

The Catholic Record.

Published Weekly at 484 and 486 Richmond street, London, Ontario.

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

ADVERTISING:

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

Publisher and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY, Messrs. LEWY KING, JOHN NICH, P. J. NEVES 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, space 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, March 11, 1893.

"MAN," says Gibbon, "receives two educations: one which he receives from others; the other, and more important one, that which he gives himself." Hence the second education depends upon man's wise employment and development of the talents entrusted to him by God. No college may impart it. It outlaws us to undertake intelligently the task of educating ourselves, and therefore when a young graduate goes out to his life-work and falls into the rear rank of onward marching humanity the fault is his own. He should be in the vanguard. We do not mean that success is reached by a single bound. The men whose names are enshrined in love and veneration for having added to the world's wealth of noble thoughts and deeds have been hard workers. They knew that patient, silent toil is the essential condition of success, and that he who hopes to win must learn to labor and to fail.

True, we read that Sheridan composed a drama in a few hours, but we also know that long before it was composed and committed to memory, the brilliant repartees and impromptu witticisms which electrified the House of Commons were planned with much care and labor in the seclusion of his home. Newton confessed that unremitting toil was the secret of the discoveries that revolutionized physical science. Buffon, the immortal naturalist, declares that genius consists chiefly in being able to rise at 6 o'clock in the morning and getting to work. Beaconsfield was scoffed at and ridiculed when he made his first speech in Parliament, and yet persistent labor so quickened his apprehension and strengthened his powers, that men soon learned to listen to the brilliant debater. And we might go on quoting name after name of men who have achieved enduring fame through sheer hard work.

They yielded not to indolence, nor were they beguiled into presumption and self-conceit by a capricious public opinion, but in laborious days they gained the lofty purpose and high courage without which no success is possible. We mention these facts in order that our college-bred young men may realize their responsibility. It has been said, and not without reason, that our college graduates manifest none of the talent which they displayed in their youthful days. Various causes are assigned. They bid farewell to study and render useless the education upon which much time and money were bestowed. They go blazing "gaudy butterflies in fashionable circles, into political salons, the fool of society, the fool of notoriety, a topic for newspapers, a piece of the street." This is the true cause of their disastrous failure in life. Much society and little work never made a man.

GLADSTONE introducing the Home Rule Bill gave one more proof of the eloquence and statesmanship that have made his name famous the world over. With his old time warmth of manner, and in diction as chaste as it was elegant, and with arguments that must bring conviction to all impartial minds, he pleaded the Irish cause. His opponents were constrained to give him careful attention, and their cries of hatred and bigotry were for the moment stilled by the voice of the Grand Old Man urging his countrymen to pay the debt of tardy justice to the Irish people. His Bill is more satisfactory than the one of 1886, and is approved of by all sections of the Irish race.

The Orangemen of Toronto are loud in their denunciation of Home Rule, and they avow their determination of whipping Irishmen into servitude. They will get a warm welcome. All their threats are made in the view of obtaining a little newspaper notoriety, and are consequently harmless. The penal laws are no more; the constabulary is powerless to assist the valiant Orange brigade, and they will submit

gracefully to the inevitable. Indeed, if past history may afford a portent, they will be the first to scramble for any emoluments in the gift of the Irish Parliament.

THE opponents of Mr. Gladstone are making every effort to direct the tide of public opinion against Home Rule. No argument is deemed worthless for such a purpose. Commercial ruin is predicted when Irishmen have the privilege of governing themselves; for there is no capital in Ireland, and for years has the world heard its perennial cry of starvation. Yes, we admit that Ireland is poor; that ere this its children have died mad raving for bread, simply because they preferred death to mamon, and because they refused to purchase immunity from wrong and persecution at the shameful price of apostasy. Their religion was prescribed, and the Penal law, "the most proper machine ever invented by the wit of man to disgrace a realm and degrade a people," cramped and constrained the strength and energies of an enthusiastic nation. What inducement was held out to an Irishman, when he could not aspire to any civil or military dignity, and when he could not even possess a horse worth more than five pounds! What future could exist for Ireland's commerce, when its trade, as Mr. Froude admits, was destroyed by English law for the protection of English commerce and English manufactures. When these things are forgotten we may talk glibly about Ireland's commercial ruin and want of prosperity.

THE EARLY BRITISH CHURCH.

We had occasion last week to make some comments on Professor Rigby's lecture in Trinity College in which he maintained that the ancient British Church was an organization quite independent of the Pope.

We showed by the Acts of the Council of Arles that the British Church, whose representatives signed the letter of that Council to Pope St. Sylvester, agreed with the whole Western Church in recognition of the Pope's authority, and that any representation to the contrary is a distortion of history to make it fit fantastic modern theories.

We must here remark that if the early British Church were not a mere sect, cut off from the Christian Church, like the Arians, Donatists, Pelagians, and Montanists, it could not but be in communion with Rome, and subject to the authority of the Pope, for during the period of its existence the whole Christian world, except the excommunicated sectaries, were in communion with and subject to the authority of the Pope.

The Council of Arles, held A. D. 314, was the first council of the whole Western Church, for the good reason that owing to the almost uninterrupted persecution to which the Church was subjected by the Pagan Emperors, it was impossible that such a Council should have been held any sooner. This very fact makes the homage paid by this Council to Pope Sylvester the more striking as a testimony that the whole Christian Church was united in subjection to the Pope, and that it only needed that the Bishops of the whole world should meet together, that they should unite also in giving testimony to the Pope's universal authority.

The testimony of the Council of Arles, however, is not a solitary fact in proof that the British Church agreed with the rest of the world on this point. It is simply one link in the chain of evidence.

In A. D. 347 another Council was held at Sardica, at which several British Bishops were also present. By this Council, at which there were 300 Eastern and 76 western Bishops, it was declared that "if any Bishop thinks he has been misjudged . . . let us honor the memory of the Apostle Peter, and let those who have judged the cause write to Julius, Bishop of Rome, that by the neighboring Bishops of the Province the judgment may be renewed, and he furnish judges."

This right of appointing judges to decide appeals implies a universal jurisdiction over the Church in all parts of the world; and it is further to be noticed that the Pope's representative, Ostius, presided at this Council.

But in the very beginning of the British Church, we find from Bede that during the Pontificate of Eleutherius, that is, between A. D. 179 and 191, "Lucius, king of the Britons, sent a letter to him (Eleutherius) entreating that by his command he might be made a Christian. He soon obtained his pious request, and the Britons preserved the faith which they had received, untarnished and entire, in

peace and tranquillity, until the time of the Emperor Diocletian."

The same statement is to be found in the ancient "Book of Llandaff," where we are also informed that the ambassadors sent by Lucius to Eleutherius were Elfan and Medwy, who were baptised into the Church, Elfan being ordained a Bishop, and Medwy a teacher. These two returned to Lucius, and "by command of Eleutherius" Lucius and the nobles of Britain received baptism, and Bishops were ordained, and an ecclesiastical order was constituted.

It is thus evident that Britain received Christianity from Rome, and that Gaul was not the "Mother Church," as the Professor states. The only reason which can be adduced in proof of Gaul being the Mother Church is that Sts. Germanus and Lupus were sent to Britain to aid in refuting the heresy of Pelagius. But the Church was established long before this, by the authority of the Pope.

The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle and Geoffrey of Monmouth give a similar account of the matter, the latter stating that such was the account given by Gildas, who was a Briton.

Nennius gives the same history, substantially, but erroneously substitutes the name of Evaristus for Eleutherius. Bishops Usher states that he had seen a manuscript of Nennius in which occurred the name Eleutherius, and there is no doubt the error originated in a mistake of some copyist.

Here we may remark on one point made by Professor Rigby, that the British Bishops whom St. Augustine found when he went to preach to the Saxons, observed Easter differently from the Romans and the rest of the Western Church.

This is true, but we must remember that Britain had been overrun by the pagan Picts and Saxons, and most of the records of the nation had been destroyed. It is not very surprising that during these troublesome times the proper time for keeping Easter had been lost, owing to the want of intercommunication with the continent.

That this was the cause of the discrepancy there can be no doubt, as the British Bishops at the Council of Arles agreed with the Council, and signed the canons whereby it was decreed that "Easter shall be observed on the same day and at the same time as the Bishop of Rome shall give notice according to custom."

We might show that the successors of Elfan frequently referred to Eleutherius as the source of their ecclesiastical jurisdiction, but we have here given authorities enough to prove that the early British Church was truly Roman, both in origin and continuance, and that it had no similarity with the modern Church of England which substituted the supremacy of the uxorious Henry VIII. for that of St. Peter's successor.

LOW VERSUS HIGH CHURCH.

The Mail of the 28th ult. gives an account of a trouble which has arisen in Vancouver, B. C., owing chiefly to a doctrinal difficulty between the Anglican Bishop of New Westminster and one of his clergymen, Rev. H. P. Hobson, formerly curate of St. James' Church, Toronto. Mr. Hobson went to Vancouver four years ago to take charge of Christ Church in that city, and it appears that he labored with considerable success in building up a congregation. He is said to have been a faithful, conscientious and painstaking minister, much esteemed by his flock.

After laboring for some time in his mission, an agreement was made with the Canadian Pacific Railway for the purchase of a lot of land, on the condition that a church should be built at a cost of \$30,000, but after spending \$8,000 on the foundations, the congregation found themselves unable to complete the building, the chief difficulty in the way being, as recently in the case of St. Augustine's church, Toronto, dissensions on the subject of Ritualism.

As the purchase of the land, however, was effected on the distinct condition that the church should be erected, the Canada Pacific Railway has obtained a judgment in the Courts by which it again comes into possession of the land.

The Bishop of New Westminster, according to the reported state of the case, has taken advantage of the circumstance to withdraw the Rev. Mr. Hobson's license to officiate in the diocese, the real motive of this action being apparently that Rev. Mr. Hobson proclaims himself a Low Churchman or Evangelical, while the Bishop is a pronounced High Churchman.

In May, 1890, the Bishop wrote to

Mr. Hobson complaining of his mode of celebrating the Communion, as not sufficiently reverent to the sacrament, as he did not rinse the cup after its being used, and drink the rinsing, as practiced by High Church clergymen. The Rev. Mr. Hobson replied that this usage is repugnant to the Evangelical principles held by him and his congregation, and that he would not do it, as there was an agreement partly entered into when the church was being built that no Ritualistic innovations should be introduced into it; and it was on this understanding that subscriptions were taken up. This agreement, however, was not signed by the Bishop, as Mr. Hobson refused to give a written assurance to the Bishop that the Communion would be administered with due regard to the proper consumption of the elements.

The feature in this matter which will strike our readers as being of the greatest interest is the fact that notwithstanding the vigor with which the Evangelicals or Low-Churchmen persecute the Ritualists or High Church party, both in America and England, the latter are steadily becoming more and more the ruling party in the Church of England. The Rev. Mr. Hobson states that his congregation, numbering 228 communicants, is the only Evangelical congregation in the diocese of New Westminster, and it was stated recently by Bishop Campbell, of the Reformed Episcopalians, on the occasion of the transference of St. Augustine's Church, Toronto, to the Reformed Episcopalians, that the Ritualists are even now the dominant party in the Church; and it was as a protest against them that the Reformed Episcopalians were established.

The Rev. Mr. Hobson has been strongly urged to solve the difficulty by starting a congregation of Reformed Episcopalians, but this he refuses to do, as he says "the Church of England is large enough for me." He intends, however, to appeal his case to test the Bishop's right to withdraw his license on what he considers very insufficient grounds, and the matter will probably be brought before the Archbishop of Canterbury for adjudication.

THE A. P. A. AND THE P. P. A.

The members of the A. P. A. (American Protective Association) in Illinois have apparently not learned wisdom by experience. Our readers are aware that it was mainly by allowing this organization to exercise some influence over them in the selection of candidates that the Republican party of that State and some others which were usually decidedly Republican were lost to that party at the elections of last November by unexpectedly large and decisive majorities.

The American people generally have too much of the sentiment of fair play to be carried away by the no-Popery cry which has been raised during the last few years by the Protective Association, and when it was discovered that beyond the usual constitutional methods to which Americans appeal for the settlement of their political differences, this Association had bound its members by oath to do all in their power to keep Catholics out of public offices, and even not to employ them in any situation at their own disposal, there was great indignation among all those who are naturally inclined to liberality. This indignation was, of course, increased when it became known that the association attempts even to taboo such Protestants as are disposed to be liberal, and the result was the practical annihilation of the Republicans for shilly-shallying with such bigotry.

It is now announced that the Protective Association will have a candidate of its own for the Mayoralty of Chicago, in the person of one Mr. Grover Harrison. Mr. Harrison has also been adopted by "the Patriotic Order of the Sons of America," which is a society similar to the A. P. A., and bound by a similar oath.

The liberal Protestants of the city have not been slow in declaring their decided opposition to any candidate brought forward as the standard bearer of any organization adopting such a platform as that promulgated by the A. P. A. The Chicago Post, which voices the sentiment of the liberal-minded citizens, declared that Mr. Harrison is "the only candidate mentioned for the Mayoralty who would listen to a suggestion to violate the Constitution of the United States by making a man's religious affiliations a bar to his appointment to an office or place of public trust."

It cannot be supposed that Chicago will do violence to its truly American au-

tecedents by electing such a man to the chief magistracy during the very year when it is manifesting its cosmopolitanism by inviting to the World's Fair all the nations of the world, and we may safely predict that Mr. Harrison will be buried deep under an avalanche of liberty-loving American votes.

On the other side, from Omaha the news comes that the A. P. A. has made such progress that it actually controls that city. In the face of this fact it is gratifying to notice that there are Protestants with sufficient courage to denounce the fanatics in no measured terms. This is done by Mr. T. W. Blackburn in a recent issue of the Omaha Bee. Mr. Blackburn says:

"Omaha has never suffered any evil from Catholics. Her best citizens are members of the Catholic Church. Her largest taxpayers are adherents of that faith. There never has been any attempt or suggestion of an attempt on the part of that Church or any of its members to control the schools, the city government, or the county affairs. Whatever may be true in other localities, as far as Omaha is concerned, Catholicism has never been a force in politics which attempted to antagonize the Public schools, or any well defined public policy. There is in my mind no more reason in Omaha for an anti-Catholic society than for an anti-Methodist or an anti-Infidel society. There can never, in America, be any excuse for a secret political religious organization, and in this city there is less excuse, if possible, than anywhere else."

Mr. Blackburn advocates an amendment to the National Constitution which would make it impossible to bring up religious issues into the political affairs of the country.

From all this we may discover that bigotry may have certain local successes, but it cannot prevail in the wider arena of national politics; and the same is to be said of the efforts made in Canada by a similar association known here as the P. P. A. or Protestant Protective Association. This society has also had some local political successes, and will continue to have such while there are bigots alive; but it will be condemned by the sober good sense of the majority of Protestants throughout the Dominion. We have no fear of any such organizations; and where they do exist, our advice to Catholics is that they take care not to be goaded to acts of violence against their members; but when the day comes when they are to use their influence through the exercise of the franchise, let them quietly but consistently and firmly vote to leave at home every candidate for public office who is known to have coquetted with the fanatics; and in the consciousness that in the general result the right will prevail, let them not be discouraged by any local reverses.

It is almost unnecessary to say that in Canada and the United States alike, these associations have generally owed their existences to the efforts made by persons of the stamp of Dr. Wild, of Toronto, Drs. Douglas and McVicar of Montreal, and Dr. Carman of Belleville to establish them. The charity prescribed in the gospel has no place in the characters of such people.

THE SCHOOL QUESTION IN NEW JERSEY.

A recent issue of the Mail states that "a bold attack is to be made by the Catholics of New Jersey upon the public treasury," in the shape of a bill which is to be introduced into the Legislature enacting that a certain sum shall be set aside for the education of Roman Catholic children, and the further information is afforded that "for many years Roman Catholics in the United States have been striving to secure a share of the public funds to maintain Separate schools."

It is very true that the Catholics of the United States feel the grievance to which they have been subjected of being obliged to contribute their share towards the education of their Protestant neighbors' children, while they must educate their own without any State assistance; and surely they have a perfect right to use all the constitutional means in their power to have this gigantic injustice corrected. It is not to be supposed that they will cease their efforts in this direction until they obtain redress; nor should they do so till they obtain complete justice.

The Mail adds, "as the constitution prohibits votes of money to churches, such a law (as that proposed in New Jersey) would raise a very difficult and troublesome question."

The Mail and other opponents of Catholic education persist in representing that the object of the Catholic body in thus seeking to remove a grievance is to destroy the Public school system, and to establish the Catholic Church as the State Church,

but for such a representation of the case there is no foundation.

The Catholics, whether in the United States or Canada, have no intention or desire either to destroy the school system of the country or to establish any State Church. But in both cases we insist that even though we form a minority of the population we are entitled to have a system of education which will do no violence to our religious convictions. We maintain that it is our natural right to educate the whole child, morally and religiously as well as secularly, which, being conceded, it follows that obstacles are not to be thrown in our way by any majority, nor any extra tax imposed as a penalty for our advocacy of a more complete education than any purely secular system can furnish. Such a penalty is imposed under the present school laws of the United States, and this is what the Catholics wish to have rectified.

In the State of New Jersey there are 35,827 Catholic children in attendance at Catholic schools which compare favorably with the Public or secular schools, and it is an iniquity that while Catholics are saving to the State hundreds of thousands of dollars annually by keeping up these schools at their own expense, they should be taxed also for the education of their perhaps wealthier Protestant neighbors.

This is the state of things which the Catholics of the State are endeavoring to have remedied. The only just remedy is either to exempt them from the Public school tax, where they have Catholic schools, or to pay from the Public school funds on appropriation proportioned to the amount of secular work the schools are doing.

It will be seen that either of these methods would remove the existing injustice; and there is no trouble about the unconstitutionality of granting State aid to Churches. There is nothing asked of the State for any Church, nor even for the religious instruction which is given in the schools, but solely for the secular instruction, which is quite as efficient as that given in the Public schools, though if the Parochial schools were even less efficient they would be made more so by giving to them their proper share of the Public school fund.

The same injustice which exists in New Jersey exists in other States as well, but the fact that several school districts in that State have voluntarily remedied it as far as the present state of the law permits, perhaps indicates that the people of that State are better acquainted with the character of the injustice inflicted and are therefore the more willing to correct it.

A PARLIAMENTARY PHENOMENON.

Mr. D'Alton McCarthy is not succeeding well in his efforts to obtain a following in the House of Commons to back him in his no-Popery crusade, notwithstanding that the Mail, the Montreal Witness, the Huntingdon Gleaner and a few other journals of Ontario and Quebec are endeavoring to boom him. Even the Ottawa correspondent of the Mail, on looking up his record in Parliament, loses courage in summing up the result of his investigation. He says in the Mail of the 3rd. inst.:

"He (Mr. McCarthy) has, as you know, taken his seat in Parliament, but there was no excitement on the occasion, and the supposed flashes of lightning that startled some staid people on the night he did so were only those from a passing electric car. Dalton is said to be both chirpy and hopeful as to the result of his new departure; but just let me say, and with no desire to detract from his ability, that he does not stay long enough in one saddle to win a heat. I have been looking back through his Parliamentary career to see where he finished in the contests in which he has heretofore entered, but the record fails to give him anything like a first place."

It is somewhat cruel that the Mail should thus give the cold shoulder to its quondam leader, who is at the same time the head of so many abortive attempts to form a party whereof the principles which he has for several years advocated shall be the shibboleth. The Mail has recently been attempting to boom Mr. McCarthy as the coming man, whose brilliancy as a political leader would eclipse anything which preceded him. We were told very recently by that journal that "McCarthy clubs" are being formed all over the Dominion, from Collingwood and British Columbia to St. John, N. B., and that "people are beginning to wear McCarthy buttons," all of which proves that "such a man must be immensely popular." What a pity it is that it should now turn out that even the Mail finds out that Mr. Mc-