

The Catholic Record.

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

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

EDITORS:

REV. GEORGE R. NORTGRAVES,

Author of "Mistakes of Modern Infidels."

THOMAS COFFEY,

Publisher and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY,

Messrs. LUKE KING, JOHN NICH, P. J.

NEVES and Wm. A. NEVES, 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 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, Dec. 15, 1884.

PROPOSED COMBINATION AGAINST ROME.

Bishop Seymour, of Springfield, Ill., following some of his Episcopal brethren, in elucidating the principles of the Protestant Episcopal Church, with a view to Christian union, remarks in a lecture some time ago delivered, that "certain fundamental rules for the government of His Church," laid down by Christ, having been "subverted in the West, by Rome," the latter is thereby "committed to a form of Church government which is irreconcilable with that established by Christ." Continuing in this strain, after the fashion of the old High Anglican school, the Bishop concludes by once more airing the quixotic scheme of bringing "all the ancient patriarchates, outside of Rome, into communion with the Protestant Episcopal churches; when thus, "historic Christianity will be banded against Rome, as a system of yesterday." What, however, this yearned for intercommunion, if attained, would be supposed specially to symbolize, apart from the virtual condonation of erroneous doctrines, it is difficult to comprehend, if it be not simply the recognition of Anglican "orders" by the other ecclesiastical bodies. Certainly, it would symbolize indifference to Revelation, as a "whole," so long as it is held in a fragmentary way, by adversaries of Rome. Yet the utter futility and worthlessness of the combination suggested, of Churches confessing themselves fallible, and possessing neither unity of faith nor unity of organization, each being wholly independent of the others, must be apparent to anyone but high Episcopalians, who generally seem to live in a sort of dream-land, where mere sentiment or imagination takes the place of rational thought. Without, however, discussing this point, it might be well for our Episcopal friends, who appear to have found some comfort in fraternizing with the late Rev. Dr. Ig. Dollinger, of Munich, to bear in remembrance the words of that celebrated exponent of "historic Christianity": "Catholicity," he says, "stands opposed to national churches," so that the "one Church composed of the multitudinous fragments of several national or political churches, is such a Church as cannot either afford a shadow of 'claim, from higher authority, or be based upon a Biblical foundation.' And again, 'When a community says Christ alone is the head of our Church,' it is at the same time saying, in other words, 'separation and isolation constitute a principle of the Church; such is its natural condition.' (Church and churches, pp. 31, 38, 41.) And so, if the theory of national or individual independence of churches or Bishops, in matters pertaining to faith, be without foundation in Bible or creeds, (where indeed there is no shred of such evidence to be found,) what, it may be asked, becomes of the "fundamental rules" of good Bishop Seymour? The truth is, that on this question the fundamental consideration lies in the fact that no communion was ever issued to the Apostles, apart from, or independently of Peter, but only as united with him, their head; for the full power of the "One Episcopate" was given whole and entire at first to Peter alone, then to the rest of the Apostles, not to each separately, but collectively only, that is to say, as corporately joined with Peter.

Taking this fact, with other well known facts and principles, into account, the evidence becomes irresistible that the Church founded by Christ is an indivisible organism; and clearly, it is only as such that it can with reason face the intellectual world as an authoritative teacher from God. The question is not simply one of "government," as might be inferred from Bishop Seymour's remarks, but a question of a Church numerically one, with one faith, and necessarily, therefore, an unbroken authority for faith, otherwise no authority whatever can be maintained: a conflicting authority from God, in respect to matters pro-

posed for intellectual assent, being an absurdity, undeserving a moment's consideration by any thinking man.

THE ANGLICAN CLERGY.

While unable, in the absence of favorable determinations by those in authority, to do more than by courtesy to grant to the episcopal clergy their several ecclesiastical titles, as ministers of a Protestant Church, we must admit that for large numbers among them we have always entertained the highest regard, being as a class of unquestioned respectability, cultured, refined, often fine scholars, learned in various departments, earnest and indefatigable in their calling. Their communion, however, though doubtless worthy of esteem as an association, in which some of the forms, rites, and doctrines of the Church Catholic have been preserved, must, as a Church of God, be accounted a sheer nullity, being in no way integrated as an actual branch of the one Church Catholic. Waiving this question, however, for the present and limiting further remark to what some may classify as "aesthetics," it is perhaps not singular to find that the Church of England has often been described by impartial critics as a Church wherein the "proprieties" are a first object—a Church designed for the "well to do" in this world: the "Church of the gentry," as Ralph Waldo Emerson calls it, "not the Church of the poor." The same writer, who as philosopher and poet seems to have been struck with the peculiarities of this Church, speaks of it as a religion believing in a "Providence which does not treat with levity a pound sterling," and hence, true to its instincts puts up bluntly a prayer for the Queen's majesty, that she may be granted "health and wealth, long to live." (English tracts, chap. xiii.) Doctor J. H. Newman also, some forty years ago, spoke of English Churchism, as, in all parts of the world, "the religion of gentlemen, of scholars, of men of substance and men of no religion at all." Doctor Ig. Dollinger, too, has given his estimate of the Church of England, when describing it as "the religion of department, of gentility, of clerical reserve, . . . not troublesome, not presuming, not importunate, . . . no inconvenient disturber of the consciences, . . . and whilst retaining some Christian doctrines, seldom wounding the hearts of the hearers by an application of them." (The Churches, p. 145) "Our Church," said one clerical gentleman to another, on a railway coach between Hamilton and Toronto, in the hearing of the writer of this, "seems to me to be content to die of respectability."

THE BRAGGADOCIO OF BIGOTRY.

There is nothing on earth more contemptible than the bluster of a baffled bully. We are filled with disgust at the boasting of Sir John Falstaff when after a miserable display of cowardice we hear him recount how he put his assailants, the men in buckram, to flight by his unprecedented courage; and it is with feelings very much of the same kind that we have read the recent vapors of Rev. J. C. Madill, President of the P. P. A., or Amoreans, in regard to the victories of that society, past and prospective.

Several times since the June elections has he indulged in this braggadocio. We do not speak here of the ignorance displayed by this exponent of P. P. A. learning, as evinced in the statement which he made at St. Mary's on the 26th of November, to the effect that Sir John Thompson and the Hon. Wilfred Laurier are alike Jesuits! Of the confusion of ideas existing in the brain of this profound student of history it would be useless for us to speak, for it is beyond the scope of reasonable hope that he could be made to understand the difference between a Jesuit and an ordinary Catholic layman. We must therefore leave Mr. Madill and the intelligent audiences before which he has been airing his eloquence in their ignorance so dense that a ray of light cannot be expected to penetrate it.

It is true that he made his assertion in the form of a quotation thus:

"A Separate school teacher speaking of the situation said: 'What makes the Protestants so mad is that we will have a Jesuit or a Roman Catholic whichever way it goes.'"

It is needless to say that there is not a Separate school teacher in the Province of Ontario so grossly ignorant as to say such a thing, except in ironical sarcasm. The sentiment is Mr. Madill's own, and it was for the purpose of making his audience believe it to be the truth that it was said; and so we leave this matter to say a few words on

the P. P. A. President's boasted victories at the Ontario elections.

He declares that:

"The P. P. A. have not only twenty-seven members in the Local House who will stand up for Protestantism every day in the week, but they have 150,000 men who are pledged to decorate the Protestant horse."

The elections of last June are too fresh in the memory of the people of Ontario that such trash as the above should be accepted by them as gospel truth. The facts that about ten candidates were put forward by the P. P. A. as their own standard-bearers, and that only two of these were elected—the members for both ridings of Lambton. Several candidates endeavored to ride two horses at the same time, as patrons and P. P. A. nominees, but came to the ground. For the most part these men endeavored to sail under false colors, hiding their P. P. Aism, and denying it where they hoped to gain by duplicity the votes of a few unwary Catholics, and in some instances they succeeded in this, though even thereby they could not score a victory, even in the most thoroughly Protestant constituencies in the Province.

For the rest, we admit that many of those who contested seats in the Conservative interest had made a secret compact with the P. P. A. to support their platform. That platform was not identical with the professed policy of the Conservative party, but the two were so much alike that it was an easy matter to reconcile them, and to appear as the accepted candidate of the Conservatives and the P. P. A., and thus there was an actual alliance of the two parties. This Mr. Madill admits when he claims that there are twenty-seven P. P. A. men in the Legislature. That is just the united strength of the successful Conservatives and P. P. Aists. But it must be remembered that the Conservatives' strength alone was thirty-eight in the last Legislature, so that the result of union with the P. P. A. has been the loss of at least eleven seats in the aggregate. Mr. Madill is welcome to all the consolation he can derive from such a victory. The fact remains that the P. P. A. alliance has annihilated a once powerful party.

In regard to the recent London election, Mr. Madill explains that he or his party was not beaten, for he himself took no part in canvassing for Mr. Essery. Mr. Essery, he says, was the Conservative, and not the P. P. A. candidate. If this is the way Mr. Madill counts noses, where will he find the twenty-seven P. P. A. men in the present Legislature? Evidently all is palatable fish that comes to his net, and what he does not catch is but gudgeon.

It would not be to the credit of the Province if Mr. Madill's boasts of victory were truthful. It would only prove that a Protestant population is easily imposed upon by a fanatical cry; but actual results have shown that the time is past for such a cry to bring about a triumph in Ontario.

Similar boasts of P. P. A. victories have been made in the United States; but we are happy in being able to say that they are as fallacious there as in Ontario.

The November elections in the United States, so far from having proved the strength of the A. P. A. in the Republic, have shown its weakness everywhere, and this is now being recognized by Republican papers. The A. P. A. simply threw itself in with the Republicans, almost everywhere, because they were conscious of the fact that they were of little or no importance in the great struggle which was taking place, and that they could not elect their members on the strength of their own platform.

Michigan is the only State in which the proscriptive society has shown considerable strength, and there, it is claimed by its organs, it controls the new Legislature. It is very doubtful as yet whether it will succeed in this, though it is certain that two of the twelve Congressmen who have been elected are Apapists of strong proclivities. On the other hand, Governor Rich, who carried the State in the Republican interest by a sweeping majority, holds Apapism in contempt, and it is probable that a majority of the eleven Republicans elected with him are of like sentiments. At all events, they were elected as Republicans, and not as Apapists.

So weak is Apapism throughout the country that only in one locality did it dare to present itself under its own colors. This was in Cook county, Illinois, where it adopted the name of "the American Citizens' Party." Chicago is in this county, and there the

A. P. A. boasts its greatest strength in the Union. It could not but be conscious of its own numerical weakness even here, but it relied on its influence. Apapism, in its own estimation, was a word to conjure by, and a full ticket was put into the field under its auspices for nearly all the State offices. There can be no doubt that the solid A. P. A. vote was practically given to the candidates of the order; and the result is, therefore, an exhibit of its actual strength in numbers, with its influence thrown in. What is this result? From the Chicago *Inter-Ocean* we learn that five parties contended for supremacy—the Republicans, the Democrats, the Populists, the Prohibitionists, and the American Citizens' Party, or the A. P. A. The full vote of the county was 243,840, out of which the A. P. A. candidate who stood highest on his ticket, Mr. Van Sicken, nominated for the County Treasurership, received just 1,321 votes. His colleagues, on the same ticket, the candidates for the County Judgeship, and the county Superintendency of Schools, received respectively only 917 and 796 votes, the whole ticket showing a weakness which no other party has ever exhibited in American politics; and all this, in spite of their bluster that they are the controlling influence in that State.

The Populists and the Prohibitionists, though very badly beaten, made quite a respectable showing in comparison with the Apapists; as they received respectively in the same county, 27,527, and 1,686 votes.

For Congress, the A. P. A. endeavored to elect only two representatives, namely, in the first and fifth districts. Here their showing was just as ridiculous as in the State election, as their candidates in the two districts received respectively only 273 and 132 votes, whereas the totals of votes cast were 48,524 and 37,205. The Populist and Prohibitionist candidates in the same two districts received respectively: in district 1, 5,154 and 577; in district 5 there was no Prohibition candidate, but the Populist received 3,702 votes.

In five Districts the A. P. A. had put up candidates for State Senatorships, and the votes recorded for them as follows: District 3rd, 200; District 5th, 98; District 17th, 136; District 19th, 27; District 23rd, 30. In the same Districts the total numbers of votes cast were 23,809; 32,687; 15,141; 15,764; 15,030.

Know-Nothingism and fanaticism are evidently a dead issue on both sides of the boundary line.

POLITICS AND RELIGION IN BELGIUM.

The result of the elections which recently took place in Belgium has been even more decisive and more gratifying than the cable reports which were sent would have led us to believe.

Though Belgium is a thoroughly Catholic country, the indefatigable secret societies have been at work there, as in other countries of Europe, to undermine religion, and from 1879 to 1884 the anti-Catholic party was able to maintain itself as the ruling power. Its designs against the Catholic religion were not thoroughly understood or known until it had kept the reins of Government in hand for some time, but then all was made clear, especially by the so-called Liberal attacks upon religious education which was abolished. Then in 1884 the party was overthrown, and a Catholic Government came into power, and has held its position firmly in the affections of the people ever since.

How it was possible for an anti-Catholic Government to become dominant at all in such a country seems to be almost inexplicable; but the cause appears to have been the secrecy with which the so-called Liberals laid their plans, and the disinclination of Catholics to bring religious questions into the arena of politics. The tortuous course of the Liberals, however, obliged them to do so, with the result that the Catholic party has been in power now for ten years, with a lease of five years longer. The present Government has been progressive, and universal suffrage has been established, with the curious provision, however, that married men and men of property have two votes, and graduates of colleges with property three votes each in order to give additional weight to stability of tenure and education.

By the recent election, 104 of the Catholic party, 16 Liberals, and 32 Socialists, have been elected to the House of Representatives. In the Senate the Catholic party has fifty-two seats, against twenty-four held by Liberals and Socialists.

Out of a population of 6,000,000 there are in Belgium about 10,000 Protestants and 4,000 Jews, nevertheless full religious liberty is granted to persons of all religions, and there is no interference by the State with the ecclesiastical administration of either Catholic or Protestant Churches, and part of the salary of clergymen of all denominations is paid from public funds. Schools are likewise in a flourishing condition, and are maintained by the State, according to results.

HARSH DEALINGS IN THE FISHERY DEPARTMENT.

We have received a memorandum setting forth in full the treatment to which Messrs. J. & C. Noble, merchants, of Killarney, Algoma, have been subjected by the Fishery overseer, Mr. Elliott, acting under authority of the Minister of Fisheries; and having carefully considered the circumstances of the case, we cannot draw any other conclusion than that the Messrs. Noble have been treated with unjustifiable severity.

In May, 1884, four steam tugs and a number of sail boats, the property of, or supposed to be the property of, the Messrs. Noble, were seized by Mr. Elliott under instructions received from the Department of Marine and Fisheries, in answer to a telegram from the Overseer, advising the department that the firm were then fishing without a license.

While it appears to be true that the men in the employ of the Nobles actually were fishing before their licenses were issued, it is also true that their applications for a license were on file at Ottawa, and the money was paid for the same, awaiting the action of the Government. Under such circumstances the Messrs. Noble, if not altogether justified, did what was the usual custom while they were in expectation of a license, and at most a fine of a few dollars would have been sufficient to vindicate the law.

Word came, however, from Ottawa, that a license would not be given to the firm of the Nobles, and they were directed to withdraw from the fishing until the matter should be settled satisfactorily. The men were then in the act of taking their nets from the water, when the fishery officer came upon them, and seized their vessels, nets and other appurtenances. The sail boats were sold, and the tugs were advertised for sale by tender, though the actual sale has been postponed from time to time. The Nobles have sworn that the loss thus inflicted upon them has amounted to no less than \$25,000; their business has been ruined, their trade has been thrown into the hands of a rival company, and it has been made known over the whole territory that fishermen who deal with them may expect the hardest possible treatment from the fishery department. In fact it would seem that the Fishery overseer had concealed from them the fact that their licenses were not likely to be granted, so that they might be caught in a trap, by sending out their tugs and boats, that the overseer might have a chance to seize them.

A Commission of Investigation was appointed to examine into the case, insufficient notice of which was given to the Messrs. Noble. They proved, however, that a trap had been set for them, and the charges made against them that they had been accustomed to break the law in former years were not sustained, though this was the excuse on which they were so harshly treated. The opportunity of disproving these charges by positive evidence was refused to the Messrs. Noble, the pretext being that such evidence had no bearing on the present case. In others respects also the Messrs. Noble were very harshly dealt with, it being established that the Fishery Overseer was personally hostile to them.

Whence arises this hostility? We are given to understand that it comes from the connection of the Fishery Overseer with the P. P. A., the members of which society are bound by oath to injure Catholics as far as possible. The Messrs. Noble declare in a letter published in a recent issue of the *Globe* that Mr. Elliott made himself a propagandist of the P. P. A. in Sault Ste. Marie.

If this has had anything to do with the persecution to which the Messrs. Noble have been subjected, the whole matter should be judicially investigated, and we hope steps will be taken to bring about such an investigation at the next session of Parliament or before the law courts. It is not to be endured that P. P. A. influences shall be allowed to thwart the ends of justice, or to inflict injustice, whether in the government of the Province or of

the Dominion. Even if the Messrs. Noble were guilty of an apparently unintentional breach of strict law, they should not be persecuted or punished beyond their deserts, or beyond what is customary, under the circumstances in which they are placed.

LET THERE BE UNION.

We take pleasure in publishing the following utterance of the Hon. J. J. Curran, delivered in Toronto after the brilliant lecture of Mr. T. D. Sullivan, M. P. We trust the words of the gentleman will have due weight amongst the Irish party at home. A terrible responsibility rests upon the shoulders of those who have caused disunion in the ranks of the Irish Parliamentary Party. They are working along the same line as were those whose names have come down to us as pretended friends—but real enemies—of their country, performing only too faithfully the work of those whose interest it is to keep the Irish people in subjection and in poverty:—

At the conclusion of the lecture Hon. J. J. Curran rose to move a vote of thanks to Mr. Sullivan, and in his remarks paid high tribute to the quality of the address and referred to the favorable impression such an exposition was sure to leave on the public mind. He had a message from the people of Canada, especially from the descendants of the Irish race, which he hoped Mr. Sullivan would carry to the present representatives of the old land in the Imperial parliament. They should remember that they were not mere representatives of the local corporations that sent them to Westminster. They were the guardians of Irish rights and the exponents of the views of the race throughout the world. They could send their names to posterity as the patriotic band who had done battle nobly for the grand old cause or sink into contempt for having sacrificed their country's opportunity. Their petty personal bickerings must cease, they must rise to the level of the sacred mission they had been sent to fulfill. They must realize that the eyes of the world were upon them. Ireland, her character, her fitness for Home Rule, everything that most nearly and dearly concerned her, were all in their keeping. With a united Irish party the last dollars of Irish Canadian or Irish American money would be cheerfully shared to further the cause of fatherland.

Rev. Dr. Burns of Hamilton seconded the address, and short speeches were made by Sir. Oliver Mowat, Sir. Frank Smith and Hon. G. W. Ross, all expressing satisfaction at the tone of Mr. Sullivan's remarks.

ALDERMANIC BOODLING IN TORONTO.

Toronto is undoubtedly a prosperous city from a worldly point of view. For many years past it has progressed beyond all expectation in population and wealth. Its boundaries have been extended so as to embrace several suburban municipalities, and with all this increased prosperity it appears to have grown equally in self-esteem so as to have arrogated to itself the high-sounding title of "Toronto the Good." To those living outside its precincts it has been a perplexing question how the city became entitled to the distinction of being thus designated, but judging from the prevalence of such associations as the P. P. A., the Sons of England, Orangeism, and others whose objects are to destroy the Catholic religion and even to deprive Catholics of the means of livelihood, as far as they can, it is very doubtful if the claim to superior goodness has any better foundation than that of the Pharisee, who thanked God that he "was not as the rest of men."

But now at the very moment when the consciousness of self-righteousness is at its height, an investigation is being held on the making of a contract with the Street Railway Company, and the fact has come to light that it was only by the wholesale purchase of the votes of aldermen that the contract was carried through. The investigation has brought this corruption into so strong a light that the people have now lost all confidence in the present Council. This is plainly expressed in Alderman Gowanlock's letter of resignation of his seat. He says:

"The public sentiment of the city has been so much inflamed against aldermen that the public usefulness of the Council of 1884 is over, and I therefore resign my seat as alderman for Ward No. 6."

Alderman Hewitt has also resigned his seat, and both resignations were accepted by the Council as a matter of course, without debate.

In reference to the same subject, Rev. D. Milligan, preaching in St. Andrew's Presbyterian Church said, on Sunday, Dec. 2nd:—

"Our present municipal evils have been brought upon us by the apathy of too large a portion of the people, by the prejudices of political partisanship, and by the wiles of the fortune-