

The Catholic Record.

Published Weekly at 484 and 486 Richmond street, Ontario.

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

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

Publisher and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY,
Messrs. LEVY, KING, JOHN KIRK, P.
J. NIXON 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, agate 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, January 9, 1892.

TROUBLES ABOUT RITUALISM.

The horror of Ritualism which is from time to time exhibited by Low Churchmen of the Church of England, and by those of other denominations who delight in calling themselves Evangelicals, sometimes gives rise to exhibitions so absurd that they would only be laughed at, were it not for the painful desecrations of God's worship to which they frequently give rise.

That under the Old Law, instituted by God Himself, distinct sacerdotal vestments were commanded to be used is well known to every reader of the Old Testament, and these vestments were to be remarkable for "glory and for beauty." The ceremonies which were to be used in the synagogue were likewise of such a nature as to impress those assisting thereat with sentiments of respect, and a feeling of awe in presence of the Divine Majesty was imparted to them by the solemnity with which these ordinances were carried out.

It is very easy for anti-Ritualists to say that all religious ceremonial should be abolished and that everything in the divine service should be carried out with the utmost simplicity—"with Apostolic simplicity," as the favorite saying is—but we have yet to learn that the Apostles, or the primitive Church, rejected the use of these aids to devotion.

It can scarcely be denied that the weakness of human nature is such that an exterior ceremonial of more or less dignity is required to impress an assemblage of Christians with due respect for the House of God, and for God Himself. If this be not the case, what is the meaning of the great strictness with which Evangelicals wish the Sunday, or "Christian Sabbath," as they are pleased to call it, to be observed? It is well known that the anti-Ritualistic Evangelicals are the most zealous of all Protestants for the observance of the Sunday as nearly as possible with the same strictness and in much the same manner as were observed under the Old Law, though the ceremonial observances of the Old Law are no longer obligatory. This is, certainly, Ritualism of a most pronounced type.

It is a curious inconsistency that these same Evangelicals are deadly enemies of "Ritualism" in every other form except in that on which they are pleased to insist upon its observance. They contend that a very strict observance of the Sunday is necessary in order to ensure due respect for God during the whole week. No doubt the Sunday should be properly observed, according to the laws of God and of His Church; but this truth is no excuse for the extreme views of Sabbatarians who would oblige Christians, if they could, to observe the Jewish mode of celebrating their Sabbath. They would not, if they were consistent with themselves, allow us to light a fire, or cook our meals on Sunday, because these things were forbidden to the Jews.

But while these Evangelicals are thus zealous for the Jewish ceremonial laws to be observed regarding the keeping of the Sunday, on what principle of consistency do they persist in denouncing as un-Christian all Ritualistic observance in the public offices of the Church? We do not read anywhere in the New Testament that Christ or His Apostles condemned the use of the priestly vestments, or of incense, or of other ceremonial practices which they saw in constant use in the temple of Jerusalem; and we may justly infer that they approved of them, and even that the Apostles made use of some similar ritual when they established churches in the various cities which they visited in obedience to the command of Christ to preach His Gospel throughout the world.

There is evidence in the Apocalypse (or Revelation) of St. John that this was the case. In the description which this Apostle gives of his vision of the Son of God officiating at the altar as the

great high priest of the New Law, the vestments which he describes as worn by our Lord, and the ornaments of the altar at which He officiates, are strikingly similar to those which are used in Catholic churches to this day, and there is not a particle of doubt that the description accords with the usage of the primitive Christian Church. In fact the early Christian writers and Fathers of the Church, in their descriptions of the usages of the early Church, show that such was really the case, and monuments have come down to us from those days which prove the same thing. We may mention one of these monuments which may be seen to this day by any one who visits the church of St. Clement at Rome. On a fresco painted on the wall of this ancient church dedicated to the saint, he is represented in the act of celebrating Mass, and the vestments he wears are almost exactly the same as those which are worn by Popes and Bishops at the present day. The ornaments of the altar are likewise similar to those still in use: the candlesticks of the altar, the position of the chalice and the Mass-book, and even the position of the celebrant at the moment when he is saying the words "*Dominus vobiscum*." We may add that it is a matter of history that these words were established by St. Clement as part of the Mass; and they are to be seen on the Mass-book on the fresco as it stands open on the altar.

The words "*pax Domini sit semper vobiscum*" (May the peace of the Lord be always with you) are also plainly to be seen. These words were instituted by St. Clement as part of the Mass. This ancient Church is known to have been built in the reign of Constantine the Great, and it is spoken of in the writings of St. Augustine as a "Church in which the oratory of St. Clement is still preserved." The Church was destroyed by an earthquake in the ninth century, but it was excavated during the Pontificate of Pope Pius IX., and the debris removed, with the result that these valuable testimonies to the antiquity of Catholic faith and practice were brought to light.

In view of such facts as these, it will be seen that those religionists who style themselves "Evangelicals," and who entertain so much hatred against any use of ceremonial observances and symbolical decorations in churches, wrongly appropriate to themselves the name "Evangelicals." Their practices are woefully at variance with the Gospel, and all the traditions of Christianity.

We mentioned in last week's issue of the Record a disgraceful incident which occurred in St. Mary's Anglican Church in Newry, Ireland, which is one instance of this insane hatred of religious symbolism. Eleven vestrymen, while service was going on in the church, advanced to the "altar rails" and in presence of the whole congregation violently seized and burned from the Communion cloth the letters I. H. S. which were embroidered on it. These words, which signify reverence to "Jesus the Saviour of men," we should suppose would be regarded with respect by any claiming to be called "Evangelicals."

A similar incident is reported from Gloucester, England where objection has been made by the Evangelicals of the Anglican cathedral to the use of a cope and mitre which have been made for the use of their Bishop. They say that "it savors too much of Romanism," and it is all the more objectionable because on the centre-piece of the cope there is a representation of the Lamb of God, which is a Scriptural designation applied to our Blessed Lord by St. John the Baptist, and also by St. John the Evangelist, who, in the Apocalypse, describes our Lord as the "Lamb that was slain" for the sins of mankind. The pseudo-Bishop has not, indeed, any right to the Episcopal insignia; but as he claims to be a Bishop, it is incomprehensible that his flock should object to his use of a Bishop's emblems.

From another direction, also, and a most unexpected quarter, objection has been made to the use of a pastor's gown in the First Reformed Presbyterian Church of Brooklyn. The objectors declare that they are "in favor of plainness and simplicity in the church."

The Rev. James M. Farrar is the name of the pastor who has adopted the preacher's gown, which is peculiarly Calvinistic in its origin and use. It is known as the "Geneva gown," and is used in all the Calvinistic churches of Europe, and in many Protestant churches throughout the United States, as by Dr. Parkhurst, Presbyterian, of

New York, and Dr. Moxom of Boston, who is a Baptist.

There is, certainly, in this case no cause for pretending that the use of the gown shows a tendency to Romanism, but the occurrence shows the vagaries of which so-called "Evangelicals" are capable.

MODEL NO-POPERY LITERATURE.

Of all the controversial literature with which the anti-Catholic religious journals on this continent furnish their readers, that given by the Montreal *Witness* from time to time is undoubtedly the most stupid and malignant.

It will be remembered that a few weeks ago the news furnishers of the Associated Press thought it worth their while to telegraph by cable a story about a Jesuit in disguise who was detected acting as a butler in the house of Lord Salisbury. This story was to the effect that "a lady" whose name was not even given, chanced, while visiting the house of His Lordship, to notice among the servants a butler whose face she thought she had seen somewhere before under very different circumstances. On reflection she remembered that the face of the servant who perplexed her so much was that of a Jesuit who had conducted her through one of the churches of Rome, while she was on a visit to that city. He was then in the garb of a Roman priest.

The thought alarmed the sensitive lady so much that she went back to Lord Salisbury's house to make a further investigation, with the result that she discovered that the suspected Jesuit in disguise had fled. She communicated the facts of the case at once to Lord Salisbury, and told him of her suspicion that the pretended butler had been entrusted by the Pope with a mission to enter His Lordship's service as a spy to discover the intentions of the British Government in regard to its policy on the question of the restoration of the Pope's temporal power.

It was then taken as a matter of course that the spy, on seeing her, feared that his plans were discovered, whereupon he suddenly decamped. This story was pretty generally published by the press on this side of the Atlantic, just as it was sent over the cable, but we are not aware that any journal except the *Witness* gave so much credit to it as to honor it with an editorial notice to the effect that the Jesuits are accustomed to pursue just such a line of conduct as was represented by the unknown "lady," and that the story might well be accepted as true.

Lord Salisbury when spoken to on the subject said that the whole thing was a fabrication, but that it was too absurd on its face to need any official denial. It is not calculated to raise our estimation of the intelligence of the readers and supporters of the Montreal *Witness*, that this journal feels that it can so far practice upon their credulity as to give countenance and to attest even the probability of such tales, which are characterized as evidently absurd by Lord Salisbury, who is certainly no friend of Catholicism. But of course the *Witness*, even when it became aware of Lord Salisbury's statement, never informed its readers that the story was an absurd concoction. We do not suppose that Lord Salisbury is accustomed to tell his butlers all the State secrets of the British Government, so it could scarcely be thought that men so cunning as the Jesuits are supposed by people of the *Witness* stamp to be, would get themselves into butlers' situations in order to learn what is going on in diplomatic circles.

In the *Witness* of the 28th ult. we find another evidence of its enterprise. In that issue prominence is given to an anonymous letter signed Saul, in which just as silly a story is related as that which came by cable concerning Lord Salisbury. It is no Popery literature, and that is sufficient to ensure that the *Witness* will give it to its readers as nutritious spiritual food.

The story is now that on the occasion of the obsequies of Rev. Father Dowd, of Montreal, Saul fell in with a "respectably dressed" Catholic woman with whom he went into St. Patrick's church, on receiving the assurance from her that he might enter without danger. The woman knelt near Father Dowd's catafalque, and said "the mortuary prayer." This was, very proper, for "it is a holy and wholesome thought to pray for the dead that they may be loosed from their sins," according to Scripture.

Saul, however, would not pray for the deceased priest, and when his companion asked him his reason for not doing so, he answered: "I believe

the good man is very comfortable, and any prayer of mine now would not be of much avail one way or the other." We wonder that he had so high an opinion of a priest's virtue as to acknowledge that he could be a "good man."

This writer further informs us that his Catholic companion told him:

"See! I have half a dozen beads with me, because it was given out only yesterday—and they don't all know it yet—that two hundred days' Indulgence will be granted to any one who had their beads touched by his (Father Dowd's) hands. Anyhow have you not a bead about you, or even a handkerchief? It might do you a service. It is seldom we have the opportunity of getting such a long Indulgence for trifling slips and offences."

The woman is stated to have made Saul otherwise her confidant, but it is unnecessary to repeat here the rest of the reported conversation.

The whole story told by Saul is evidently an invention. No Catholic woman would have made such a statement as we have quoted; but it appears that the *Witness* is always ready to open its columns to every slander against Catholics or Catholic doctrine.

THE TABLES TURNED.

Four years ago the bigots of Boston succeeded, by means of a No-Popery cry, but more effectually by inducing the Protestant women of the city to register as voters, in electing a Mayor, a Common Council, and a school commission hostile to Catholics. Not only were the Catholics of the city deprived of representation, but all Protestants who were suspected of being in favor of doing justice to Catholics in educational matters were ruthlessly rejected from the Council, and we cannot easily forget the paeans of victory which were sung on the occasion by anti-Catholic journals in our own Dominion, which we need not name.

We had also Justin D. Fulton boasting in a lecture delivered in Toronto soon after, that he had been very instrumental in gaining the glorious victory over Rome. And what was the nature of the victory? It was the victory of intolerance and deceit, and they who gloried in it were boasted advocates of Equal Rights! It was a victory whereby a Bostonian majority declared that the Catholic children of Boston, in attendance at schools for which their parents paid taxes, should be taught that the Catholic Church holds doctrines which she never held.

We told these gentlemen at the time, that their rejoicings were premature. We told them that they had succeeded in arousing the spirit of fanaticism, but we added that the victory they had gained would be short-lived; and our prognostications have proved to be correct. At the elections which have just been held the fanatics have been routed, horse, foot and artillery; and what is better still, there is every reason to believe that the recent victory is an earnest of what will be the permanent state of affairs in the city.

At the elections last year there was already evidence that a reaction was taking place, but this year has settled the question.

The Democrats announced boldly that justice to Catholics was part of their programme. The Republicans, both this year and last, pandered to the fanatics, while putting on a mask of hypocrisy over their intentions while seeking for Catholic votes. The whole strength of the Fulton and Company's Committee of One Hundred, which had dictatorially determined to rule the city, and especially to hold the schools under their control, was concentrated on the Republican side. The result is that whereas last year the Democrats had a majority of 9 in the city council, there are now 48 Democrats to 27 Republicans: the Democratic majority being 21.

On the School Committee, 9 Democrats and three nominees of the fanatical One Hundred were elected. The most decisive vote of all, however, was for the Mayoralty. A much larger vote than usual was polled, a vote which was scarcely ever exceeded, except in the years of the Presidential elections, and the result is that the Democratic candidate for the Mayoralty, Mr. Matthews, was elected by a majority of 15,182 over the Republican, or by 14,418 over both of his opponents together. This is the largest majority ever given to a Mayor of the city. The figures were: Democratic, 34,716; Republican, 19,534; Prohibitionist, 764.

There will be no pranks in the anti-Catholic journals this time, over the result.

It is not altogether outside of the possibilities, or even probabilities, that this discomfiture of the fanatics may have such an influence on the coming presidential election as to turn the scale. It would be very amusing and instructive if Filthy Fulton proved to be the Rev. Burchard of the Republicans for 1892.

THE SCOTCH CROFTERS.

It is a mistake to suppose that Ireland is the only portion of the British Isles where the greed of the landlord has brought into existence a land question which needed to be settled in order to rescue the tenantry from a condition of abject poverty bordering on starvation. The Ulster Orangemen and all those in Canada who sympathize with them oppose tenant right and Home Rule in Ireland because the people of Ireland are mostly Catholic; but they conveniently close their eyes to the fact that Protestant Scotland has its land question also, which is in every respect similar to that of Ireland, and which must be solved on the same general principles recognizing the right of the tillers of the ground to its first fruits, enabling them to live out of their own earnings.

The case of the Crofters of the North and West of the Scotch Highlands is once more prominently before the public, and this time in the form of a decisive victory which they have achieved in the Courts.

The abodes of the Crofters in the Highlands, and on the islands, are humble huts of the poorest description, and the Crofters themselves earn a precarious subsistence by cultivating the small portions of land which are there allotted to them, but which are quite inadequate for their subsistence, so that they are obliged, besides cultivating their land, to seek some other occupation in addition to enable them to earn a living.

The patches of land which are tilled by the Crofters are so small that they cannot be called farms, and so the name Crofts is given to them, and the tenants who till them are called Crofters, but the Crofters of each township have, in addition to the piece of land they occupy, the right of pasturage on the hill or moorland adjoining their holdings. They have, however, no lease to ensure to them that their holdings will be permanent, the only guarantee being the word of the proprietor, which is usually unreliable, and they are consequently liable to eviction at any moment, and such eviction is often as ruthlessly carried out as in Ireland, at the will of the landlord. These tenants-at-will are either turned adrift, or are obliged to remove to poorer crofts so that their holdings may be divided among several other tenants whose combined rental will be greater than a single tenant is expected to pay; or the rents may be raised at the whim of the landlord. This occurs, especially, when for not being sufficiently subservient, the tenant is not regarded with favor by the proprietor or factor in charge.

No remuneration is allowed the tenants for improvements, when they are evicted, and of course as time lapses, the holdings become poorer and poorer, for there is no encouragement to improve them or the mode of farming them. Hence the condition of the crofters is constantly becoming less and less endurable, as their farms become poorer, which must necessarily be the case when they are not improved.

In addition to all this, the whole population of a township have frequently been evicted and placed upon hillside and moorlands, which are bleak and sterile, because the proprietors wished to turn their comparatively more fertile fields into large farms or deer forests.

Under such circumstances, of course, the condition of the crofters has become every year worse than ever before.

The old tribal tenure of land gave the clansmen a title to their holdings as long as they rendered military service to their chief, but as this feudal tenure has become absolute, the proprietors have taken advantage of the changed conditions to claim an absolute ownership, thus making the condition of the people as intolerable as that of the Irish tenantry, and in some respects even more so, so that at the present time it is about as intolerable as it can possibly be. They are subject to all the hardships of which the Irish complain, except the single one of landlord absenteeism. The introduction of improved methods of cultivating the soil, sowing the seed, and mowing by machinery, has also cut off from them the oppor-

tunities they formerly had for earning a living by working in the Lowlands during the summer, and thus, between rack-renting, loss of their improvements, evictions and deprivation of employment, they are reduced to the most deplorable state of indigence.

If at any time a crofter offended his lord, or refused to accede to his unjust and even criminal demands, which it was frequently necessary for him to do, as he valued the honor of his family, there was no alternative for him but to leave the country, and it was not until the inhabitants of Lewis, the largest and most Northerly of the Hebrides, actually took up arms to protect their homes against their landlords who proposed to evict them in order to seize upon their little farms and their common pastures, that public attention was called to their hard condition, which has not been improved since Burns wrote,

Lord, man! o' gentry care sae little
For delvers, ditchers and sic cattle
They gang as saucy by poor folk
As I would by a stinking brock
I've noticed on our Lord's court day,
And mony a time my heart's been wae,
Puir tenant bodies, scant o' cash
Hae they man, thole a snash;
He'll stamp and threaten, curse and swear
He'll apprehend them, point their gear;
While they moun stan' w/ aspect humble
And hear it a' an' fear an' tremble.
I see how folk live that ha' riches,
But surely puir folk moun be wretches.

The General Assemblies of the Kirk of Scotland and the Free Kirk received many petitions or overtures, begging of them to intervene in favor of the crofters by petitioning Parliament to ameliorate their condition. They did so, and a court was soon established to adjust the rental and reduce excessive arrears. The proprietors, among whom was the Duke of Argyll, claimed, like the Irish landlords, that the crofters had no just grounds for complaint. But, in spite of their representations, Parliament passed a law establishing a court on the basis demanded by the General Assemblies. This court recently held a session with the result that in nearly every case brought before it, the rent was reduced to a degree unexpected by the landlords, who are now very indignant at the decisions which have been reached. The average reduction of rents has been fully 35 per cent., and of arrears 65 per cent., and in some cases the rents were reduced even 60 per cent. and the arrears 90 per cent. There is scarcely an estate in the whole crofter region on which these reductions have not been made, the whole sum due to the owners having been cut down by some millions of pounds sterling. The landlords have, in consequence, been obliged to curtail their expenditure to such an extent that the merchants say that their receipts from the Scotch Northern land owners have been very much diminished.

The land owners threaten to appeal to Parliament to have the court abolished, or at least to have its most sweeping decisions quashed. But they are not likely to be successful. The present Tory Government is obstinate enough in refusing to ameliorate the condition of the Irish; but where it is a question of relieving Scotchmen, they do not dare to perpetuate a like injustice.

MR. CHAMBERLAIN FIRES OFF A BOOMERANG.

Mr. Chamberlain, in a recent speech delivered at Edinburgh, in the hope of reanimating the spirits of the Tories of that city, took occasion to attack Home Rule on the exploded ground that it would be "Rome Rule," and further to convince his audience that this would be a dreadful misfortune he pointed with the finger of scorn at the Province of Quebec as being an illustration of the evils of priestly and of all Catholic domination. The inference is, of course, that Home Rule should be withheld from Ireland. He said:

"In the French Province of Quebec, the Church of Rome wields an unquestionable and an unlimited authority. It has secured possession of the greater part of the land. It controls the Legislature; it discourages Protestants and Protestantism; and it favors the members of its own community; and, as a result of that, enterprise is dead within the Province, and there is no contrast more striking on the American continent than that between the energy and the industry of the great Protestant city of Toronto and the decrepitude and the apathy and the silence of the once famous Catholic city of Quebec. That is the effect of the intervention of the priest in politics. That is the effect of Catholic domination."

Mr. Chamberlain has never been remarkable for truthfulness during his political career, especially since he became the henchman of an unscrupulous Government; but the above few lines contain so many untruths and misrepresentations that none but a politician without the least regard for honesty could give utterance to them.