolished, our co-religionists will insist upon it that the public schools shall be secularized. Catholics will have Catholic schools, even if they are unjustly forced to maintain a public school system from which they derive no advantage; but, should this occur, it will be their duty to insist upon it that the schools they sustain shall be strictly non-sectarian: and it is perfectly well understood that this would be the result of the abolition.

We mentioned already that Dr. King, of the Manitoba Presbyterian College, spoke in terms similar to Bishop Machree. Further, he gives the programme which would constitute the religious curriculum in the compromise schools which both would like to see established in the Province. The Bible should be read daily, either in the Catholic or Protestant version, and Christian morality should be taught and enforced by Christian considerations. That is all; yet even that is more than the Bishop thinks practicable. He would confine the doctrinal compendium to the Apostles' Creed, the Lord's Prayer and the ten commandments.

The Doctor acknowledges that his programme is a meagre one. So it is; yet, with great inconsistency, after insisting strongly on the great importance of both moral and doctrinal teaching, he takes the ground that if Catholics be not satisfied with it, they should establish and support from voluntary contributions the schools in which would be given such teaching as will satisfy them! So the penalty on Catholics for not accepting his dictation in religion must be that they shall support two sets of schools: one for themselves, another for Presbyterians and others who may fall in with the Doctor's views. The Bishop of Rupert's Land does not propose such a penalty. He is willing that Catholics shall be still free, if they cannot adopt his suggestions.

The Anglican synod endorsed their bishop's views unreservedly and apparently without opposition. Hence we may well suppose that Mr. Greenway will not have the universal support he expected in his despotic course.

But the signs of the times do not end here. It is not true that the Free Press is the only journal which opposes the tyranny. The Sun at first is described to have been "flat-footed" for Mr. Greenway, but on October 30th it called attention to the utterances of the two divines, to whom we have referred above, and while declaring its opposition to separate schools, it significantly adds: "It is right, however, in compelling all classes of the community to financially support one system of schools that this system should do no violence to the religious beliefs of any one part of the population." It then acknowledges the difficulty raised by the decided opposition of the "heads of the Episcopalian and Presbyterian Churches" to non-religious schools. It adds that if religion is to be taught in the schools at all teachers must be trained for the work, and calls attention to the facts that in only one Province of the Dominion are schools entirely secularized and in a large majority of United States schools religious forms are also maintained. It concludes thus:

"For our own part we do not think we are justified in ignoring the precedents thus set. We think the Greenway Government might well have consulted the leaders of thought to see if a satisfactory solution could not be found ere coming down flat-footed for entire secularization. . . . We are aware that many others do not think as we do, and that an extreme course is likely to add to the difficulties of the situation, if, indeed, it does not imperil the attainment of the main end in view."

This is undoubtedly an acknowledgment that the Greenway programme is virtually dead. On this point the Free Press is still more positive. Speaking of the two gentlemen above referred to, it says their high character and authority lead us to believe that they speak for the Anglican and Presbyterian denominations of the Province. Nay, more, it adds: "There is reason to believe that in taking this course they have the sympathy of all the other leading Protestant Churches in Manitoba; so that it may be said with some confidence those deliberations have sealed the fate of the secular movement." It continues: "There is no paltering with the suggestion (of secularization) from first to last, in any or all of its aspects; they are unequivocally and resolutely opposed to it." It is evident that the Sun as well as the Free Press is now to be accounted among the opponents of the bigotry which it was intended to enact; and these two are the most influential papers of Manitoba.

Both journals would be glad that the impossible compromise offered by the two divines should be accepted. Independently of the reasons we have already given against this, Catholics could never consent that the moral and doctrinal teaching of their children should be left to teachers of whatever sect might happen to be employed in the schools, and sometimes to teachers of no religion whatever. Even

where the schools are professedly non-denominational, we know by experience that underhand attempts are frequently made to ridenle, and sometimes openly attack, Catholic doctrines and practices, as was notoriously done in Boston last year: and what makes matters worse, the people of Boston have since, by their votes, approved of the teacher's course. We have known many similar instances in Ontario. If once such teachers had the privilege of giving doctrinal instruction according to their fancy, there would be an end of these fanatical efforts. It will not do to say that Catholics would be on the same footing as Protestants in the compromise. This would not be the case. We all know that the various denominations of Protestantism are fairly tolerant of each other, but that there is much intolerance towards Catholics, and hundreds of teachers would be very glad to have the opportunity of displaying it. There is, however, satisfaction in the thought that Manitoba as a Province will not, after all, be dragged through the mire of religious intolerance by Mr. Greenway's and Mr. Martin's precipitate adoption of an intolerant policy.

We notice with pleasure that the Gladstone Age and the Brandon Mail are also on the side of religious toleration; and we may well ask: Is it another sign of the times that Mr. Martin has stated publicly that he has resigned his seat in the Cabinet, whereas the other ministers say he has not resigned?

HOW IT WORKS.

In Germany it is the law that parents decide in what religion children are to be educated, yet it recently occurred in Tiegendorf, Eastern Prussia, that Catholic children were compelled to accept the religious Protestant teaching which was imparted to their Protestant fellow-pupils in the elementary schools. The parish priest, Father Weitzmuller, heard of the injustice and went to the Inspector, Parson Len, to complain, whereupon he received this reply: "It is quite correct that Catholic children join in the singing in the Evangelical Church, but if they choose to do it, I cannot prevent them. Again, if Catholic children are present at the Evangelical religious classes and learn the Lutheran Catechism, I look upon that as a proof of sound Christianity, and leave you to state what kind of compulsion there can be in it. The fact of the matter is, it makes very little difference, for, after all, you always get those answers from children which you want them to give."

It is quite true that an appeal can be taken in such cases to higher authorities, till it reach at last the Minister of Public Worship; but, in the meantime, the injustice continues, and, besides, not all parents have the perseverance and boldness to carry their complaints further when they meet with a rebuff like this from the official who is within their reach. This is one of the dangers which also under a system of so-called non-sectarian education, and in the United States it happens frequently. In Ontario it also occurred frequently, especially when there was no separate school system; but the very possibility of establishing separate schools now keeps the proselytizing teachers and trustees in check. Under the system proposed by the Protestant divines of Manitoba there would be constant cause of complaint, and no redress would be possible in practice; for there would be always great difficulty to prove the interference of the teacher, and even when it could be satisfactorily proved he would be sustained by many Inspectors. The Germans complained very loudly, and with reason, because the Lutheran schools in the Baltic Provinces were closed recently by Russia; yet in the case we have mentioned there was not even the lame excuse which the Russians had, that the German schools taught loyalty to Germany and disloyalty to their own sovereign, the Czar. The moral is that they who wish to abolish Catholic separate schools in Canada have proselytism for their object.

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION.

As a vindication of the necessity of religious instruction in schools, Dr. King's address at the Manitoba Presbyterian College is very powerful and convincing. It is only when he maintains that a compromise ought to be made, and that the religious instruction should be confined to very narrow limits, that the reasoning becomes weak. He calls attention first to the difficulty of introducing into the public schools any religious teaching while Christians are so divided in religious belief, but this is, as he properly remarks, not the domain of the State. He says: "This lies wholly within the domain of conscience which a power wielding the sword may not enter." Are we to infer from this that all religious teaching, doctrinal and moral, must be excluded from the schools? Dr. King does not draw any such conclusion. France has excluded from the Government schools all reference to God, and one of the Australian colonies has carried out the same principle to such an extent that in inserting a passage from Longfellow into one of the school books, a religious sentiment to which the poet gives expression has been carefully ex-

cluded. The Doctor says: "The people of Manitoba, I feel sure, are not prepared for any such course in the matter of public school education." The Mail has added that the French Government, by excluding religion, have also consorted to the most sacred convictions of the people, as is evidenced by the fact that where the religious schools have been positively suppressed by the arm of the law, they are filled with pupils while the Godless schools of the Government, side by side with the religious schools, have their benches almost empty.

The doctor correctly considers the object of education, as furnished by the State, to be to make good citizens, in a proper respect for law, so that strong and prosperous state may be built up. This can be attained on instructing the rising generation those steadfast principles which promote the public welfare." To good citizens, the school must be good men. Learning divorced from morals may have no other result than to give us more skillful swindlers or expert thieves. This reminds us of a terse expression of the "Iron Duke Wellington" which contains the idea. The Duke said: "Education out religion makes men clever devils."

The Doctor then points out that teaching, to be effective in the highest degree, or in any degree near to the highest, must lean on religion as enforced by religious considerations. He then declares that if Catholic state schools can only be got rid of, the entire secularization of the system, much as he desires to see it disappear, he would not consent to chase this end at such a cost. He proposes a minimum of religious teaching in the schools which might be upon by all denominations, leaving aside Agnostics and Jews, and the persons who might raise objections, this, inasmuch as they are few in number and on the other hand with a constant clause they could be excused from attendance on the religious exercises, and would thus have no just cause of complaint.

This programme cannot be acceptable to Catholics, and the very reason the doctor advances in its favor is the reason why Catholics should insist on the retention of Catholic schools and Catholic teaching. He says: "The statistics of the several Churches, the amount of money contributed within the Province for religious purposes shows the keen and general interest the inhabitants take in the matter. The schools are theirs, sustained by money. Surely they have the undoubted right to give a place in their common Christian beliefs, especially where these are seen to be in a high degree, if not indeed indispensable, the ends for which the schools exist."

Instead of inferring from this, the doctor does, that a mere modicum of Christianity should be taught, and that wherever Catholics are sufficient numerous to sustain truly Catholic schools they have a perfect right to them; matter of religious education pertains to parents, and not to the State. Liberty and every facility ought, therefore, to be granted to parents to instruct their children in the schools, especially if they are unable to do so at home, and Government give State aid to schools, they should extend at least to those in which religion is included, otherwise a penalty would actually be inflicted on them for the very kind of school which is advocated by the doctor to be the one which is most desirable. He acknowledges that the only reason for inferring a shadowy Christianity is because different denominations cannot upon anything more desirable. As Catholics are concerned, we are agreed as to what is needed, and we ask that we shall be at liberty to our schools teach what we know necessary.

We are frequently told that home the church are the places where should be taught. Besides the which Dr. King gives to this the may add that religion is too important to be placed in the background, institutions which allure youth from the of morality and faith are numerous, and even with all the teaching of virtue and doctrine which is culminated during school-hours, the impression left upon pupils be too strong. Add to this that parents are not capable of giving instruction at home, and that are capable as so occupied with affairs that they have no time to to the proper religious education of their children. Why then should they attend to this duty in their schools? would indeed be much more to say that parents may teach at home, or history, or geography, as they should teach religion, make this a pretext for excluding the school.

We cannot close this article making reference to a testimonial Dr. King renders to the Catholic on the subject of the Great Inter- the Church takes in religious ex-