

The Catholic Record.

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

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

REV. GEORGE R. NORTHGRAVES, Author of "Mistakes of Modern Infidels."

THOMAS COFFEY, Publisher and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY, MISSISSA, LUKE KING, JOHN NIGH, 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, space measurement.

Approved and recommended by the Archbishops 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.

Advertisements must be paid in full before the paper can be stopped.

London, Saturday, March 10, 1894.

THE HON. H. G. JOLY.

One of the most remarkable events which have for many years stirred the political atmosphere of the Dominion of Canada was the visit of Mr. H. G. Joly, ex-Premier of Quebec, to Toronto last week, to lay before the people of Ontario the actual condition of the Protestant minority of Quebec, under the rule of an overwhelming Catholic majority, strong in their religious convictions, his purpose being, as he expressed at the beginning of his address, "to dispel the prejudices existing in the minds of many Ontarians against the people of Quebec, and to show that they (the Catholic majority) are not the bigoted, narrow-minded people they are represented to be."

There have been periods, undoubtedly, when the friendly relations between Catholics and Protestants throughout the Dominion have been severely strained. It was foreseen when the Confederation Act was agreed to by the delegates of all the Provinces of Canada that such shocks would occur, and they were to some extent provided for by the Act itself, which was specially framed to protect the rights of the minorities, at least in Ontario and Quebec, where it was most to be feared lest those rights should be interfered with.

To whom was it to be attributed that these strained relations existed? The Mail and some other journals have been constantly dinnning it into our ears that it arose entirely from the fanaticism of Catholics, and especially of French-Canadians, whom they represent as being engaged in a never-ceasing plot to drive the Protestants of Quebec out of that Province, and even to take possession of a portion of Ontario, and to establish a French nationality in the North-West.

On these and similar grounds the Protestants of Ontario have been goaded to enmity against the French-Canadians and the Catholics of the whole Dominion. Mr. Joly's object was to restore confidence and friendship between the people of Ontario and Quebec.

The purpose of Mr. Joly is most praiseworthy and patriotic. It is not easy to allay religious dissensions when once they have been excited, but it is an heroic act for a man like Mr. Joly, who is justly regarded as a representative Protestant of his Province, to devote himself, at a great personal sacrifice, to the work of making peace, and we sincerely hope his noble purpose may be attained.

He tells us that it was at a banquet given in Montreal by the journalists of Quebec that the idea was formed that he should undertake this mission of peace. Mr. W. T. Preston, President of the Ontario Press Association, while replying to a toast expressed his pleasure that between the English and French races in Quebec there is not that friction or ill-feeling which might be expected if we were only to regard what is frequently said in the West on this subject. It was then suggested, and the idea was generally approved, that Mr. Joly should undertake the task of enlightening the people of Ontario on a matter which has been so grossly misrepresented to them by those who either have been misinformed on the subject, or who have purposely misrepresented the matter from interested motives.

Mr. Joly is a Frenchman, yet a firm Protestant, but this has not been an obstacle to his obtaining the confidence of French-Canadian Catholics; and he has been for many years the representative of a constituency almost exclusively Catholic. He stated that for this constituency he had been elected for a quarter of a century against all comers, though his opponents were frequently Catholics, and in some instances the endeavor was made, without success, to raise a religious prejudice against him. The people of the constituency had answered to these cries that a Catholic who attacked his opponent thus was a bad Catholic, and they would sooner

trust a Protestant than a bad Catholic. The county of Lotbiniere, which has thus constantly elected Mr. Joly to represent it, has a population of 20,688, of whom 20,330 are Catholics. This single fact is enough to show that French-Canadians are liberally disposed towards Protestants. The Mail has endeavored, however, to make it appear that Mr. Joly has been badly treated, and through him the Protestants of Quebec, because he is no longer the representative of that county, and he is not now, as he was once, Premier of Quebec.

It is so well known that such positions as these often depend upon other causes than religious animosity, that it is not necessary to refute the Mail's contention. High as Mr. Joly has always stood in public estimation as an honest and honorable politician, the fact that he is a Protestant did not give him any special claim to hold these positions for ever. He was subject, like all other politicians, to the vicissitudes and exigencies of the times. But we are pleased to find that he himself recognizes that he was not left in the shade on account of his religion. He declared at the Toronto meeting that he was not asked to resign. He found, however, that he differed from his constituents on a matter of public policy and he retired of his own accord. He added that "he was not driven from public life, but he had stepped down because of the reasons given. He maintained that there is no set purpose on the part of the majority to tyrannize over the minority in Quebec."

The question on which Mr. Joly differed from his constituents was the treatment of the half-breeds of the North-West, which brought about the Reil rebellion. It was a question on which the people of the country had a right to disagree, and it was practically admitted even in the despatches sent from the Colonial office to the Canadian Government that there was good reason for the half-breeds to suspect that their rights would be interfered with. The French-Canadians had, therefore, a perfect right to have their own opinion on the matter, and Mr. Joly, apparently, is satisfied that they had such a right.

The Jesuit estates question was another of the issues which caused much ill-feeling between the two Provinces. On this question Mr. Joly states that the French-Canadians had not the remotest idea to set aside the authority of the Queen and to substitute for it that of the Pope. The name of the Pope was mentioned in the bill merely because it was necessary to mention the name of the authority who alone could sanction the agreement made, so that there would be no possibility to make a second claim.

The whole address was an appeal to the Protestants of Ontario against the anti-Catholic agitators which have so many times been excited in the Province. Mr. Joly's purpose was the more generous coming from a Protestant, and it should have all the greater effect, as it is undeniable that no one knows better than he the true state of affairs as they exist in the Province of Quebec.

THE LORDS AND THE PROSPECT FOR IRELAND.

The quarrel between the British House of Commons and the Lords, which has been raging ever since the rejection of the Home Rule Bill, has become greatly intensified by the most recent action of the hereditary branch of Parliament in rejecting the Employers' Liability Bill, or rather in mutilating it to such an extent as to amount practically to its rejection.

In the interest of the working classes the popular house passed this bill with the clause that no employe can sell or transfer by contract his right to recover damages in the case of accident. Many of the Lords gave it as their opinion that the passage of this clause would too much restrict the liberty of workmen, and so it was erased by a large majority.

It is remarkable that the liberty which the Lords desire to give the workmen is the liberty to give up that protection which the law at present grants them. The passage of the act in such a form as this would make it entirely useless, and the result is a conflict between the Lords and Commons which has brought prominently forward once more the question of the continued existence of the Lords as a legislative body. The strain between the two houses has become so great that Sir William Vernon Harcourt, speaking recently to his constituents at Derby, spoke more plainly than ever of the necessity of restricting the

power of the Lords to nullify the action of the people's representatives. Thus he asked:

"What is the use of the representatives of the people passing measures of reform, wasting whole sessions of labor in elaborating bills which are in the end summarily rejected or fatally mutilated by the hereditary chamber? Yes, gentlemen, that is a very great question. It is one which, in my opinion, will more than any other occupy your attention in the years that are to come."

It is significant that whenever mention was made of the Lords the speaker was interrupted with cries of "Down with them;" and Sir William was in complete accord with his audience, though owing to the responsible position he occupies as Chancellor of the Exchequer, he could not at present indicate what steps will be taken by the Government to change the relations between the Lords and the Commons. He indicated clearly, however, that a change must take place. He said:

"Some shallow-pated people think it is all over when a measure has been rejected in the House of Lords. It is only just beginning. (Cheers.) That is the way all great reforms have always begun. No great reform, or hardly any great reform, has ever been willingly accepted by the House of Lords. I have not time to say to you to-night all I think, or all I have to say on the House of Lords, but something I will say."

After some witty remarks on the changed position of the Liberal-Unionists in regard to the Lords, he quoted with evident approbation, some words spoken by Mr. Joseph Chamberlain in 1884 at Denbigh, just after the Franchise Bill had been rejected by the Lords. These were called "Plain Words to the House of Lords," and they indicate what remedy a resolute reforming Government can and must apply when the hereditary legislators set themselves as an obstacle to the passage of desirable measures of reform.

Mr. Chamberlain then said: "Are the Lords to dictate to us, the people of England? Are the Lords to dictate to us the laws which we shall make and the way in which we shall bring them in? Are you going to be governed by yourselves, or will you submit to an oligarchy which is the mere accident of birth? Your ancestors resisted kings and abated the pride of monarchs, and it is inconceivable that you should be so careless of your great heritage as to submit your liberties to this miserable minority of individuals who rest their claims upon privilege and accident. They are ancient monuments, and I for one should be very sorry to deface them; but I do not admit that we can build upon these interesting ruins the foundations of our government. I cannot allow that these antiquities should control the destinies of a free empire; and when they press their claims without discretion and without moderation, when they press them to an extreme which their predecessors never contemplated, then I say, they provoke inquiry and controversy which cannot but end in their humiliation."

Mr. Chamberlain was himself a member of the Cabinet when he spoke thus, and though his attitude towards the Lords is now greatly changed, the re-asserting of his words by a member of the Cabinet at the present time shows the tendency of the times to abridge the power of the hereditary legislators who have so many times come into collision with the popular house, by preventing useful legislation.

The Employers' Liability Bill is a necessary measure, taking away from niggardly employers the power to coerce their men by oppressive regulations, and the country demands that it should become law in order to protect workers. By rendering it inoperative the Lords have justly incurred popular indignation. They are sensitive enough to feel that the storm is gathering against them, and they have already shown signs that they intend to bend before it. But they have of late so frequently brought upon themselves the odium of the people by opposing their will, that the general sentiment is now that their power must be positively limited so that they may not in the future raise the same obstacles to useful legislation which they have done hitherto.

Sir William Harcourt reminds the Lords of their constitutional functions. He tells them that it is a mistake to suppose that they constitute a sort of supreme court of appeal to rejudge the acts of the representatives of the people and to revise the conduct of the responsible government. If they censured a ministry, no regard would be paid to such censure. Their right of veto is of a very limited character; and though they may in the beginning delay the passage of a bill which they regard as mischievous, they must pass it in the end. They have only the power of obstruction. If, then, they come too frequently into collision with

the people, they may raise such a storm of will cause them to regret their temerity, and make them more accommodating in future.

The Irish Home Rule Bill, which the Lords so disdainfully rejected by a majority of more than 400, is not to be considered as disposed of yet. Wherever and whenever the leading Liberals refer to it, they declare that it must be passed, and the modifications which will be applied to a new bill will make it more favorable to Ireland, and less favorable to the Lords than was the one which was so disdainfully rejected.

The issue of abridging the power of the Lords is now fairly before the people, and though the struggle is likely to be a fierce one and perhaps long also, there can be no doubt of the final result. The people will triumph—the people of Ireland as well as those of Great Britain.

The ministry are not prepared at present to propose the complete overthrow of the House of Lords, but they are determined to force the Lords to give way on the two Bills which they have, for the present, burked—the Employers' Liability and the Parochial Councils Bill. They will also extend the franchise, and after these measures become law there will probably be a general election, by which Mr. Gladstone will likely be strengthened, and the Home Rule Bill will be passed once more, whereupon the Lords will in all probability be more complaisant than they have yet shown themselves to be. If they refuse to yield, the next step will be to clip them of some of their prerogatives, if not of all: "to end or mend them," as the favorite phrase has been since the first session of the present Parliament.

At one time it was thought that the House of Commons would reject the amendments made by the Lords to the Parish Councils, and the Employers' Liability Bills, but after mature consideration the Government has decided to accept them under protest, with the intention of insisting hereafter on their passage in the form in which they have been passed by the popular house.

In announcing this determination, Mr. Gladstone stated that it would be a loss of dignity to both houses to pass the bills back and forth from one house to the other. The Government had the choice between rejecting the Lords' amendments entirely, thus abandoning the Bills, and accepting them under protest. They had resolved to adopt the latter course, as these bills had occupied the attention of the house for a long period, involving a vast amount of labor. The Lords had wrecked the legislation of the Commons with but little consideration; but the Government desired to save at least something from the wreck.

Further, he stated that the Government has no anxiety to precipitate a crisis, but that the time had come when the decision of the people must be invited to be made, whether the judgment of a non-elective chamber is to be allowed, not merely to modify, but to annihilate the work of the Commons.

THE MISSION.

The mission being held in St. Peter's cathedral in this city, conducted by Rev. Fathers Doherty and O'Brien, of the Society of Jesus, has resulted, as was expected, in the production of abundant fruit. There is perhaps nothing more consoling to spiritual guides than to witness a transformation from indifference to warmth and fervor on the part of the people in the practice of their religious duties. That such has been the case in the present mission no one can doubt who has witnessed, from early morn until late at night, the great throngs of people attending the cathedral at all the exercises. The retreat has indeed been blessed; for many who have for years permitted the world and its vanities to engross all their time and attention, no longer postpone thought of the world beyond, but have made their peace with God and took firm resolutions against ever again straying into the path where spiritual life decays and dies. His Lordship the Bishop of London, the missionary fathers and the reverend clergy resident in the city have spent two weeks of earnest solicitude and hard work, but we feel sure they count these as but little when the consoling reflection comes to them that they are laboring in the midst of a happy, united and devout people.

A PAMPHLET issued by Mr. Schwalle, the pastor of the so-called Reformed Church of Bremen (Germany), openly attacks the doctrine of Redemption and indeed the whole body of Christian doctrine. The pamphlet is entitled, "Is Jesus the Saviour?" and in it the endeavor is made to prove that Christ did not die for the human race. This is but one of many specimens of the unbelief in Christianity which has so widely spread among the Protestants of Germany.

MR. FRASER'S RETIREMENT.

In the Legislative Chamber at Toronto, on the 28th, the announcement was made by Sir Oliver Mowat that the Hon. Mr. Fraser, Commissioner of Public Works, had been compelled by ill-health to resign his commission in the Cabinet and to retire from public life. He also stated that, by the consent of His Honor the Lieutenant-Governor, Mr. Fraser would hold office until his successor was appointed and his responsibility is for such governmental action and such governmental measures only, as he sees his way to concur in, other governmental matters being as to him open questions.

It would be but the simple truth to state that Mr. Fraser's resignation is regretted not alone by the followers of the Government, but by those also who are opposed to it in the political arena. For twenty years he has held a place in the Cabinet of Ontario, and during all that time his administration has been above reproach. Seldom has a public man laid down his charge and received from political friend and political foe alike such a large measure of the warmest praise. The breath of scandal has never hovered about the Department of Public Works—the political boodler, the man who is a loud-tongued patriot for revenue, first, last and always—had no chair in the office of Christopher Fraser. His administration from the day he entered the Cabinet until the present hour has been clean and brilliant. We desire not to minimize the merits of the other colleagues of the Attorney-General. What has been said of Mr. Fraser may indeed be said of them also, but they are still in the thick of the fight; and they will be weighed in the balance when the hour for retirement arrives. But now that the Commissioner of Public Works has yielded up his trust, we may in all candor declare with perfect truth that he has set an example in the political life of our country which it would be well for all to follow. He has placed before the coming generation of public men a model which leads to honor, to glory, to distinction, and, if followed, will give them a place in the roll of honor side by side with those who are remembered in Canadian history for the fame they had justly earned and the good they had done for their fellow-men and for the land that gave them freedom and happiness.

SADDLING THE WRONG HORSE.

After the Montreal election for the Mayoralty, the Toronto Mail found great satisfaction in the fact that a large number of the votes were lost through an improper marking of the ballots, the number of illegal ballots amounting to nearly 1,500. The fact was stated as proving the ignorance of French-Canadians, and consequently the inefficiency of the system under which they were educated.

Unfortunately for this theory the result of the investigation arising out of the protest of Mr. McShane against the election of Mayor Villeneuve is that it was proved that nearly all the ballots spoiled were those of English Protestants who had written on their ballots the letters P. P., supposed to signify "Purist's Protest," because they were against both candidates alike. This method of signifying their discontent with both candidates was adopted at the suggestion of the Protestant organ, the Montreal Daily Witness.

There can be no doubt that many of the ballots spoiled otherwise than by the use of the tell tale letters were so treated for similar reasons with those of the Purists who thus marked their ballots.

The Star and the Gazette, which favored the election of Mr. Villeneuve, ridicule the "electoral suicide" committed by the Purists, of whom the Gazette says: "The number of people in Montreal who are too self-righteous to work with their fellow-beings for the general good are creditably few and far between." Those who acted in this way, however, seem to glory in their supposed courage. One of them, signing his letter "A. P. P. voter" defends the course thus pursued in the following curious manner:

"Now, sir, why should we be thus scoffed at? Had we remained away from the poll, and thus manifested no interest whatever in who was to be our chief magistrate, the fact would never have been recorded, but when we had 'Is Jesus the Saviour?' and in it the endeavor is made to prove that Christ did not die for the human race. This is but one of many specimens of the unbelief in Christianity which has so widely spread among the Protestants of Germany."

He declares his reasons for spoiling his ballot to be that Mr. McShane is "unworthy of the support of honest

men," while Mr. Villeneuve, on the other hand, is "connected with the liquor traffic; and

"No man who amasses wealth out of the heart's-blood of his fellow-men shall ever receive a vote of mine, and so long as such men are put forward for public office, so long I for one shall continue to follow the Witness' advice and mark my ballot with a 'P.'"

It is scarcely necessary to argue such a matter seriously, as the laws give to all the liberty to exercise the franchise as they see fit, or, if they prefer, not to exercise it at all. But it is, at all events, a growing conviction in the minds of the public that it is the duty of every citizen to use the franchise in the best way possible to secure good government, as the circumstances of the occasion demand; and it is difficult to imagine a concurrence of circumstances in which a practical decision may not be arrived at regarding how a vote should be cast which will be in accordance with one's conscientious convictions. If this be a real obligation, it is difficult to see how the deliberate ballot-spoilers can be excused from gross neglect for not fulfilling a sacred duty. At all events the Mail saddled the wrong horse; for it is clear that they were not French-Canadians who were influenced by the advice of the Witness.

ROMANCERS ON THE CHURCH.

We gave in our last issue an account of the blunder, or worse than blunder, perpetrated by Mr. Rider Haggard in his romance of "Montezuma's Daughter," wherein he relates the story of an "immured nun" in Seville, confirming it with the statement that he had seen in the museum of Mexico a skeleton of a nun who had been taken out from the walls of a religious house. The discussion arising out of these statements has elicited the fact that the skeleton seen in Mexico by Mr. Haggard was merely that of a body taken out of the common cemetery and placed in the museum to illustrate how strangely the human body is preserved in the climate of Mexico. The body, therefore, was not that of a nun, nor was it taken from the walls of a convent.

The Liverpool Catholic Times takes occasion from the exposures of Mr. Haggard's mistake on this subject, to mention another ridiculous blunder made by him in King Solomon's Mines, one of his best known novels. Therein he represents an eclipse of the sun as having taken place when the moon was newly full, an event which could not occur, as the merest tyro in science knows that an eclipse of the sun can take place only at new moon, when the moon passes between the earth and the sun.

Mr. Haggard's novels have been very widely read, owing to the boldness with which he depicts impossible events as realities; but it is evident that as a scientist, or as an antiquarian he is far from being an authority of any weight.

There is this difference between Mr. Haggard and Jules Verne, that the latter, apart from his sometimes putting into hypothesis that science, has made more progress in some particular respect than it has yet succeeded in doing and in some instances more than it will ever probably succeed in, has nevertheless kept within the bounds of actual knowledge in every other respect. Thus, much is to be learned from his writings regarding the geography of the countries he describes, their natural products, the people inhabiting them, and other matters pertaining to them. The discoveries of science, and the uses to which these discoveries may possibly be applied are also graphically described by him. There is, therefore, much truth in his novels, and a great amount of information is conveyed to the mind through them, the machinery only, or the plot by means of which the knowledge is conveyed, being fictitious; but the fiction is such that it is easily distinguishable from the truth which constitutes the lesson proposed to be imparted to the mind of the reader.

But there is nothing of all this in Mr. Haggard's writings, the success of which has arisen merely from the love of the marvellous which is inherent in those who delight in his style of writing. This being the case, he should abstain from pretending to portray the history and practices of the Catholic Church, which it appears he knows only how to caricature and not to describe. He should confine himself to tales of a Munchausen character.

Mr. Haggard is not the only writer who has endeavored to misrepresent the Catholic church in the romances which have come from his pen. Eugene Sue and Alexander Dumas

have done so likewise, but though these writers have shown so much hatred of Catholicism, and indeed of all religion, in their novels, their pictures of the history of the Church are so grossly exaggerated beyond the most extreme limits of probability and even possibility, that they cannot deceive any except the most ignorant.

Yet we do not remember that even these writers have attempted, as Mr. Haggard has done, to give credibility to their vile stories by means of foot notes making statements to the effect that the events they describe ever had their counterpart in real life. Eugene Sue, on the contrary, expressly states in his preface to the Wandering Jew, a villainous romance, that his description of Jesuitism is purely imaginary, and that it was his intention merely to represent what Jesuitism would be if its principles were strictly carried out.

It is needless to say that the principles on which the novelist rests his fabric are as imaginary as the fabric itself. He lays it down that the Jesuit must obey his superiors in all things, even to the perpetration of the most horrible crimes. The Jesuit of fact has for his motto, "Ad majorem Dei gloriam."—"For the greater glory of God," and to the attainment of this end all his actions are directed. His life must therefore be quite different from that depicted by either of the novelists we have named. His vow of obedience is limited to obedience in things lawful, and this must have been known to these novelists, who wrote solely with the object in view to raise the worst prejudices of an irreligious public against an illustrious order which has done so much for religion. Judging from their works these writers might be esteemed as ignorant of the order they described, if they related what they believed to be truthful. But they were not so ignorant. Their venom is therefore to be attributed to a diabolical malice which seems to have entirely possessed their souls. Yet it is upon such misrepresentations that much of the prejudice rests which exists so widely spread among those Protestants who regard these writings almost as an inspiration.

We mentioned already in our previous article on immured nuns that Mr. Haggard had borrowed his ideas on this subject from Sir Walter Scott's "Marmion." The pleasure afforded to a certain class of readers by such tales as this was made evident when, some years ago, all Ontario was in a ferment to force Marmion as a subject for literary study on the children at the Provincial High schools, for no other reason than because it contained this slander against the Catholic Church.

Marmion is, of course, conceded to be a work of great literary merit, if beautiful language, and vivid description constitutes such merit. But it is undeniable that the story is one which is not any more suitable for the reading of youth than would be one of Zola's novels, or the New York Police Gazette. Nothing would have induced the Ontario public to desire Marmion to be studied in its grossest details, except the fact that there is something in it to insult Catholics.

In his other works Sir Walter Scott does not thus grossly do violence to public morality, nor does he go to such extremes in hatred to Catholicism as the writers we have already mentioned. Yet there is plenty in all his works to show that he was indoctrinated in all the hatred against the Catholic religion with which Presbyterians of his age were filled from infancy. The Catholic priesthood, especially, are always represented by him in the worst possible light. Priests as represented by him are always either villains or madmen. We need only add that the very ultra character of such descriptions should convince the readers of his books, that they are not truthful; yet we know it is no exaggeration to say that many Protestants accept these fables as if they were historical truths. It is no wonder that a generation which has learned history from such sources is intensely prejudiced against Catholics and the Catholic Church.

We must here add that the history of the Marmion agitation in Ontario should be sufficient to convince fair-minded Protestants that Catholics are reasonable when they assert that it is next to impossible to have a strictly non-sectarian system of education. In an anti-Catholic atmosphere the education given to children will always be more or less anti-Catholic in character, yet this is only one out of many reasons why Catholics insist upon educating their children in Catholic schools. Our chief reason for this is that we wish positive religious teaching to be