

The Catholic Record.

Published Weekly at 484 and 486 Richmond street, London, Ontario.
Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

EDITORS:
REV. GEORGE R. NORTHGRAVES,
Author of "Mistakes of Modern Infidels."
THOMAS COFFEY,
Publisher and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY,
Messrs. LUKS, KING, JOHN NICH, and
P. J. NEVEN, are fully authorized to receive
subscriptions and transact all other business
for the CATHOLIC RECORD.
Rates of Advertising—Ten cents per line each
insertion, scale measurement.
Approved and recommended by the Arch-
bishops 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, April 21, 1894

LORD ROSEBERY AND HOME RULE.

The question of the dissolution of the British Parliament as one of the immediate consequences of Mr. Gladstone's resignation is forcing itself forward in spite of all the efforts of Lord Rosebery and his Cabinet to prevent a crisis.

The Government majority in a full house is still estimated to be 38, of which only 36 may be relied upon as regular in attendance in the house. This majority was already changed into a minority of 1 on a private bill relating to the supply of water to the east section of the city of London.

None of the Parnellite members were present at this division, as they were busy in Dublin quarrelling among themselves, and denouncing the Government for its apathy on Home Rule. The deficiency of the Parnellites, however, would not have caused a defeat were it not for the dilatoriness of other members supporting the Government.

Some of the Liberals were anxious to throw on the Irish Nationalists the blame of the defeat, and the Westminster Gazette said: "This serious feature of the situation was in the absence of ten Nationalists and Redmondites from the House," and again the same journal gave currency to a report that it is the intention of Mr. McCarthy's party to join the Parnellites in an endeavor to overthrow the Rosebery Government.

It then announces that "the Liberal party will certainly not bend its knee to beg for their support, and the result of such a course would be to set back Home Rule for ten years. Unfortunately the misunderstandings within the Irish party are producing a bad impression in the country, and are certainly damaging the zeal of the Liberals. They (the Irish) have need of a strong man to lead them."

Of course it is not to be denied that the dissensions of the Irish party have a deplorable effect; but the Nationalists, who really represent the Irish people, are not to be held as responsible for the conduct of the Parnellites. This matter was discussed before, and when Mr. Gladstone accepted alliance with the Nationalists, it was plainly on this understanding. But an analysis of the vote on the East London Water Bill shows that the only Nationalists who were absent were paired, which completely exonerates them from the charge of neglecting their duty to the Liberals. Moreover, there was a larger ratio of Liberals absent, and three of them were not paired at all. In addition to this, a number of Radical members abstained from voting, and the Government defeat is due to these causes more than to the deficiency of the Parnellites.

On the Parnellites but little reliance could be placed at any time to support even the Government of Mr. Gladstone, though they did not break out into open revolt. The Nationalists proper under Mr. McCarthy's leadership cannot, therefore, be blamed for their absence on the occasion of the Government's defeat, and the Liberals must therefore acknowledge that the Nationalists have remained faithful to their pledges to support the Government as long as the Liberals show fidelity on their side to the pledges they have made to take efficient steps for the final passage of a satisfactory Home Rule Bill.

The majority of 1 by which the Government were defeated must be considered merely as a snap vote, and not as indicating the real strength of parties in the House; and if a direct vote of confidence were taken in a full house, there is no doubt that the Government would still be sustained by its full majority of 38. Yet the Liberals acknowledge that another defeat similar to the one already sustained would necessitate a resignation or an appeal to the people once more, as it would indicate that the Government has not sufficient control of its majority to ensure the passing of necessary legislation. Even as the case stands it appears that it has lost this control, as

the whips cannot rely on their party responding promptly to their summons when a vote is to be taken, and from this cause, during the last two weeks the majority has dwindled down at times to 24, 18, and even 15 on nearly every division. At one moment a break with the Radicals seemed imminent, as they are bent upon an immediate attack upon the House of Lords, and are pressing the Government to begin the campaign, which they are loath to do, because the Radicals are more hostile than the Government to an hereditary chamber, and would strip the Lords entirely of the veto power, whereas the Government are willing to allow some power to the Lords to check hasty legislation, though not to place an obstacle in the way of carrying out the positively expressed and unalterable will of the people.

On this very point a serious split was threatened. A motion by Mr. Dalziel to deprive the Lords of the veto power was brought up in the House and opposed by the Government, which is not prepared for such a measure at present. The Radicals pressed the motion, but finally at a caucus Mr. Dalziel declared that he had no wish to place the Ministry in a minority, and it was agreed that Mr. Morley's motion give to the Government the day appointed for the discussion of Mr. Dalziel's proposition. The Government was thus sustained by a vote of 268 to 244, the majority being 24. It is possible therefore that in spite of all the vicissitudes to which it is exposed it may weather the storm.

The question naturally arises, "What is the prospect of Home Rule under the present circumstances?"

Lord Rosebery has taken care to explain that his words, which were taken to mean that the cause of Home Rule must be shelved until an English majority be gained over to it, had no such meaning.

In his speech at Edinburgh delivered in the presence of fifty thousand enthusiastic Liberals, he said,

"It was a surprise to him that his speeches are beginning to be read, and that a great deal is being read into them."

He still adhered to his words that "we must carry conviction to the heart of England;" but he explained that this does not signify, nor did he mean it to signify, "that the predominant vote of England is to be waited for before action be taken. Why, they would never carry anything in this case. We await the people's voice, and when we have it we will be prepared to take the measures thus inspired. We do not propose to sit on the banks of the stream of time and watch the stream pass by until it runs dry." Yet he added that as the English majority against Home Rule has been lessened by time, there is good hope that England will be brought to the side of Home Rule; and he would endeavor to bring about so desirable a result. He expects to get an English majority; but he positively declared that a decisive majority of the four nationalities must prevail, even though there should be an English majority on the other side.

We have no doubt that this assurance will satisfy the Irish Nationalists. It need not be asked too strictly now whether this was or was not Lord Rosebery's meaning when he first announced that "England must be convinced." It is enough that he now announces that Home Rule shall be granted if a majority of the House of Commons continue to support it, and that the Lords must become convinced of its necessity. It is gratifying to observe that the most representative men of the Nationalists have declared that they rely upon Lord Rosebery's declarations.

Thus, Mr. Wm. O'Brien, speaking at Newcastle on St. Patrick's day, said, "I believe that the Liberal party is as true as steel." Mr. Dillon said at Edinburgh on the same day:

"I have just heard Lord Rosebery speak upon the Home Rule question, and in regard to the substance of that speech I congratulate Scotland upon the position occupied by her illustrious son. More importance will be attached to that speech than to any other delivered within the last fifteen years. In Lord Rosebery, Ireland has an honest and honorable champion."

Mr. Healy, Mr. Blake, and Mr. Davitt spoke to the same effect in London.

The enemies of Home Rule are still occupying themselves in foretelling disaster to the Liberals, both because of new dissensions among the Irish Nationalists, and of a Conservative reaction in the country. The by-elections do not bear out these prognostications, for the Government has held

its own; and on the other hand, we are convinced that the Nationalists are too much in earnest to allow new dissensions to endanger the national cause at the moment when Ireland's victory is on the point of being achieved.

THE CATHOLIC SUMMER SCHOOL.

The Catholic Summer School has been productive of much and permanent good, inasmuch as it has demonstrated that Catholics are capable of handling the subjects that clamor for solution and are discussed by thinking men throughout the world. The prospect was at first regarded with distrust, but the glowing success of last year has removed all opposition, and with the utmost hope and confidence it enters upon its work of this year with the greatest vigor and enthusiasm.

The Board of Studies met at the call of the chairman, the Rev. Thomas McMillan, Paulist, and arranged the programme of lectures, addresses and conferences for the session beginning July 14, in Plattsburg. Bishop Spalding of Peoria will preach the opening sermon. The Jesuit Provincial, Rev. Wm. O'Brien Pardow, is to give four lectures on the Bible: the Southern novelist, R. M. Johnston, in five discourses will treat of eminent authors and give the school tribute to the late Brother Azarius: Geo. Parsons Lathrop is to discourse on the French Revolution in three lectures: Judge Robinson of Yale will have two lectures on legal principles: the labor question will be treated in two lectures by the Rev. Morgan Sheedy of Pittsburg, and the geology of the Ausalle chasm will be the subject of an address from the New York State geologist, Prof. James Hall. Papers will be read by prominent authors.

It is a hopeful sign of better things to see such an institution revered and patronized, for it is at least a token that the amassing of wealth does not engross the attention of all our citizens. It is, moreover, a potent factor in the education of the people. The discourses and papers are carefully prepared and are thus happily deficient in the qualities of modern literature, inexactness and slovenliness.

We wish the Summer School a large measure of success.

WORSE THAN MERE BUFFOONS.

There are in the A. P. A. many ludicrous features which have justly brought upon it the ridicule of fair-minded people who recommend that it be treated with contempt only. Thus we are not surprised that the Rev. Professor Swing, the well known eloquent Chicago preacher, makes a good hit on the alarming circulars issued by that organization representing that the Catholics are meditating the extermination of Protestants. In a recent discourse he said:

"When we Protestants are invited to dine with Archbishop Ireland or Cardinal Gibbons must we look for poison in our coffee? Must we carry a pistol in our dress coat? Recently the Pope has issued an order that the clergy of Spain must not attend bull fights hereafter. Is this order issued because Leo XIII. wishes the clergy to give their undivided attention to the killing of Protestants?"

There is not a doubt that the A. P. A., equally with the P. P. A. of Canada, its sister society, deserves all the ridicule which it has brought upon itself by the absurd calumnies it has invented and circulated through its organs of the press, but such an event as that which occurred recently at Toledo in the actual purchasing of three thousand Winchester rifles for the pretended purpose of self defence against an expected attack which Catholics were to make upon the Protestants of the United States, is more mischievous than ludicrous, though it has been generally looked upon as a subject for merriment, and has made the A. P. A. the laughing-stock of the country.

But there is too much of what is seriously mischievous in A. P. A.ism to allow it to be regarded simply as a folly to be laughed at. It too gravely threatens the peace of the nation.

A recent evidence of this is to be found in the disastrous riot which took place in Kansas City on the 3rd inst. some particulars of which have already been made known to our readers. This riot in a few minutes resulted in so much bloodshed as to bring sorrow to many families, and to be the precursor of future evils which cannot yet be foreseen or estimated.

As it was feared that at the elections in Kansas City, which took place on the above mentioned date, there would

be trouble, fifty special constables were appointed by Justice Latham to preserve order. As these were chosen indiscriminately from among Catholics and Protestants, the A. P. A. thought proper to take umbrage at the selection, and there were several riots at the polls in various parts of the city. The rioting reached a climax as soon as the constables attempted to quiet the mob, and one of the constables was shot by an A. P. A. and instantly killed. The murderer was himself shot immediately after, and the wound is said to have been fatal. In the melee which followed, firearms were freely used, and a hundred shots were discharged within five minutes. Two other persons were fatally and several seriously injured.

It is said that while this riot was going on the A. P. A. telegraphed to Armourdale and Argente, strongholds of the A. P. A., for a thousand men to come to Kansas to assist the A. P. A. On the other hand this is denied, but the truth will probably be ascertained at the investigation which is to be made into the whole occurrence. It is to be feared that in other places where A. P. A.ists have also provided themselves with arms riots will likewise be frequent; for though the society is not endorsed by the majority of Americans, it is strong enough to cause much trouble, and its aggressiveness may bring about as much bloodshed elsewhere as it has already caused in Kansas City.

According to the A. P. A. view, Catholics must not be appointed to any public office; neither may any Protestant who is friendly to Catholics or willing to grant to Catholics that fair-play which is the right of every American citizen. To the carrying out of this principle in practice the A. P. A. is sworn, and thus it happened only a few weeks ago that the Mayor of Denver, Col., was publicly stigmatized as a "traitor and a perjurer," by the A. P. A. branch of that city, because, despite the unlawful oath which he thoughtlessly took when becoming a member of the branch, he appointed a Catholic to a minor yet responsible position immediately after his election to the mayoralty. Though it is acknowledged that the appointment was a good one, the mayor is denounced as worthy of the direst vengeance on the part of these irresponsible vindicators of the cause of Protestant ascendancy. The public are informed that at his death, whenever it may occur, a funeral service must be given over his grave consigning him to the doom of the perjured!

All this mummery does not terrify the mayor, who has seen the folly he committed in becoming a member of the society in the first instance, though now he openly repudiates it. But there may be some so foolish and frivolous as to be terrorized by these bigots who pretend to have under control the thunderbolts of heaven.

Another mayor, Mr. Edwin S. Smeltz, of Lancaster, Pennsylvania, similarly incurred the hatred of the fanatics a few days ago, by appointing a Catholic policeman after his election to office. On this occasion there was not even a pretence that Mayor Smeltz was bound to the A. P. A., but a member of the organization, one Theodore Klingler, filled with the hatred which had been inculcated into him by this organization, and another known as the Protestant Order of the Sons of America, went with a pistol to the mayor's house to murder him. Not being admitted to the house, he pulled out his pistol at the front door and made a violent speech on Protestant liberties, which mean the right to impose one's views on others at the muzzle of the pistol, or the dagger's point.

Concerning the responsibility of the A. P. A. for this attempt at murder there is not the slightest doubt. Is it to be expected, then, that Catholics will simply stand as apathetic spectators while matters are being thus carried on? Is the A. P. A. to be regarded simply as a piece of buffoonery while it is attempting its intolerances even under the mask of idocy? This cannot be. When a lunatic becomes dangerous he must be confined within the precincts of an asylum, and so be impeded from practising his mad freaks at the expense of those who are sane.

It appears from the latest intelligence available that the Catholics of Cleveland, Ohio, have fully entered into this view of the case. A full list of the members of one of the A. P. A. lodges of that city came into possession of the Catholics and has been circulated among them, with the result that as the A. P. A.ists have sworn to transact no business with Catholics which they

can avoid, the Catholics generally have facilitated the keeping of these oaths by resolving not to do business with A. P. A.ists. But this is one of the results the A. P. A. did not contemplate, and the merchants of Cleveland who were most officious in endeavoring to propagate A. P. A. principles, are now trying to make the public believe that they are not, and never have been, members of the obnoxious organization. These men have discovered that Catholic dollars have as sweet an odor in their coffers as the brightest Protestant coins, and sadly they miss them as they find their former customers now passing their doors to make their purchases elsewhere.

We understand that the lodge whose roll has thus been made public is on the point of breaking up.

In Rochester something similar has occurred, and business firms there are finding it expedient to announce in the newspapers that A. P. A.ism is an unknown quantity in their establishments.

We commend to the best consideration of our readers the course which has been followed by the Catholics of these cities. The same thing has been tried with good results in some towns of Ontario we could name; and we have no doubt that if the experiment be made in other localities, it will prove equally efficacious.

REV. DR. BRIGGS AGAIN.

A conference of the supporters of the Rev. Dr. Briggs, of Union Theological Seminary, New York, took place recently at Cleveland, where a statement of religious principles was issued in which the authority of the General Assembly to impose a creed was strenuously denied. By this action the celebrated heresy trial is brought once more to public notice.

Commenting on the pronouncement of this Congress, Mr. H. Scott, a lawyer, argues thus from a legal point of view:

"For over forty years I have been practising in courts of law, including the Supreme Courts of several States and of the United States. I have learned therein, when a question has been settled by the Supreme Court, to yield and respect it, whether I like it or not. As an elder in the Presbyterian Church for over thirty years, I have learned the same thing, and I expect to yield the same respect to the highest court of our Church that I do to the Supreme Court of the United States. I believe this principle of yielding obedience to constituted authority, whether in the home, the State, or the Church, is fundamental, and the duty of every Christian minister, elder and layman."

Conclusive as this reasoning is supported by the most orthodox Presbyterians to be, surely a lawyer of Mr. Scott's ability could scarcely have failed to notice that it is fatal to the authority of the General Assembly instead of sustaining it. If obedience is due to the highest court of the Church, that court is not to be found within the pale of Presbyterianism, which is based upon an act of rebellion against the highest court of the Church.

The Church of Christ is not an institution local to the United States, and limited by national boundaries, as the General Assembly is, which pronounced on the case of Dr. Briggs. The supreme authority of the Church must therefore be looked for outside of a Church whose jurisdiction is confined to a single nation, whether that be the United States, England, France or Prussia.

If, therefore, it be true, as Mr. Scott says, that "this principle of yielding obedience to constituted authority, whether in the home, the State or the Church, is fundamental, and the duty of every Christian minister, elder, and layman," then Luther, Calvin, Knox, Oliver Cromwell, and King Henry VIII. were alike bound to yield to the supreme authority of the Catholic Church when they rebelled against it.

The Evangelist, which takes the side of Professor Briggs, makes mince-meat of lawyer Scott's ratiocination with a logical chopping-knife of another kind. It reminds the legal gentleman that Presbyterians have, before now, more than once appealed to the Civil Courts to adjudicate in matters of the Church, and to restrain the use or abuse of ecclesiastical power when it involved a title to property. In the Supreme Court of the United States it tells us, all parties concerned have an unbounded confidence; and it asks:

"Why should not the Briggs case be brought before this arbitrer as the Court of last resort? Let us have a judicial decision, whether the General Assembly has a right to make a creed for us simply by the vote of a majority and to impose new Articles of Faith which have no place in the Confessions that have come down to us from our fathers, as the authorized Law and

Constitution of the Presbyterian Church, and whether in case of refusal to accept these modern inventions, said majority has a right to subject the minority to the penalties of ecclesiastical discipline.

Who can say now that the people of Scotland and Ireland are not beginning to see that the thorough godly Reformation effected by John Knox and Oliver Cromwell was carried too far?

It is all very well to disclaim any intention of introducing "Ritualism and Unscripturalism," but the act speaks for the intention. It is a Ritual that is demanded and the Confession of Faith denounces what is "beside" Holy Scripture, or "in any way not prescribed" therein, equally with what is "contrary to God's Word."

A NEW RITUALISTIC MOVEMENT.

A curious movement is now going on in the Presbyterian churches of Scotland and Ireland, under the auspices of the church service and the Scottish church societies, for the introduction of a more elaborate ritual in public worship.

Than the Presbyterians and the old Covenanters of Scotland there was no sect among Protestants who condemned more strenuously anything savoring of religious ceremony; and though this condemnation is not clearly made a point of doctrine, the Confession of Faith had it undoubtedly in view in pronouncing the abrogation of all the ancient ceremonial laws under the New Testament, adding that "God alone is Lord of the conscience, and hath left free from the doctrines and commandments of men which are in anything contrary to His word, or beside it in matters of faith or worship. So that to believe such doctrines or to obey such commandments out of conscience is to betray true liberty of conscience." (Conf. xix, xx.)

Further, we are told, "the acceptable way of worshipping the true God is instituted by Himself, and so limited by His own revealed will, that he may not be worshipped according to the imagination and devices of men . . . in any way not prescribed in Holy Scripture."

It may be said that all this does not imply that Ritualistic ceremony must be entirely set aside, yet there is no doubt that the Presbyterians intended it should be so understood, and so interpreted it. Hence in the Directory of Public Worship it is declared not only that the Catholic Liturgy is "vain, erroneous, superstitious, and idolatrous" but also that,

"The Liturgy of the Church of England (notwithstanding all the pains and religious intentions of the compilers of it) hath proved an offence, not only to many of the godly at home, but also to the reformed Churches abroad."

Many of the ceremonies of the Church are also said to be "unprofitable and burdensome . . . having occasioned much mischief, as well as disquieting the consciences of many godly ministers and people."

In conclusion it is asserted: "We have . . . after much consultation, with men of flesh and blood, but with His (God's) holy word, resolved to lay aside the former Liturgy, with the many rites and ceremonies formerly used in the worship of God; and have agreed upon this following directory for all the parts of public worship at ordinary and extraordinary times."

The discovery is now made that the present church service is "cold and dead," and that "a brighter one not less devotional" should be adopted.

The Belfast Witness, a resolute upholder of Presbyterian forms, says:

"Our (Irish) church service (though nowhere so cold and dead as it had become in Scotland) is cold and bald enough in many places. Nothing but the want of knowing any better would reconcile congregations to put up with it even for one day. Singing there is which is not praise, praying which is not prayer, worship, so-called, which is not devotional, sacraments administered without the appropriate praises and prayers that should accompany a general slovenliness and irreverence, not intended, of course, but all the same, marring the whole service, obscuring the glory of Christ, and hindering the edification of His people. Is this picture exaggerated? Not in the least degree. Is it too much to say that amongst all the Church agencies and objects this improvement of Church worship is one of the very foremost in value?"

The Witness then calls upon the Church Courts to consider the question seriously. It adds that it "does not" wish for anything Ritualistic or unscriptural. . . . But we are suffering from other and opposite evils. We want more glow of spiritual and devotional life in the service. We want a service in which the people