

**The Catholic Record.**

Published Weekly at 424 and 426 Richmond street, London, Ontario.  
Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

EDITORS:  
REV. GEORGE R. NORTHGRAVES,  
Author of "Mistakes of Modern Ireland,"  
THOMAS COFFEY.

Publisher and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY,  
Messrs. LUKK, KING, JOHN NICH, P.  
SEVEN 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, space 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, July 15, 1898.

**THE PROSPECT FOR IRELAND.**

Mr. G. W. Smalley, who sends by cable to the New York Tribune his views concerning the Home Rule Bill, is intensely anti-Irish in sentiment. Hence it is not surprising that in a recent cable despatch he declares that the British House of Commons, by deciding that the Home Rule Bill is to be reported by the Committee of the whole on 31 July, has signed away its liberties.

Amendment after amendment has been proposed in Committee with the express object in view to kill the Bill by rendering it nugatory, until it became evident that the will of the majority is to rule at all it is absolutely necessary to fix a time for the termination of the long drawn out debate upon it. This is what Mr. Gladstone has done, and this has vexed the Tories to an incredible degree. They wish now to render Home Rule unpopular by representing that it is being passed hurriedly, and without giving time for its proper consideration by Parliament.

In reply to statements made by Mr. Arthur Balfour to this effect, Mr. Gladstone pointed out that the late Irish Secretary had urged the closure measure whereby the debate is to be cut short, when the Coercion Bill was being pushed through Parliament, the plea being that it was of the utmost importance that the Bill should be passed with as little delay as possible.

It is now quite as necessary to pass the Home Rule Bill, and it is not proper that the majority in Parliament should be put down by the obstructive tactics of the minority. In fact the majority has rights which the minority must not be allowed to take from them. Accordingly he is determined that the Bill should be pushed through Committee so that it may be voted on by the House early in August.

The complaint of the Tories is that by this mode of procedure the minority is deprived of its rights, and Mr. Balfour informed the House that Mr. Gladstone had opposed the closure when it was proposed for the sake of silencing opposition to the Coercion Bill. This Mr. Gladstone admitted, but he said the House had differed from him in opinion at that time and had declared in favor of closure. It was his duty, therefore, to accept the decision then arrived at until it be repealed, and there was no occasion more pressing than the present to put into operation the law of closure then adopted. There is, therefore, every prospect now that the Bill will soon pass the House of Commons. How it will fare before the House of Lords remains to be seen. It is said that within two weeks from the date when it will be read by the Commons a third time, it will be rejected by the Lords.

The course which Mr. Gladstone will pursue in that event has not been announced, but it is certain that he will not leave the matter there. He may either add a sufficient number of names to the peerage to pass the Bill, or he may appeal once more to the country to sustain him; and if he returns again to parliament with a majority at his back equal to that which at present sustains him, the Bill will be passed again by the Commons, and means will be taken to prevent the Lords from circumventing the expressed will of the people.

The Home Rule Bill may be delayed by the opposition of the Lords, but the will of the people as expressed by their representatives will certainly prevail in the end.

The conviction that Mr. Gladstone will succeed has greatly exasperated the Tories, who now feel that their only hope is in delaying the passage of the Bill. If they succeed in doing this it is possible that Mr. Gladstone may succumb under the terrible strain to which he is being subjected. He may die or he may be made incapable of continuing his severe work, in which case the mantle of the Premier must pass to the shoulders of some politician who, it is hoped, will not be

so earnest in giving justice to Ireland as he has proved himself to be. The Tories now seem to be intent on bringing about this contingency, and any movement which may cause a delay is palatable to them.

The latest deal in this direction is a manifesto by English Catholic aristocrats against Home Rule, which, they say, they hold it to be their duty to resist. They say that the agitation for Home Rule is based upon principles identical with those of European Revolutions which have been reprobated by the Holy See. They take care, however, not to point out what Catholic principle would be violated by Home Rule in Ireland. They have good reason for the omission, because there is no principle of Catholic morality violated by extending more liberty to the people to govern themselves as their best interests demand.

They say also that Home Rule would be injurious to the Catholic religion. This is certainly a curious objection in face of the fact that Lord Salisbury and Mr. Balfour have asserted over and over again that it means Catholic ascendancy in the Parliament of Ireland, and that the Orangemen of Belfast never tire declaring that "Home Rule means Rome Rule."

It is consoling to find that the views of the fifty-seven Lords and Colonels and Captains who have signed this document are not shared by the Catholics of England generally; and, with the exception of the London Tablet, there is not a prominent Catholic journal which opposes Irish demands, for the reason that the English Catholics are one with their Irish co-religionists in demanding this measure of justice.

The English aristocratic Catholic Unionist manifesto will have as little effect in stemming the tide of public opinion as had the manifestoes of the Irish Presbyterian General Assembly and the Methodist General Conference. The people have rendered their verdict, and their voice must be listened to with respect.

**DUBIOUS TOLERANCE.**

The Montreal Witness has become unexpectedly kind and tolerant towards Catholics, if we are to judge by the following language alone which it uses in its issue of July 3:

"Our own preference would be to let the two languages and Separate schools continue wherever they exist."

But the tolerance disappears when we read in the next sentence that

"Separate schools have long been an institution in Ontario, and throughout their whole history have been such a standing witness to Roman Catholicism of the inferiority of their own system that intelligent Roman Catholics themselves often repudiate them."

The toleration which the Witness is ready to extend to us is therefore only to last as long as that journal believes that our schools are of inferior quality, which it declares to be the case at present.

The Witness is evidently misinformed in regard to the efficiency of the Catholic Separate schools in this Province. It must take its statistics from the oft-repeated assertions of the Mail; for they are evidently not drawn from the reports of the Education department, which show for the Catholic schools as good results as are produced from the Public Schools of the Province, notwithstanding the fact that the schools laws favor the latter in every possible way. Whether in regularity of attendance, competency of the teaching staff, the number of children in the higher branches, or the percentage of children who are year after year able to pass the High School and Collegiate Institute entrance examinations, the Catholic schools of Ontario are quite on a par with the Public schools. It is not at all likely, then, that the wish of the Witness that Catholics will become disgusted with their Separate schools will be realized.

The High School entrance examinations for 1898 have just been held, and we venture to assert that the results will prove this year as they have done in the past that the Catholic schools of the province will stand well to the front when their results will be made known. We request Separate school trustees and teachers, and others interested in Catholic education, to furnish us with certified statements of the results of these examinations as soon as they are made known. But we remind those who will make known to us these results that we cannot make them a fair basis of comparison unless the figures be given under the following heads:

1. Total number of those who have passed the entrance examination in the municipality or county, or High School district.

2. Number of Separate school children who have passed the examination in the district.

3. The total number of children attending school in the municipality or county or High School district; or if this cannot be ascertained, the population of the district affected.

4. The total number of children attending the Separate school, or the Catholic population of the Separate school section or sections, if the population of the district be given under paragraph 3.

5. When possible the number of marks obtained by the competing pupils should also be sent to us.

**"HISTORY OF THE EARLY MISSIONS IN WESTERN CANADA."**

The Very Rev. Dean Harris has by this cleverly written book earned, and justly, a place among the literati of Canada, and has well won a right to the gratitude of every lover of our country's history. We trust that his elegant and facile pen will transcribe other records that should be read by all Canadians. Wonder it is that silence should so long have brooded over this epoch of history, but lack of time may perchance be ascribed as a cause. True appreciation of the enduring glories of our past did not inspire our writers, for

"Earth's crammed with heaven,  
And every common bush affire with God;  
But only he who sees takes his shoes."

Father Harris has done his work, and well. Few are there, perhaps, who may realize the hours of toil entailed by such a work. They only who, urged by motives of religion and patriotism, have chronicled a country's history, may understand it. We who can but imagine the difficulty of verifying quotations, of consulting archives, of comparing narrations with one another, the research, patient and persevering, that must be the characteristic of the student of history and the toil of clothing cold historical data in warm vesture of living and breathing language, can scarcely comprehend the magnitude of the task.

We reap the fruits of his labors, and we lay before him our tribute of thanks and congratulations.

With a loving and painstaking hand he has sketched the lives and labors of the early missionaries. The figures of the Franciscans and Jesuits, stand out in bold outline upon the glowing pages, and in spirit we see them dwelling in the forest primeval and going their ceaseless rounds of love and mercy and of questing for human souls and laying the foundations of the civilization of which we are justly proud.

Father Harris has given expression to opinion of the Indian that will not be endorsed by those who glean their knowledge of the denizen of the forest from the novels of Fenimore Cooper.

"To make a hero of the American Indians, as is often done by writers of fiction, is to raise a monument to cruelty on a pedestal of lust."

Chateaubriand's assertion, that man without religion is the most dangerous animal that walked the earth, found its verification in almost every savage that roamed the American continent.

In graceful and eloquent sentences he depicts the labors of the Jesuits, whom he calls "The Imperial Guard of the Catholic Church."

"It is no compliment to the honesty and intelligence of our age that, even now, with the imperishable parchment of their heroic deeds unrolled before us, there are to be found those whose partiality is so pronounced that they cannot think of the Jesuits without associating them with blood, poison and daggers. The repeated and time-worn calumnies of secrecy, unscrupulous agencies, conspiracies and the like, make up the literary and religious rubbish that too often passes for delectable reading at many a rural fireside. The conventional Jesuit is a familiar figure and a terrible one. He is as grotesque as he is unreliable and intangible. But we of the household of the Faith have known the Jesuits from the day that Ignatius Loyola, in the grotto of Manresa, threw himself heart and soul into the will of Jesus Christ. We have witnessed their sublime virtue, their undaunted courage, their magnificent sacrifices on behalf of the cross, and we challenge history to show us their peers."

Brave and truthful words!

All through the work are passages of rare beauty and eloquence. We have no hesitation in saying that it is certain to have a large circulation. Every Canadian should possess a copy. Accuracy of statement and elegance of diction make it a worthy and lasting contribution to our literature.

We dare again to wish that the skilled voices of the past could speak once more of past days and convey the incredulous that

Canada has material with which to build a national literature.

This is Canada's reproach, that it has no literature. It is in swathing bands—a little child nourished by the ideas of others. We look to Europe for our nations of prose and poetry. Writers we have, but they are decorators, not builders. There is too much dilettanteism about them. They exert no appreciable influence upon the minds of the people. Their names may be seen occasionally in a review and be murmured by the coterie that looks upon them as rising men, but they are unknown to the majority of Canadians. The scenes of other times and lands enlist their literary services, and the wealth of romantic legend and tradition is passed unheeded.

The "History of the Early Missions in Western Canada" is published by Hunter, Rose & Co., Toronto.

**ORIENTAL CATHOLICS.**

Some of the non-Catholic journals are at the present time very much exercised over the fact that many Eastern Catholics coming recently to America have had priests appointed to attend them, who say Mass and conduct other religious services in their own language, and from this fact they suppose that there is some unaccountable change going on in the bosom of the Catholic Church which in Western countries has preserved the custom of offering up the Mass only in Latin.

Some Catholics also, who were under the impression that Mass is said only in Latin, have been puzzled by what they have only recently discovered that it is said in several Eastern tongues, and enquiry has been made of us as to how the unity of Catholic faith is affected by the fact. We have been reminded that Catholic controversial writers argue strongly in favor of a universal language in the ritual and ceremonial of the Church, and that the use of Latin in the Mass and the administration of the sacraments is defended on the ground that the purity of faith is best preserved in the universal Church by the employment of a language which is also universal, inasmuch as it is known by learned men the world over.

In reply we would remind our esteemed correspondent who writes on this subject that the use of any language in particular is not a matter of faith, but of discipline. It was not prescribed by our Lord nor even by the Apostles that but one language should be used in the services of the Church. It is therefore quite within the power of the authorities of the Church to fix the language in which these services shall be said; and for the same reason the ceremonies and the ritual which shall be used in any locality are matters on which the authorities of the Church are competent to decide; and the decision is made according to the circumstances of the case. Whatever is permitted by the supreme authority of the Church in any locality is therefore lawful, and may be used without any scruple of conscience.

It is no more destructive of unity of faith that Mass is celebrated in the Western Church in Latin, and in various parts of the Eastern Church in Greek, Coptic, Syriac, Armenian, etc., than is the study of the catechism in English, French, German, Polish, Spanish and other languages by persons of various nationalities on this continent. The Catholic Church is universal, and comprises within her pale persons of every nationality; but whatever may be their nationality and language, their faith is one. They believe the same doctrines, receive the same sacraments, assist at the same Sacrifice of the Mass, recognize the same Supreme Head of the Church and are governed and instructed in the faith by the same hierarchy of Bishops and priests, exercising similar jurisdiction under the Pope in their respective dioceses.

The arguments used by Catholic theologians and controversialists in favor of a universal language, or at least a language almost universal, have a sound basis; yet it does not follow that there can be no sufficient reason for permitting the use of other languages under certain circumstances.

Latin is truly the language of the Church; and it is the language in which the holy Sacrifice of the Mass is offered up in nearly all the dioceses of the world, since about eleven-twelfths of these dioceses use the Latin liturgy. This uniformity arose providentially out of the fact that St. Peter, the first Head of the Church, fixed his See in Rome, the centre of the great Roman Empire, which extended its conquests throughout nearly the whole known world. But other apostles established

branches of the Church among other nations, and the early Liturgies were composed in the languages spoken in these localities.

During the first three centuries, while the infant Church was subject to almost continuous persecution, absolute uniformity of language was an impossibility, whatever might be thought of its expediency. It is readily seen that at an age when intercommunication between different nationalities was much less easy than it is to-day, the necessity of one language throughout the Church was not so great as it is now when the facilities of communication are so multiplied. This absolute uniformity was, therefore, not insisted on, and the diverse liturgies became consecrated by long usage. In fact the use of several distinct liturgies became in time an irrefragable testimony to the antiquity of the one Catholic faith which is preserved equally in them all; and for this as well as other solid reasons it has never been deemed advisable to abolish the Oriental rites. We may even say that it would not be expedient now to destroy the valuable testimony afforded by the diversity of rites to the perpetuity of the Catholic faith, for the reason that there are now a-days so many assaults on Catholic truth that we need all the evidences to the apostolicity of Catholic doctrines which these rites afford.

It is evident that the various rites in use in the East show that a doctrine which is in them all could not have been surreptitiously introduced into the Church at any time since this diversity first existed, and thus it is proved that the doctrines of the real presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist, the sacrificial efficacy of the Mass, the utility of prayers for the dead, the honor due to the Blessed Virgin Mary and to the other saints of God, and the fact that the angels and saints intercede for us before the throne of God, have been handed down to us from the Apostolic age. Many other Christian doctrines and practices are similarly shown to be of Apostolic tradition; and even if the Orientals desired to change their rite and to adopt the Latin, it is doubtful that it would be expedient for them to do so now. But, certainly, when it is known that they are very much attached to the practices which have come down to them through a period of fifteen, or even eighteen centuries, it will be understood that it would not be prudent to insist upon their adoption of the Latin Liturgy.

As far as Orientals in America are concerned, it is probable that after the lapse of some years, as they become more and more assimilated with the people among whom they live, they will by degrees adopt the Latin rite.

An article in the Living Church, to which our attention has been called, states that the existence in America of Orientals using their own Liturgy in their own languages will lead Catholics in America to desire the adoption by the Church of an English Liturgy. But the use of a universal liturgy is more needed now than ever before.

When Catholics of one country pass into another it is highly desirable that they should be made to feel that they are at home when they enter the House of God. This would not be the case if they found the holy sacrifice of the Mass offered up in a language and with ceremonies to which they were total strangers. It is very appropriate that local Churches, such as all the Protestant Churches are, should use local languages. But it is also appropriate that the Universal Church should offer up the most solemn act of worship in a language which is also universal.

Latin in the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass is not an unknown tongue, as Catholics everywhere are familiarized with it, and they all understand it sufficiently to follow the priest through the various parts of the Mass. Their prayer books explain to them thoroughly what the priest is doing; and thus wherever they may be, though they do not understand the language of the country, they are still able to assist at Mass with profit to their souls.

We may here add that it is not at all unlikely that before many years the reunion of the schismatical Oriental Churches with the Catholic Church will be again effected. The policy of the Church in retaining the Oriental Liturgies will undoubtedly be of great assistance in bringing about this consummation which is so much to be desired. It must be borne in mind by our readers that, besides the schismatical churches, there are in the same countries where they exist churches which recognize the authority of the Pope, and which therefore belong truly to the Catholic Church.

**GLADSTONE HOLDS HIS OWN.**

On Monday of last week a by-election was held in Pontefract division of Yorkshire to fill the vacancy caused by the unseating of the Gladstonian member, Mr. Harold James Reckitt, for bribery. At the general election a Conservative was elected, but on his elevation to the peerage the seat was captured by the Liberals with a majority of 63. The constituency is a close one, the Conservative majority at the general election having been 40. A great effort was made by the Conservatives to regain the seat, in order to maintain their oft-repeated assertion that there is a reaction in the country against the Home Rule Bill, and even the Liberals were rather despondent at the prospect of reducing the Government majority. Following the loss of a seat in Scotland the loss of Pontefract would have been a severe blow, and the rejoicing of the Liberals at the victory they have gained is therefore great. The two vacant seats in Cork have also been won by acclamation by Nationalists of Mr. Justin McCarthy's party; and thus Mr. Gladstone's majority remains exactly at 40 where it was at the general election. Mr. T. Williams Nussey, the Liberal candidate at Pontefract, polled 1,191 votes against 1,156 for the Conservative candidate, Mr. Elliot Lees. The Liberal majority was therefore 32.

Mr. Gladstone has announced that it is the intention of the Government to push the Home Rule Bill through the House so that it shall be reported by the Committee of the whole on July 31. A resolution to this effect has been passed by the House of Commons, notwithstanding the opposition of Mr. Balfour and the Conservatives.

**A THREATENED SCHISM.**

A secret meeting of Presbyterian clergymen of New York and adjoining States was held in New York City on June 29 for the purpose of considering what course is to be pursued in consequence of the decision of the General Assembly adverse to Dr. Briggs, whereby the doctor stands suspended from the ministry. The meeting was large, and was composed entirely of supporters of Dr. Briggs, and advocates of the doctrines for which he has been condemned. There were present clergymen from New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Connecticut and Rhode Island, as well as from several cities of other States.

An active part was taken in the proceedings of the meeting by several members of the faculty of Union Theological Seminary of New York, of which Dr. Briggs is one of the professors. Dr. Ecob, of Albany, was also present, and took a prominent part. Dr. Ecob is the most highly esteemed Presbyterian clergyman of Albany, and it was he who recently announced from his pulpit that henceforth he renounces Presbyterianism as an intolerable tyranny, which he casts from him as he would a soiled garment.

The strictest secrecy as to the proceedings of the meeting was enjoined on those present, but the representative of the Recorder was able to gather a fair account of what took place, and he asserts that strong resolutions were adopted against the action of the assembly, and that immediate steps are to be taken to circulate a protest against it, to be signed by Presbyterians of the advanced school of Theology all over the country.

An intense feeling of indignation was manifested against what is called the despotism of the assembly in endeavoring to force a new creed upon the Church, and it is generally believed that the movement in resistance will result in a complete split, and the secession of a large number of adherents from Presbyterianism.

Dr. Briggs himself has also assumed a most defiant attitude, and in a sermon delivered in Asbury Park, N. J., on the 25th ult., he declared plainly that there is too much insistence on specific doctrines among the denominations of Christendom. He maintains that even between Catholics and Protestants the existing doctrinal differences are of little importance, and that there should be union of all Churches, which he believes is one of the things which will come to pass in the future.

He evidently overlooks the fact that Christ promised that under the guidance of the Holy Ghost His Church should teach all truth, and that the commission which Christ gave to His Apostles was that they should teach all things whatsoever He had commanded. The Catholic Church, therefore, cannot compromise doctrine; and in fact all the doctrines of the Catholic Church are so linked together as to

constitute a whole which cannot be received in part and in part rejected. Catholic doctrine has been handed down from the Apostles as it was delivered to them by Christ, and must be received in its entirety.

While we by no means approve the doctrines for the teaching of which Professor Briggs was denounced, we are constrained to say that the malcontents have a right to establish a new sect of doctrines to suit their fancy as Protestants had when it originated; there is an authority in the Church of Christ to condemn heresy and so the first Presbyterians should have submitted to that authority instead of establishing a new fold with a creed. If the Church has no authority in the premises, Dr. Briggs should have been condemned.

There is in all the aspirations of unity which have been manifested by Protestants during the last few years an evidence that in spite of the agreements which are the natural result of Protestantism, a conscious that the Church of Christ should be one; but they greatly mistake the character of that unity on which insisted, and which He prayed always endure in His Church. It is "one Lord, one faith, one baptism." This implies a unity of doctrine, cannot be found without the pale of Catholic Church, which alone acknowledges one Supreme Head to whom we are preserved from "tossed to and fro with every wind of doctrine."

**THE CHRISTIAN ENDEAVORERS.**

A very regrettable incident occurred in connection with the meeting of this association in Montreal, particulars of which are given under in a press despatch:

"A gang of French-Canadian quarry men attempted to cause trouble but they were quickly stopped by the police. The French-Canadian enraged at a speech made by Mr. Karmaraka, a Hindu, India, who compared Roman Catholics to idolaters, and to-night several of them marched down the convention waving colors and the 'Marseillaise.' A crowd of Irish volunteers gathered around the drill shed with the object of firing the Frenchmen. A body of men soon arrived on the spot and dispersed the mob. The volunteer French-Canadians then marched through the streets singing, cheering, but the police crowd moving, and this stopping serious disturbance. Several would be made. The society passed resolutions repudiating speaker's remarks, and an editorial letter was sent to the papers."

It is pleasant to note that truthful and uncharitable hatred of the Rev. Mr. Karmaraka is repudiated by the society; and the lesson will not be lost on many ministers who deem it the proper to air their views on what is the practice of the Catholic Church. The occurrence, however, though a blot on the record, is no wise a reason why a mob should gather in poses of violence, and those in the vile business should be punished.

**ENGLISH CATHOLICS AND CRATS.**

The "English Catholics" have lately an indignant protest against the petition, and appended read the names of the Duke of the Blounts, the Cliffords, the Vaughans, the Talbotts, etc. These families are Catholic, and despite the persecution of the tion period, preserved pure sullied their heritage of faith. dark and bitter days when Catholic was a thing hunted and scorned refused the bribe that fair was the priceless boon of faith, struggled and fought till victory rewarded their efforts.

Why, then, having tasted of adversity, do they strive the aspirations of the people legitimate mode of Government?

Are the sufferings of yesterday considered of little consequence every utterance of an Irish branded with the stigma of the day has gone by without wanting words will suffice to nation meek and submissive whim and beck of Tyrant Irish people is justified by in seeking redress, and no and impartial mind may dare the right.

We do not mean to intimate facts might warrant the insinuation that the noble gentlemen who the petition have any claim to