

Catholic Record.

London, Sat., March 2nd, 1889. THE PROTESTANT PREACHERS OF LONDON AND THE JESUITS.

Ontario is just now suffering from a very bad attack of Jesuit-phobia, and its paroxysms are painful to witness. It is probable, however, that the patient will soon recover from this grievous disease and regain the full use of its reason. But the Protestant preachers will not allow the patient to recover if they can help it. Proferring to be ministers of the God of peace and charity, they game seems to be to inflame the public mind and in the interest of their craft to disturb public order and social peace.

Then comes Rev. Mr. Porter, who has no hesitation in affirming that the Jesuits believe in the "and justifying the means." We acquit Mr. Porter of originality in giving expression to this wicked falsehood. It was the invention of falsifiers who are long since dead and gone, and its survival in our day only proves the wonderful vitality of lies. Mr. Porter's ignorance regarding the character of this falsehood is, since he is a public teacher, unjustifiable and sinful.

Rev. Mr. Davis has a word to say on the subject. This dear gentleman, unctuous, simpering and Chabod-like, raises up his eyes in holy horror at the wicked Jesuits and hesitates not to endorse the following stupendous calumny: "The Jesuits' oath declares that all kings or governments are illegal without the Pope's confirmation and that they may be safely destroyed; disown allegiance as due to any Protestant whatsoever, be he king, prince or inferior officer, and binds every member to do his utmost to extirpate the Protestant doctrine and destroy all their power, legal or otherwise. Therefore, I claim that Jesuits cannot be loyal to their country. If they are the enemies of their country, why should they be established? I do not oppose the set because the Jesuits are Roman Catholics, for I am willing to give them such liberty as I claim for Protestantism, but as the Jesuits are sworn to oppose and extirpate Protestant monarchs, whom they call heretical, I claim they should receive no such aid from any Government. Most decidedly they are not entitled to advantages in a Protestant country which the Protestant do not possess. It would be well, in my opinion, for men to act upon principle rather than expediency in a case of this kind."

It is needless to say that the Jesuits take no such impious oath as the foregoing, but still the calumny will be repeated to the end. The Rev. Mr. Jones, himself a Jesuit, and connected by blood with some of the most ancient and respectable families, Catholic and Protestant, in Ontario, has written the following letter to the Toronto World denying emphatically that he or any other Jesuit was ever required to take such an oath, but he might as well have kept silent, for the voice of truth will not be heard in the storm of fanaticism now raging. However, we insert it here, as it will serve to convict Rev. Mr. Davis and men of his stamp of violating the eighth commandment of God. It is that they also hold the doctrine that the end justifies the means?

The following letter appeared in the World and other Toronto papers on Wednesday. The writer, Father Jones, is a cousin of Messrs. Beverley and Clarkson Jones, and a nephew of Mr. W. J. Macdonell, of that city: "The attention of the members of the Society of Jesus, established in Montreal, has been drawn to the reproduction in your issue of Tuesday morning, Feb. 12th, of what is stated to have been published in the Semeur Franco American as an oath taken by Jesuits. The reproduction alluded to is a gross libel on the Society of Jesus; I therefore request you to insert the present most formal repudiation of any such oath. As a member of that order for the last thirty-one years, familiar with its constitution, its principles and its modes of action, I deny that any oath of that nature is or could be taken by any Jesuit or Catholic.

I am not wholly unknown in Toronto, having been many years a resident, and a member of the Society of Jesus. For which reason I now, over a responsible name, with the full approval of the proper authorities, denounce, on the part of the order, that doctrine among others maledictusly imputed to us, namely: That we, or other members of the Catholic Church, may lawfully disobey or be disloyal to secular princes or governments, either Catholic or Protestant, in matters secular. I regret that the calumny was not brought to our knowledge sooner—and in all likelihood others have escaped our notice, as we see few if any Toronto papers. We are fully determined, as citizens enjoying the same rights and protection as other subjects of our beloved sovereign, to take prompt measures to vindicate our good name, and to hold accountable those who publish maliciously any libel which is of a nature to detract from the usefulness of the society.

Trusting fully to that spirit of fairness which is the boast of every Anglo-Saxon all the world over, and which, quite independently of other considerations, should prompt them as all other fair-minded men to have a wrong righted, I expect that you will publish this letter in your next issue. Yours very respectfully, ARTHUR E. JONES, S. J. St. Mary's College, Montreal, 18th February, 1889.

Rev. Messrs. Hunter, Ryckman and others were also consulted, and how the Jesuits can survive their utterances is a mystery above the reach of comprehension, and only shows the awfully dangerous character of this insidious and aggressive organization. These men differ widely from each other in the doctrines of Christianity and in Church government, but, like Herod and Pilate of old, they join together in hatred of the Catholic Church.

There is only a handful of Jesuits in the whole Province of Quebec, and all Canadian Protestantism appears to be afraid of them. If Protestant preachers would try to imitate the zeal, the spirit of self-sacrifice, and the love of souls that animate those disciples of St. Ignatius, they would be far more profitably employed than in giving an exhibition of unchristian hate, calumny, and all manner of uncharitableness that serve to bring the sacred cause of religion into contempt and to cause the infidel and the scoffer to exclaim, in mockery and derision, "See how those Christians hate each other."

Let them learn lessons of good sense, and take sound advice even from a Pharisee. When the Jewish council assembled in Jerusalem, nineteen hundred years ago, for the purpose of attacking and destroying the first Company of Jesus—the Apostles—Gamaliel addressed to the council these words of wisdom: "Now, therefore, I say to you, refrain from these men, and let them alone; for if this council or this work be of men it will come to naught. But if it be of God, you cannot overthrow it; lest perhaps you be found even to fight against God." (Acts v., 39.)

COLLAPSE OF THE TIMES CASE.

The case of the London Times against Mr. Parnell has at length reached its culminating point, and a more complete fiasco than it has proved to be never came before a law court for adjudication. The accusations of the London Times, against Mr. Parnell especially, but also against the members of the National party, were so horrible, that if one-tenth of them had been believed it would have been sufficient to damn them forever in the estimation of an honorable public. It is scarcely necessary to say that they were not believed, except, perhaps, by some fantastic old woman in the Tory camp. Who that believed that they were in league with moonlighters for the purpose of murdering landlords and their agents and harmless farmers who supported the Government, would entrust them with the government of the country? Who that was convinced that they were the instigators of the two atrocious murders which took place in Phoenix Park, and which elicited the reprobation of civilized Europe, would believe that Mr. Parnell and his Nationalist following in Parliament would be fit men to sway the destinies of their country? We do read in the history of both England and Scotland that men who were certainly implicated in the most horrid crimes have still been the darlings of the people and have been kept by them in positions of the highest trust, but such a thing is inconceivable in Ireland, where the popular instinct is too virtuous and courageous to endorse or even condone such criminality in public men. This, too, was the favorite argument of the Times and other Conservative organs: "How can such men as Parnell and Harrington, Dillon and Davitt, whose hands have been imbrued in blood, become guardians of the nation's safety?" The celebrated forged letters were flaunted in the face of the public as proof positive of their complicity in crime, and through Attorney General Webster's astounding statements in the O'Donnell case, the Government endorsed fully the worst things asserted against the Irish leaders by the Times.

The appointment of a special commission of enquiry was certainly not made by Government for the purpose of showing fair play to the Nationalists. If this had been the object known partisans of the Government would not have been selected as Commissioners. The course of the Times, showed all along the weakness of its case. If it could have associated the Irish members with the commission of gross crimes, it would not have been necessary to pay out money lavishly to witnesses to induce them to swear that the members had some remote connection with the murderous organizations of the Moonlighters, or the Invincibles.

The avoidance of the main issue was strong evidence in itself that the Times was perfectly conscious that it could not connect Mr. Parnell with any of these outrages by the testimony of credible witnesses. But time works wonders, and the main issue has at last been reached. Pigott, from whom the Times purchased the letters, has been on the witness stand, and has sworn that the letters which profess to be Mr. Parnell's approval of the Phoenix Park murders have really Mr. Parnell's signature attached to them. "He has no idea who wrote the body of the letters." Five letters said to have been signed by Mr. Parnell were produced, and six signed by Mr. Patrick Egan. These he also identified as being in Mr. Egan's handwriting.

Mr. Houston, Secretary of the Irish Loyal and Patriotic Union, swore that he had paid Pigott £200 from October, but that the Times paid the bills of Pigott after May, 1887. Pigott wanted £500,000, so far as has yet appeared, he did not get near that amount. Pigott also swore that he had asked money from Sir

G. O. Trevelyan on account of his support of the Government. From Mr. Forster Pigott did obtain large sums of money, not as a subsidy, however, but as an individual needing charity. When Mr. Forster's patience was exhausted, and no more money could be got from him, Pigott threatened him with the publication of his letters, hoping thus to extort from him further sums of money. Thus did he endeavor to blackmail his benefactor.

Sir Charles Russell asked Pigott to write "livelihood, likelihood, Richard Pigott, proselytism, Patrick Egan, P. Egan, and hesitancy." He wrote "livelihood, likelihood, hesitancy," just as they were misspelled in the forged letters, thus affording strong presumption that he was their forger. There are, besides, strong resemblances between his handwriting and the handwriting in the body of the letters. In addition to this, letters from Pigott to Archbishop Walsh were produced of date 4th May, 1887, and 5th May, marked private and confidential. In these letters he informed the Archbishop that proceedings were contemplated with the object of destroying the Parnellites' influence in Parliament, and that he for a consideration could indicate how they could be defeated.

Sir Charles Russell called upon Pigott to explain how the designs could be defeated if the letters were genuine, and the only answer which Pigott could make at last was: "I may say at once that the statements I made to Archbishop Walsh were unfounded." This created a sensation. Sir Charles Russell asked him: "You deliberately told lies?" Witness: "Well, exaggerations." Sir Charles: "Did the exaggerations have any truth?" Witness: "Very little. I forgot what I meant when I wrote to Archbishop Walsh that the charges were a mixture of what I believe to be true and untrue."

A letter was also produced from Pigott to Egan, written 27th Feb., 1881, in which he asked urgently for £500, or at least £300 for important information which he professed to be able to give, besides £200 which he said he had received for the paper of which he was proprietor. He threatened that if Egan would not accede to his request he would sell his information to another party.

He acknowledged that Egan did not answer his letter nor send the money. This man, now a beggar, now a black-mailer, now a liar—or an exaggerator—is the man on whose evidence the Times' case rests solely. The cable despatches tell us that even the most pronounced Tories admit that the whole case of the Times has resolved itself into a gigantic fizzle. The Telegraph, a Tory organ, admits that Pigott's evidence has been "blown to the four winds of heaven, and with it the case of the Times" and that the Government also has been "winged" in the contest.

It is expected that Pigott will be prosecuted for perjury; though it is thought probable that he will acknowledge that he is himself the forger of the celebrated letters and that the judges will grant him immunity from prosecution for perjury in consideration of his now telling the truth.

The forged letters were produced without envelopes, so that there is no evidence that they passed through the mails. Pigott acknowledges that he tried to sell out his information to any one who would pay him sufficiently, whether Forster, Egan or Archbishop Walsh. None would touch the dirty fellow till he found a purchaser in the Times.

Besides the coincidence that Pigott mispelled the same words which were mispelled in the forgeries, whole phrases were repeated in the latter which were found in genuine letters which had been written by Messrs. Parnell and Egan. A member of Parliament writing to the Herald says: "The whole process of manufacture appears to be laid completely bare. An innocent letter copied, a few compromising passages tacked on to it, and the production in a finished state offered to the highest bidder."

That the case of the Times has completely collapsed is now the universal verdict. The Freeman's Journal proclaims that there is yet to come testimony of a startling nature which will give a thrilling ending to the career of a spy, informer and purchaser of false testimony, in a way which surpasses imagination.

The London Times people come in for the following life like sketch at the hands of the able Mr. Labouchere: "I am so filled with wordous admiration at the childlike simplicity of the editor, manager and collector of the Times that I cannot refrain from expressing at once my delight that this artificial and sinful city possesses three such ingenious geese. I say geese, because the "Babes in the Wood" were of serpent-like cunning, Gilbert's "Three Little Maids from School" were guileful women of the world, and the Shepherd of Salisbury Plain a Machiavelli compared with these three mare-nealing old women at Printing House Square."

THE JESUITS AND THE FREE PRESS.

Last week the London Free Press, commenting on our remark that a wave of Protestant bigotry was sweeping over the entire Dominion, asked who are to blame? Thus evidently insinuating that the Catholics are themselves the disturbers of the happy relations that should exist among the citizens of a free country. It is the story of the wolf and the lamb repeated. The Catholic Church in Quebec had been deprived of the revenues of some property she owned in that Province, and during the last eighty-nine years the rents of such property, worth \$2,000,000, were being paid over year by year to the Canadian Government. Quebec obtained Home Rule, and by the Act of Confederation came into possession of these lands and tenements belonging to the Catholic Church. Since the declaration of Confederation in 1867, twenty-two years ago, the Quebec Government has been pocketing the proceeds of these lands and tenements, to the detriment and actual loss of some thousands of dollars annually to the real owner, the Jesuit Fathers, who, previous to the year 1800, held these estates in trust for the Catholic Church. But the Quebec Government is just now managed and controlled by men of conscience who are anxious to make some compensation to the plundered Jesuit Fathers. The latter have shown a willingness to meet the Government half way, and, in fact, in order to obtain a quiet settlement and for peace sake, have consented to accept, not indeed the \$2,000,000 or the interest thereon for the eighty-nine years, to which they are entitled, but the small sum of \$400,000, which is not even a round fourth of the capital which belongs to them. And, foremost, because the Catholic people of Quebec have come to this quiet understanding about their own private affairs, the Protestant howl must be heard through the land, and we are asked who are to blame for the wave of low, unjustifiable, brutal bigotry that is just now threatening the peace of the whole Dominion. The Jesuits Fathers, who were the pioneers of civilization and the first preachers of God's gospel to these lands, were shorn and robbed of the property donated to them by pious and grateful members of the Church, and now, when simple justice is done them, Interlopers from the North of Ireland and Scotland wearing white chokeys and broad philleries on their foreheads, shout "to arms, to arms." England has contributed her frenzied Goldwin Smith to swell the insane chorus—and "Down with the Jesuits," *Harro sur le bandot*, resound from end to end of the bigoted Province of Ontario.

How the Free Press and every other unfair and unscrupulous sheet would exclaim, "Papal aggression! priestly domination!" should any one Catholic priest in Quebec or in Ireland employ the fire-brand utterances delivered in the several Protestant churches in Toronto on Sunday last. Rev. Dr. Wild said in his pulpit: "I don't believe the Province of Quebec had power to incorporate the Jesuits. I don't believe that in the sight of British law the Jesuits can be an incorporated body. In the reign of Queen Elizabeth in 1585 a law was passed making it treason for even a Catholic priest to be found in England, and felony to harbor one, and the Jesuits were expelled at the point of the penalty of death. That law has never been repealed. And British law says it is a penalty of death for a Jesuit to be in our presence. And if you killed one I question if you could be hung to-morrow."

As many ignorant Protestants see a Jesuit in every Catholic priest they encounter it is not outside the probabilities to fancy the effect such blood-curdling speeches may produce. When a Protestant minister from his pulpit urges on his fanatical hearers to the murder of Catholic priests, it is time the authorities of the land should step in and stop the mouth of such reverend instigators to riot and bloodshed. Dr. Wild played the same pranks in his pulpit on the occasion of Mr. Wm. O'Brien's visit, and a blood-acciding riot was the unfortunate result. He was allowed then to incite to murder with impunity.

Rev. Mr. McGregor, in the Western Congregational Church, said: "We are asked to believe, that by warning, nursing and domesticating the Jesuit viper in our bosom, he will lose the poison from his fangs. Oh! shame on those editors and leaders who speak of a great issue in this way. The Jesuits are stealing away our liberties, they are stealing away our privileges, and it is only the beginning of troubles and sorrows of our fair Dominion, unless the developments of that order is arrested by a strong and united front being presented by the Protestants of our own land. To strengthen the Jesuit in our land is simply to strengthen a determined and skillful foe of every liberty worth preserving. I am prepared to enter upon a crusade against them because it is a crusade against popular ignorance, superstition and corruption."

The few Jesuits who are now doing God's work in the Province of Ontario must feel highly complimented by the utterances of Rev. McGregor. Why should a strong and united front of the whole body-Protestant, with its thousands of able-bodied preachers and local

evangelists, be necessary to arrest the progress of about two dozen Jesuits, all told, now sojourning in Ontario. The Protestants in Guelph, Port Arthur, and Killarney must be laughing in their sleeves at the silly antics and bawbiatic bravadoes of those rev. choralists who pretend to preach the gospel of peace in Toronto. In those places just mentioned the Jesuit Fathers have been preaching and baptizing, and building up monuments of religion for the last fifty years. They are known by their works, and they are respected and loved by all who know them, by Catholic and Protestant alike.

The Rev. Hugh Johnston told a most bare-faced, infamous lie when from the pulpit he informed his unfortunate hearers last Sunday evening that "The Jesuits are in our houses, in our bed-chambers and in our kitchens. They have been incorporated in Quebec, and as well might you incorporate an army of dynamites." Language of this kind spoken from a Christian pulpit in Toronto, must sound very strangely on the ears of people who have been long acquainted with the patient, unobtrusive Jesuit Fathers in Chatham, Guelph and Manitoulin Islands, where all have appreciated the good work done in their midst. Tourists and merchants who sail up the lakes in summer time and visit the Jesuit missions at Fort William and Wickwegon, must be utterly astonished at the unblinking hardness of those ministerial lies about the good fathers. The elegant churches and neat, well-appointed schools erected by Fathers Chone, Duranquet and others along the shores of Lakes Superior and Huron; the thousands of highly-educated children, both white and Indian, to be met with on the islands of those inland seas, are living evidences that a crusade against the Jesuits is not what Rev. McGregor calls it, a crusade against "ignorance, superstition and corruption."

The Jesuits by their support of the Ultramontanism of the Catholic Church have made their peace with the Pope and the Church; but in view of their past record, no special pleading can convince Protestants that they are not the inveterate enemies of civil and religious liberty, and of true national progress. Their object and principles are utterly inconsistent with a true patriotism. *Christian Guardian, 20th February.*

It is time that nonsense like this should cease. Let us know, brother, in what have the Jesuits opposed civil liberty? When, where, and how have they been enemies of religious liberty or of national progress? To what principle of Jesuitism do you refer as being contrary to true patriotism? This is all mere balderdash borrowed from the ravings of such mad declaimers as Dr. Wild, Goldwin Smith, and the paper for which we understand the letter gentleman now furnishes the anti-Jesuit articles, the Toronto Mail. The character of the Jesuits stands too high to be injured by the barking of curs, but as Principal Grant said the other day, when we notice a calumny, no matter how often it has been refuted, we should denounce it.

And here we may remark that the Guardian has given publicity to that villainous forgery which has been styled "the Jesuits' oath," and which, it is said, "every Jesuit takes when he enters the order." The thing is so preposterous that any one of common sense might know that it is an entire fabrication. No such oath is taken by any Jesuit. The principles of the Jesuits are merely the principles of the Catholic Church. About these there is no secrecy, no concealment. They are taught in the Little Catechism which every one may obtain from any Catholic child in the country. Examine the principles which are there found and tell us, then, which of them is "inconsistent with true patriotism." We may tell the Guardian that the few Jesuits who are and have been in Canada have done more for the country by colonizing, civilizing the Indians, and establishing successful colleges than the ministers of the Guardian and Dr. Wild's denunciations would or could do in double the period.

If Jesuit principles are adverse to the good of the country, surely it would be easy to specify them, instead of making such broad general assertions, which are simply a slander on a noble order of priests who have carried the gospel of Christ to the utmost ends of the earth, and who have watered with their blood the soil of our own Canada as well as other countries, for Christ's sake.

The founder and editor of the Catholic Review of New York, P. V. Hickey, Esq., is dead. This is a most severe loss to Catholic journalism in America. From the Hamilton Times we learn that Bishop Dowling, of Peterboro', who is Bishop-elect of Hamilton, paid a visit to friends in that city a few days ago. His installation into the See of Hamilton will take place about the 1st of May, when the Rev. Dr. O'Connor will be raised to the hierarchy to succeed him in charge of the Diocese of Peterboro'. Dr. O'Connor's consecration will take place at Peterboro'.

PROGRESS OF HISTORIC CON.

Not long since the said in the Spectator the Ritual Committee that it is very difficult can Bishop to trial offence. Archbishop "How is it as regards To this Dr. Littledale are no means why bringing an Arch which Dr. Tal smiling, rejoined hear it."

The very unusual matter of which I has, however, taken of Lincoln, who is celled of the Church of Canterbury, spoke before the ecclesiastical at Lambeth for trial cal robes. He has the clergy and cese, and £17,000 scribbed for his de most elaborate. H was into Africa opponents are the rubric, as they do required by the ca the King Edward book. The charge ritualism." He e that he will rout foot and artillery. air that the Ritual newed with increa but it will extend discussion on which properly co also to the doctr distinctive of Hig

The Rev. J. L. Krox Little adm dozes of High Ch occasion from the Canon's sermons eeries of discour are to produce The themes v Langtry purposi Tolly Succession! Abolition, tismal Regenera jects, and Mr. of the highest t the Low Church they pompously up in arms with will have a liv views of Chru parties attacki gentleman and a warfare has alre weeks, and the must add fuel parties are spo constantly chal the press with summed-up on the tall of n

In the doce call' are show Hamilton is a sion, and a "C has been establ express purp oam. Several are members a branch has St. Catharine's in the last m of the society ing the "read in the neighb practices," especially the stand with the celebrating to the use of ce tion was pas prayer book prayer book the objection that the anti ang the jewe

In favor said that the monies and careful stud Christin w Fathers of d degmas ar d In order to land to a Primitive endeavor t Church. I do not dit that to be untied to t dently was that the u self ackno the third one mind the prerog over the w of a few Church en Holy, Ca named in change it than would the Chin change a soldiers in The Lo