

When Archbishop Bruchesi was in Rome, there was indeed a telegram sent by him, as a Canadian citizen and one of the chief representatives of Catholic opinion, requesting that the proposed Education Bill should be withdrawn for the time being, so that certain features which appeared to be likely to lessen the influence of the clergy in school matters should be reconsidered and revised, but there was no intention to prevent any real improvement of the school system, in regard to which his Grace certainly feels at least as deep an interest as any citizen of the Province of Quebec can possibly entertain. But the Archbishop is undoubtedly opposed to any school law which would impede the teaching of religion or lessen the importance of religious teaching as part of the school curriculum. But the Review must be aware that though a cable despatch did state that the Archbishop's despatch was really from the Pope, another despatch immediately afterward acknowledged that this was not the case, so that the Pope did not send any mandate on the subject to the Quebec Government, as the Review asserts. From this falsehood the reliability of our contemporary's other statements may be judged.

Oh what a tangled web we weave
When first we practice to deceive!

We must now say a word in reference to the alleged illiteracy of the Province of Quebec. It is true that the census reports show a somewhat larger number of adults there who do not read or write than in the other Provinces, but this certainly does not arise from any effort of the Catholic Church to keep the people in ignorance, as the Review represents, for it is well known the efforts of the clergy have always been directed toward keeping the schools of the Province in an efficient condition, and they have succeeded to such an extent that the proportion of those who receive a higher education has been greater than in Ontario. But there have been causes at work which made it more difficult for parents in Quebec to keep their children at school, the chief of which have been the comparative poverty of many of the people which compelled them to adopt precarious modes of earning a livelihood, large families, and the scattered population in many districts.

It must, besides, be remembered that the Public school systems now in vogue are comparatively recent, having been established only within the last fifty years. It is to the credit of Ontario that it has had a good start in this educational race, but it would be pharisaical to boast that the reason for this is its superiority in race or religion, and, besides, it is not at all sure that Ontario's lead is a fixed and permanent fact, for the school statistics of the Dominion show that the average attendance of children at school in Quebec at this moment is very much better than in any of or in all the Provinces of Canada. From the Dominion Year Book we find that whereas the average attendance of children at the Public school in Quebec last year came up to 70.7 per cent. of the registered attendance, in Ontario the average was only 50.3 per cent. For this reason the actual attendance at school was greater in Quebec, in proportion to population, than in every other province, and this has been the case for many years past. We can safely say, therefore, that whatever start in the race Ontario may have, Quebec is in a fair way of catching up, if not of taking the lead in this matter before many years pass.

As far as the statement is concerned that there are municipalities in Quebec wherein not an adult can read or write, we cannot believe it without some better evidence than the random assertion that some nameless legislator made the statement on the floor of the Local House. At the same time we may say that even an Ontarian has no right to throw stones while living in a glass house. We have known school trustees in some localities in this province who could not read or write, and very often we have met trustees whose knowledge of these two accomplishments was very little better than nothing.

A SECULAR PAPER'S TRIBUTE

(From the Buffalo Commercial, March 1.)

There may be no occasion for immediate alarm in regard to the condition of Pope Leo XIII. but the old Pontiff is reaching the line that he must cross from time to time—to-morrow, March 2nd, is his nineteenth birthday. When his earthly career is finished all impartial men will gladly see his name placed high on the roll of those who have been loved, honored and revered for their devoted service to the State, to the Church, to humanity, and to God.

ABBE PEROSI.

News comes from Rome that Lorenzo Perosi, the great Italian priest composer, is to go to England in the spring for the first time since his newly acquired fame suddenly made him one of the men everywhere talked about. No foreign visitor has in recent years been so awaited with greater interest. He is said to be small and insignificant in appearance except when seated at the organ, or conducting the performance of one of his oratorios. Then his face lights up, and one sees the indications of the genius which has lately made him prominent in Italy.

His own country looks now to him, as it once did to Mascagni, for its renaissance as a musical land. Perosi is twenty-six years old, and was born at Tortona, where his father led the choir in the principal church. He studied music along with, and for the sake of, music went to Rome. It is said that he also studied for a while in Germany. He was selected for the post of choir-master at St. Mark's in Venice, and while there composed his first oratorio. He still lives in Venice in quarters situated in the Cardinal's house, although he is soon to go to Rome to undertake the duties in the Sistine Chapel to which the Pope has assigned him.

Perosi is short, and conducts always in the long black cassock worn in the streets by Italian priests.

"STRIKE, BUT HEAR ME"

Archbishop Keane's glad and prompt appreciation of the Pope's letter on "Americanism" makes opportune the following extract from the first sermon delivered by him as rector of the Catholic University. He said: "Politicians may, for their own ends, denounce our Holy Church as inimical to our country's institutions—as they have done of late on both sides of the water—and many of our fellow-citizens may be inclined to believe them. We will find comfort in remembering that our dear Lord was also reviled as an enemy of the public peace; and from our country's prejudices we will appeal to our country's common sense by an argument which will not fail to be appreciated—in our practical lives we must show that we are better citizens than our slanderers."

"Our country may think us unfriendly because we tell her of her mistakes—because we warn her that, by a system of Godless education, she is training generations that, for want of proper religious moulding and principles, will be as unfit to be good citizens as to be good Christians. Wedded to their views and plans, she may denounce us as enemies for our advice. Our conduct and answer must be like that of the Lacedaemonian hero, Themistocles. At the opening of a great battle he respectfully offered his commander-in-chief an advice contrary to his plan, but on which the fate of the contest clearly depended. The commander, enraged at receiving an unwelcome advice, approached threateningly, as if to strike him. 'Strike,' said the hero, 'strike, but hear me!' So must we act and answer."—*Sacerdos*, in American Herald.

BIBLE READING.

Following is the text of a Brief recently issued by a Roman Congregation:

His Holiness Leo XIII., at an audience on December 13, 1892, with the undersigned Father of the Congregation of Indulgences and Relics, made known that he grants to all the faithful who shall have devoutly read the Scriptures for at least a quarter of an hour an indulgence of three hundred days, to be gained once a day, provided that the edition of the Gospel has been approved by legitimate authority. Furthermore, the Sovereign Pontiff grants monthly a Plenary Indulgence to all those who shall have read in this way every day of the month. It can be gained on the day of the month when, after confession and Communion, those who have fulfilled the conditions shall have offered up the customary prayers for the intentions of the Holy See.

This creates an interesting situation. At the very time when Bible reading is "going out" among non-Catholics, the Holy Father seeks to make the Word of God the daily spiritual food of the faithful. And, curiously enough, the means which he employs is indulgences—one of the bugaboos of Protestantism, and, historians say, the chief occasion of the "Reformation." From this timely decree non-Catholics may learn two important lessons, once for all: first, that the Church is the best friend of the Bible; and, secondly, that indulgences are not bought but earned by spiritual effort. Doubtless these lessons will be missed by many; but we may expect to hear on all sides the imbecile statement that "Rome has changed her front," that "Modern thought is permeating the Vatican," etc., etc., *ad nauseam*.—*Ave Maria*.

SORRY FOR SATAN.

Mr. Tollemache tells the Spectator of London the following story of a little girl, which he had, he says, at only one remove from her own father: The child once went in great distress to her mother, saying that she had committed a sin which could never be forgiven and which was too bad to be repeated. By dint of a little coaxing she was induced to make a full confession, which was in this wise: "I felt so sorry for poor Satan and wanted to give him a little comfort; so I got a glass of cold water and poured it down a little hole in the kitchen floor."

Many an outcast from society, many a Magdalen without Magdalen's repentance, many a swindler, nay, many a murderer, can trace their fall to the evil influences of the devil's pen in the "yellow journals."—*American Herald*.

PROTESTANT BIGOTRY IN ENGLAND.

Prejudice and Intolerance Still Reign—A Review of the Subject.

From the impassioned outburst of insane religious bigotry now raging in Protestant circles in England, it is evident that the cruel spirit of the penal laws had never died out in that land of error and prejudice. It only slumbered underneath the surface where it had been driven by the advance of civilization and intelligence belonging to this advanced age of the world.

The vulgar and brutal classes in Britain inherited the evil trait from ancestors whom no civilizing power could influence or enlighten; hence the astonishing rapidity with which the flame of Protestant ignorance and brutality has overspread the country upon the bare mention of partial justice to the Catholics of Ireland in the matter of university education. But this is not the only pretext for the wild outcry of hatred and intolerance. The ritualistic scene has also inflamed the minds of the intolerant bigots in the higher circles in and out of the Church. It is the cause and misfortune of error, and imperatively of religious error, that it should bring confusion and unrest upon its hapless victims. English Church clergymen have been feeling the dreadful consequences of their errors for years past, but they had neither the grace nor the courage to openly confess their unhappiness and error, with a view to repentance and reconciliation to the one saving fold—the Catholic Church.

They felt the stings of remorse and the painful uneasiness that springs from a conviction of deceit and wrongdoing; but they would compromise with their conscience, their belief and their honor. They would keep friends with the world while pretending to draw nearer to God by introducing into their religious worship some of the Catholic practices. In a word, they would serve God and mammon at one and the same time—a thing which the Redeemer Himself declared to be impossible. They would not abandon their wives and rich livings and parsonages, but they would decorate their altars after Catholic fashion, and not only recommend confession, but make it compulsory. The reverend Anglicans who act in this way are rather to be pitied than blamed, for in this striving towards Catholic belief they are actuated by the moving spirit of grace which naturally draws all men to the saving principle of truth. But the reverend strivers are handicapped by the weight of error and unblessed transmitted to them from erring ancestors, and from their own inherent power they are not able to grasp the truth all at once. But having taken the first steps Romewards, as many of them are sincere, according to their lights, will get grace to go forward until they are privileged to kneel at the very foot of the altar steps of the true Church. This, of course, will be reserved for those who are really contrite of heart and spirit, and who pray for the dispersion of the erroneous delusions from their minds.

The half-hearted compromisers will stumble and flounder in the sea of religious illusion and deception until rescued by a ray of light from the throne of mercy itself. At the time Lord Halifax made his desperate efforts to induce the Pope to recognize the validity of Anglican orders in the ministry, many weak-kneed Catholic laymen thought that the Pontiff had been too frank in declaring the absurdity of the claim of the followers of the religion manufactured by the adulterous Henry VIII. and Elizabeth, and that such frankness would stop the onward march of the ritualistic army in England; on the contrary, it has had the very opposite effect, and logically and naturally so, for if men are sincerely looking for spiritual truth and guidance, they don't want to be deceived in a matter pertaining to everlasting happiness or else eternal reprobation.

The Pope could not shift his ground an inch to please or conciliate kings, nobles or sects if he had to do it at the expense of the sacred deposit of the faith, confided to his keeping as the lawful successor of the Fisherman, who had received it direct from the sacred hands of the Saviour Himself. Error is a pernicious thing under any condition, but it is not horrible to think of its misfortune when it comes to the blinding of men who are in search of the way that leads to salvation?

To tell a man who is going in the way of evil that he is nearing a ruinous precipice, is but pure charity, if the knowledge of his danger can save him from certain destruction. Protestant England has a black record to answer for, but it were better not to recall the horrible deeds of the penal days of persecution and slaughter, but rather to join in the supplications for her conversion and return to the Church which she once wantonly despised, robbed and desecrated. It is a heinous crime to have to answer for, but the blackest guilt is washed out by true and sincere repentance. Those hundred or more of Anglican parsons who have declared their intention of sticking to the lighted candles on the altar, of saying Mass according to their own fashion, and inculcating the necessity of confession, will not draw back under the threats of parliamentary edicts or the frowns of episcopal rulers. They will rather go forward in their religious strivings, and that hundred will induce another hundred to do the same, and the good work will go on until religious illusion and error shall not have a leg to stand upon. We are not sanguine enough to hope for this glorious result all at

once; but it is evident that the awakening has come, and the more the delusive and dangerous doctrines of man-made forms of worship are looked into the more dreadful will they appear, and conscientious seekers after the true faith will no longer rest in peace in the possession of their errors, much less face the shores of eternity weighted with such soul-destroying crimes unatoned for. In regard to the wild outburst of prejudice against Catholic Ireland, that will subside, too. She may not get her Catholic university now, but it will come in time, as will Home Rule itself, and then the people will be able to erect their own educational institutions, as they will be able to make their own laws and governments. It is coming to that in spite of Britain's perfidy and treachery to the dependent nation. The local Government measure, late applied in Ireland, gives the people a foretaste of what Home Rule verily means, and having once tasted its benefits they will not rest contented with less than a full measure of self-rule. John Dillon's resignation paves the way for a reuniting of all the Nationalist forces in Ireland and in the House of Commons, and this being once effected, the representatives of the country will be able to demand justice for their people. The bigots of Ulster and the landlords of the country will oppose any scheme for the relief of their fellow-countrymen, but the voice of intolerance and prejudice will be silenced by the overmastering voice of four-fifths of the people calling for the concession of simple justice so long denied them.—*Wm. Ellison in Buffalo Union and Times*.

POPULAR CHURCH HISTORY.

Mr. Nye's Church Defence publications have already received some attention in an article by Mr. J. H. Round in *The Contemporary Review*. The following is from the current issue of *The Saturday Review*:

The Church of England has no worse enemies than those too ardent champions whose zeal, unchastened by adequate knowledge, associates her defence with perversions of fact and the interests of fanaticism. If the "popular" literature of "Church Defence" is represented in style, temper, and substance by the works of Mr. C. H. F. Nye, we think the Church has good cause to pray for salvation from her friends. We ourselves yield to none in our loyalty to the Church of England which we value as the most beneficent of the national institutions, and revere as the true representative in this country of the historic spiritual society founded by the Apostles. For this very reason we resent the degradation of the Church's cause involved in the circulation by authority of such publications as this "Popular Story of the Church of England," which has now reached its eightieth thousand.

The pamphlet attempts to give a consecutive history of the National Church, from the earliest times to the present day—a millennium and a half in ninety-one pages. The style is loose and declamatory, and the standpoint that of a half-educated High Churchman, who impartially hates "Romanists" and the Liberation Society. We might excuse the style in consideration of the exigencies of "popular" composition; and the standpoint is so naïvely confessed and so constantly kept in view, that we can hardly escape blame if we omit to make the usual allowance. Our censure is provoked by the perversions and, even more, the suppressions of fact, the utterly false perspectives of the history, the wrong impression left on the reader. These faults are only justly estimated when it is remembered that the persons for whom this pamphlet is designed must be supposed to be quite unable to criticize or correct its statements.

Wherever Mr. Nye has the good fortune to get hold of a sound text-book he keeps fairly straight, but once bereft of this guidance, his historical incapacity comes promptly into view, and we must add, wherever he allows himself the luxury of commenting on the facts, or what he thinks are the facts, he sinks into the crudest partisanship. Dr. Bright's "Early English Church History" preserves him from the worst blunders during the first chapter, although he succeeds in seriously deranging the proportions of the history. Perhaps it follows from the necessities of popular writing that the picturesque should always overshadow the important. On page sixteen we have the statement that the Diocletian persecution raged in Britain on a great scale, though the precise contrary is asserted by the fourth century authorities, and no modern historian allows more than small local disturbances which Constantine, then governing the island, could not restrain. Mr. Nye, however, is much influenced by architectural considerations. We gather from a creditable "Pen and Ink Sketch by the author" which adorns the beginning of the pamphlet, that he himself is an artist, and we attribute to the fact his curious subordination of narrative to architecture. Thus, in the present instance, he has in view a description of St. Alban's Cathedral. The legend of St. Alban, the still more shadowy legend of Aaron and Julius, and the fiction of a general persecution under Diocletian, are but steps to this end.

ANTI-ROMAN PREJUDICE. The worst feature in the pamphlet is the anti-Roman prejudice which always colors and often distorts the "history." "Romish" corruptions, and the errors of the Papacy, which we call Popery, are of comparative [sic] recent date, and had no existence in the Roman Church in the time of Augustine" (p. 25). "The claim of

the Bishop of Rome to be Universal Bishop was entirely unheard of for eight hundred years after Christ." "The claim of Papal infallibility was not made until the present generation." These, and many similar statements which are freely distributed over Mr. Nye's pages, are worth anything to the Roman controversialist. They contain an element of truth: some Romish corruptions were subsequent to St. Augustine, and St. Gregory did repudiate the name, though certainly not the substance, of a Universal Episcopate, and the dogma of Papal infallibility only dates from 1870, though the claim is far older. But they are more false than true: and they convict the writer of the ignorance which incapacitates, or prejudice, or both. The action of Rome in the earliest stages of English Church history is minimized and often ignored. Theodore of Tarsus, we are shortly told, "was chosen Archbishop;" we are not told that he was chosen by Pope Vitalian, and consecrated with great solemnity by that Pontiff; nor are we reminded that the Archbishop carried out his great work of organization under the authority of, and with constant reference to, the Apostolic See from which he received his commission. Theodore describes himself in the preamble to the canons passed at Hertford in 673 as "ab apostolica sede destinatus Doruvernensis Ecclesie Episcopus." Mr. Nye is careful to relate the disastrous fate which befel Wilfrid's appeal to the Pope, and to draw a grotesquely excessive inference (p. 36). He can hardly be acquitted of dealing dishonestly with his readers when he keeps back other facts which absolutely prohibit the conclusion to which he desires to lead them: viz. "that, up to this time, the Church of England was independent of the jurisdiction of the Pope of Rome." His ignorance is the less excusable since his authority, Dr. Bright, very carefully discusses, in connection with Wilfrid's appeal, the actual relations between England and Rome at that time. We doubt whether Mr. Nye altogether appreciates the meaning of the words he uses. The Conqueror's refusal to do fealty to Gregory VII. is alleged as proof that "up to the time of the Norman Invasion the Pope had no jurisdiction over the Church or Crown of England" (p. 39). We learn that during that period the Church "was wholly independent of the jurisdiction of Rome," and not "in organic relationship with the See of Rome." (p. 41) What would Alfred have said to such a statement, or Dunstan, or the long series of English pilgrims—royal, noble, and obscure—who thronged the ways to Rome, and died in the sacred city, or the missionaries like Boniface, himself the protagonist of extreme Papal claims, or the scholars like Bede and Alcuin? This will not do. It is the worst advocacy of just Anglican claims.

Medieval history is still more crudely treated in the same spirit. There are no gradations of light and shade. Always attention is fastened on Papal oppression, never directed to Papal services. The Popes are presented as the habitual tyrants of the National Church, which maintains a precocious Protestantism. Stephen Langton is the opponent of the Pope's assault on English liberties; we are told that he was himself the Pope's nominee (p. 41). S. Anselm is not mentioned at all, and "Becket" is dismissed in a half-contemptuous paragraph. Yet both were champions of Papal power and national liberty, causes which, in the twelfth century, were not so incompatible as Mr. Nye supposes, though we freely admit they became widely enough parted at a later date. We advise Mr. Nye to read the Bishop of Oxford's judgment on the Becket controversy, and the remarkable conclusions to which Dr. Abbot has arrived on the same subject. The sooner English Churchmen wash their hands of a theory of Church history which exalts Rufus and Henry II., and Edward III. as the exponents of the national conscience and consigns to obloquy S. Anselm, S. Thomas, S. Edmund—indeed all the honored churchmen of the middle ages—the better for their own reputation as historians, and their own success as "Church Defenders."

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND AND THE PAPACY. Mr. Nye's account of what he calls the "Re-formation" is handicapped by his grotesque theory of the medieval English Church. He imagines that the Church of England always claimed independence of Rome, "was never at any time a part of the Church of Rome." The truth is that the position of the Church of England toward the Papacy was in no respect different from that of the contemporary Church of France or other continental churches, save only that, for various reasons, the Papal authority had a rather a freer hand here than elsewhere. That the Roman theory of the Papacy has undergone a portentous development, which would not have received the acceptance of medieval theologians, is true, but to draw a distinction between the English Church and any other within the Roman supremacy in the Middle Ages is a vain undertaking. Indeed, Mr. Nye proves as much, for he oscillates between assertions of Anglican independence and descriptions of Roman tyranny. The whole account is a very strange performance.

We have scraps from a speech of Mr. Gladstone, and a pamphlet of Professor Freeman, and a controversial work of the late Lord Selborne, a glowing account of the "Morning Star" of the Reformation, and a curious version of the Reformation itself. When John Wycliffe is condemned, and his Bible burned, we are bidden to exorcise the obscurantist zeal of "the Romanists" (p. 51): when the foundation of colleges and schools is narrated, we are

reminded that "the Church was foremost in the education movement" (p. 53). It never occurs to Mr. Nye that the munificent William of Wykeham was a member of the hierarchy that condemned Wycliffe, and is known to have joined in the action against the Reformer. Perhaps the oddest passage in this very odd "history" is the account of Henry VIII.'s action:

"The King, who was much younger than his wife, was greatly disappointed at having no son to succeed him, and he therefore declared that his marriage with his brother's wife was an illegal act. There was another lady attached to the Court who expressed herself ready to marry the King if she could only do so legally, thereupon the King asked the Pope to release him from his marriage tie. The Pope could or would not consent. The ceremony had been blessed by a former occupier of that See, and it was a delicate matter for his Holiness to interfere with, and the messengers sent to Rome by Henry came back with various excuses. The clergy and people, groaning under Papal intolerance, threw their influence on the King's side, and eventually the King proposed that the clergy should acknowledge him to be 'the protector and only supreme head of the Church and clergy of England next to Christ.'" (p. 54) We can imagine no better torture for Roman controversialists than to have such a theory of the Reformation placed by authority before the people of England. It is, indeed, lamentable to find such inconsequent and ignorant work commended by the majority of the English Bishops. The concluding chapter of this pamphlet sustains the historical character of those preceding, with this difference, that the Non-conformists take the place of the "Romanists" as victims on the altar of "Church Defence." The last ten pages are little more than an expanded and rhetorical version of parts of the "Church Year Book." Work of this kind published in the professed interest of the National Church must be repudiated. We yield to none in our desire to maintain the Church of England in full possession of her status and endowments, but we cannot degrade the cause to the level of such "history" as Mr. Nye's. It may be popular, but it is not honest, and we will have none of it. "Non tali auxilio, nec defensoribus istis."—*London (Eng.) Tablet*.

CONVERSIONS.

"I shall never be a Papist," said Dr. Samuel Johnson, "unless on the near approach of death, of which I have a great terror." When death came, the doctor, like many another who postponed his conversion, had not the grace to become a "Papist;" but his dread of God's judgment was terrible to his friends. Mr. Percy Fitzgerald, writing in *The Month*, records his answer to one who sought to allay his fears by reminding him of his services to religion and virtue, of the good his writings had done, etc. "Every man," roared the anguished doctor, "knows his own sins and what graces he has resisted! And am I, who have been a teacher to others, to become a castaway?" Johnson's Catholic tendencies—his defence of prayers for the dead, the invocation of saints, etc.—are well known, as is also his comparison between converts from Protestantism and those who leave the Church. "A man who is converted from Protestantism to Popery may be sincere; he parts from nothing, and he is only superadding to what he had. But a convert from Popery to Protestantism gives up so much of what he has held as sacred as anything he retains—there is so much laceration of mind, that it can hardly be sincere and lasting." And once when he heard that a certain clergyman had sacrificed his prospects to become a Catholic, he exclaimed, "God bless him!"—*Ave Maria*.

FATHER CHINIQUY.

The following question and answer are from the *New York Sun*: "Did the Pope of Rome during the Civil War of 1861 issue a statement that he was in favor of the Southern cause and thereby cause about one half of the Sixty-ninth Regiment to desert?" James Connolly.

The Pope did nothing of the sort. Half of the Sixty-ninth did not desert. More than a thousand of its men were killed, wounded and taken prisoners, and the Sixty-ninth lost more men in action than any other New York Regiment.

To these might be added a few more questions and answers which might be worded somewhat as follows:

Q.—Seeing that this story of the Pope's declaration in favor of the Confederacy is an infamous lie, what would you call the man who invented it?

A.—Obviously, an infamous liar.

Q.—Who was that man?

A.—Charles Chiniquy.

Q.—What does The Presbyterian Witness call Charles Chiniquy?

A.—A "dear old saint."

Q.—Can a man who is an infamous liar be a "dear old saint?"

A.—Evidently, in the opinion of the Witness he can, provided his infamous lies be directed against the Pope and the Church of Rome.—*Antigonish Casket*.

There is so much wretchedness in the world that we may safely take the word of any mortal professing to need our assistance; and even should we be deceived, still the good to ourselves resulting from a kind act is worth more than the trifles by which we purchase it.—*Hawthorne*.

The human mind is capable of great things, but unaided by intellectual grace and revelation, it cannot solve the mystery of its own being.—*American Herald*.