

The Catholic Record.

Published Weekly at 481 and 483 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. Luke King, John Nish, P. J. Neven
 and Joseph S. King, are fully authorized to re-
 ceive subscriptions and transact all other busi-
 nesses for the CATHOLIC RECORD.

Rates of Advertising—Ten cents per line each
 insertion, advance payment.

Approved and recommended by the Arch-
 bishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa, and St.
 Boniface, the Bishops of Hamilton, Peter-
 borough, and Ogdensburg, N. Y., 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.
 Articles must be paid in full before the paper
 can be stopped.
 When subscribers change their residence it
 is important that the old as well as the new ad-
 dress be sent us.

London, Saturday, August 13, 1898.

THE DEAD ARCHBISHOP.

In the pulpits of the various Catholic churches throughout the Dominion reference was made on Sunday last to the untimely death of the Archbishop of Toronto. A very tender allusion to the deplorable event was made in the great church of St. James, Dominion Square, Montreal, and the prayers of the congregation asked for the eternal repose of the soul of the great Archbishop. But in the city of his more recent labors from every pulpit came forth the tribute of warm, affectionate hearts to a great heart stilled in the silence of the tomb and placed, according to his wish, beneath the altar of the Blessed Virgin—in St. Michael's Cathedral—a fitting receptacle for all that was mortal of him who many years ago received there at the hands of his Bishop the commission to preach the word of God and labor in His vineyard. The priestly life began with the blessings of the Queen of Heaven around and about it—and now the priestly hands are joined and laid at rest, while the same heavenly smile seems to breathe the words "Well done, faithful soul."

The references to the Archbishop's death made in the Catholic churches of Toronto were not the eulogies ordinarily pronounced on the occasion of the death of prominent men held in great regard by fellowmen. They were peculiarly heart tributes, and the words that fitted the occasion failed to come to the preachers. Hearts laden with sorrow cannot give voice to their promptings. The wound was deep. The affliction was great—for death had dealt a cruel blow. The emotion of the preachers and the sobs of the faithful told in a language all their own—the language of woe—that a great soul had gone to give to its maker an account of its stewardship.

And why all this great mourning? Ask the orphan, and he will tell you that a kind benefactor is dead. Ask the sorrow-laden, and he will tell you that he who shed a sunbeam on their blighted lives is now no more. Ask the poor, and they will tell you that the hand of the cheerful giver is now powerless to aid. Ask the members of his flock who listened to his sermons, and they will say that they sorely miss one who touched their hearts and enkindled in them once again the early devotion of First Communion days. Ask his priests, and they will say they have lost a true friend, a kind father, a loving counsellor, one whose words made their hearts glad and nerved them to carry with joy and gladness the heavy burden placed upon their shoulders. Ask the citizen who is not of his fold and he will say that the loss is a great one—for the Archbishop of Toronto was a man of peace, a man whose great heart swelled with love for all mankind—a messenger of good-will whose acts on this continent seemed the echo of those that angelic spirit who now sits in the chair of Peter.

The Archbishop of Toronto is dead. May our dear Redeemer meet him in heaven with the same sweet smile with which he ever greeted the members of his flock when they entered his home.

WHO ARE THE INTOLERANT ONES?

During the debates on Home Rule which took place under the administration of Mr. Gladstone, much stress was laid by the Unionist speakers upon the possibility that under the rule of the majority, in a Catholic country like Ireland, the Protestant minority would be subject to various petty persecutions which would make their condition intolerable.

It was represented that the Government of Ireland would be under control of the Catholic priesthood, and that Home Rule means, in reality, "Rome Rule."

Mr. Joseph Chamberlain made a fly-

ing trip through the North of Ulster, during which he dwelt strongly upon this objection to Mr. Gladstone's proposal to establish Home Rule, but he was very cautious not to hint at the fact that under the present system of alien rule, the Protestant minority has been kept in the position of being able to tyrannize over the Catholic majority.

Of course, the Orange element to which Mr. Chamberlain made his address were excited to the highest pitch by the frantic appeals made to them. They thought it quite right and natural that the Catholic majority should be ground under the heel of an insignificant minority, as had been the case for three hundred years, and more especially during this century, since the Union Act placed Ireland at their mercy. Even in the face of their pretext that they are supereminently loyal to the Queen and the Protestant succession, they threatened to take up arms, and if necessary that their last man should die in the ditch, fighting against the Queen's authority, should a Home Rule measure become law. And in expressing these sentiments, they were even encouraged by Lord Salisbury himself, and the whole supereminently loyal Conservative and Unionist party.

The exhibition made by the Orangemen of Donegal in their preparations for the celebration of the 12th July illustrates at the same time the domineering spirit of Orangism, and the forbearance of Irish Catholics, and proves that the hypothesis of the Conservatives, that the Catholic majority would tyrannize over the Protestants, if they had the power, is destitute of foundation.

Though Donegal is in Ulster, 75 per cent. of the population of the county are Catholics, and its four Parliamentary representatives are Home Rulers. Among these four, one is Mr. John Gordon Swift MacNeill, a Protestant, elected by his Catholic constituents, the Orange and Protestant element having been opposed to him. Surely if Catholics had been the tyrants they were represented by Mr. Chamberlain to be, they would not have chosen a Protestant as their member of parliament. Yet in this very Catholic country, where Catholic liberty has been shown in so marked a manner, the Orangemen announced their celebration of the 12th of July, by placards to the following effect, according to the Dublin Freeman's Journal:

"A grand Orange demonstration will be held in Donegal on Tuesday 12th of July 1898. Who dares to speak of Derry, Aughrim and the Boyne? Papists, stand aside! We conquered you before, and can do so again. Our motto is still, 'Down with Home Rule, hurrah for King William, and to hell with the Pope.'"

This insulting document was posted throughout a county in which the Catholics are so preponderant that they could drive the Orangemen into the ocean, yet this domineering faction insults them in this gross manner.

There is no body of men who would bear this outrageous insult, except the tolerant and forbearing Donegal Catholics, and there was, therefore, no collision at the Orange procession there, notwithstanding the provocation given. The very fact that a Protestant is elected as the County member is evidence of the liberality of the Catholics but the forbearance of the Catholics when so grossly insulted is further evidence of the same thing, and proves that Mr. Chamberlain and his allies have made it a point in their public addresses, to misrepresent the Catholics of Ireland, in order to justify the injury they persist in inflicting on Irish nationality.

THE DEATH OF PRINCE BISMARCK.

The death of Prince Bismarck on Saturday night, July 30, at his home in Friedrichsruhe, Prussia, has removed from the scene of political life one of the most conspicuous figures of the world. He dies at the age of eighty-three years.

Prince Otto Edward Leopold Von Bismarck was one of the makers of the history of Europe, for to him above all men is to be attributed the unification of the multitude of petty German states into a great and powerful empire under one sovereign.

In his youth, as a student, he was one of the wildest among the wild students of the University of Göttingen, and gave a good deal of trouble to the President and faculty of that institution. He was far from being studious, but having entered the University for the purpose of studying law, and being determined to pass his final examination, he applied himself to work toward the close of his university term, and passed creditably.

He fought many duels during his

college life, the number being estimated at nearly thirty, being in every case victorious.

In 1845 his father died, leaving to him an extensive estate in Pomerania, and in 1847 he married a clever woman of the house of Von Puttkamer. He frequently acknowledged that to her he was much indebted for encouragement and good advice throughout his military, parliamentary and diplomatic careers.

Bismarck was anti-democratic, and anti-resolutionistic, and though in the beginning of his Parliamentary career he sometimes voted in opposition to the wishes of the King of Prussia, he was not long in the Chamber before he became thoroughly a supporter of the royal policy. This led to his being frequently chosen as a diplomatist to represent Prussia in the various courts of Europe.

In 1862 Bismarck was appointed by King William I., President of the Ministry. The king had met with a check in the Chamber of Deputies, which had refused to vote the military estimates, and he fixed upon Bismarck as being the man of all among his statesmen who would be able to control that body and force the acceptance of the royal policy.

Count Bismarck accepted the position, and at once attempted to carry out the plans of the king; and it was in his efforts to do this that he first earned his title to the name of "the man of blood and iron."

It had long been the desire of Bismarck to extend the power of Prussia in the great German Diet, and it was in pursuance of this design that he persuaded Austria to assist Prussia in annexing Schleswig-Holstein.

Austria discovered the design of the Prussian President when it was too late, and within a very few years a war between the two powers became inevitable in order to decide the question of predominance in the Diet, which was settled by the disastrous result of the battle of Sadowa, at which the Austrians were totally defeated.

This was the battle which settled the question of breech-loading versus muzzle loading rifles in war. The Prussians were the first nation to adopt breech loaders, while the Austrians were, of course, armed with the old muzzle loaders, and were defeated through the rapidity of the fire of their foes, who mowed them down before they could come to close quarters. Austria was thus driven out of the German Confederation, and Prussia openly assumed the chief place therein, and Prussia obtained an increase of territory.

The war with France in 1870 also grew out of Bismarck's plans for the extension of Prussian influence. The selection of Prince Leopold of Hohenzollern by the Spanish Cortes for the Spanish throne precipitated the conflict. The Emperor Napoleon demanded a guarantee from Germany that no German prince should ever be placed on that throne, but the demand was scouted, and King William turned his back in contempt on M. Benedetti, the French minister, at Ems, after this demand had been made.

The Franco-Prussian war followed Napoleon was overthrown, and though Prince Leopold did not obtain the Spanish throne, the result was even more important than if this had been the result, for the unification of all the North German States was effected, and King William was crowned emperor of Germany in the French Imperial palace at Versailles, which was occupied by the German invaders as a barracks.

Prince Bismarck's aspirations were thus almost fulfilled. Still there was one aim not yet accomplished, and this he now endeavored to effect. It was to make the Catholic Church the mere tool of the State. He wished to appoint Government theological examiners in all Catholic seminaries, to subject Papal decrees to the exequatur of the Emperor, and to control all Episcopal appointments by giving the king the right of veto to them. These were points which the Holy See could not concede, but the Reichstag passed laws to give the Emperor the powers he desired, and abolishing religious orders in the Empire.

These laws were known as the Kulturkampf or Faith laws, and Bismarck boasted that he "would never go to Canossa,"—which meant that he would never retreat from the hostile position he had assumed toward the Catholic Church and the Pope.

This position taken by Bismarck was the beginning of his downfall. Hitherto, the gratitude of the German people for the unifier and consolidator of a great Germanic Empire led them to bear much of the Premier's arbitrariness, but when he undertook to tyrannize over the Church, of over one third of the people, the Catholics boldly withstood him, and the Centrist or Catholic party was formed in the Reichstag, which so grew in strength that it soon numbered over one hundred members, disposed to support the Government where its policy was for the general good, but firm in demanding that full religious liberty should be restored to the Church. With Poles and other Catholic members whose policy in regard to the Church was identical with that of the Catholic party proper, the Centrist strength was made even greater than the above figures would indicate.

Bismarck was obliged to retreat from his hostile position toward the Church, and many of the penal laws were repealed during the latter part of his term of office, and the reaction went on even after his retirement, till now, the Faith laws have been completely wiped off the statute books, until the only one which remains is that excluding Jesuits from the Empire. It may be expected that this will also soon be repealed.

Prince Bismarck's arbitrariness made him disagreeable to the Emperor, and the quarrel between the two culminated in March, 1890, in the refusal of Bismarck to conciliate further the Catholic party, to whom Emperor William II. was favorable. Bismarck then tendered his resignation, which was accepted by the Emperor, and General Von Caprivi was made Chancellor and Premier in his stead. Since that time this office has been given to the Catholic Prince Hohenloke, who now holds it, giving greater satisfaction to the nation, by his conciliatory methods, than did ever Prince Bismarck by his policy of "blood and iron."

In fact, Prince Bismarck, much against his will, "had gone to Canossa" even before his retirement, and from his retreat at Friedrichsruhe he looked on with undisguised regret at the complete retraction of his anti-Catholic policy, a retraction which he had himself been obliged to inaugurate.

We cannot and we do not wish to withhold from Prince Bismarck the praise which we presume he chiefly sought, that he was truly worldly-wise. "The children of this world are wiser in their generation than the children of light." But he was decidedly an enemy of the Catholic Church. He would have been truly a greater man if he had known how to utilize the authority and power of the Church to check Anarchism and Socialism which have been making so great strides in Germany since 1871, instead of antagonizing the power of the Church for good, and forcing it into a partial hostility to the Government, while asserting its own natural right to liberty, and defending the liberties of the people.

The Emperor himself encourages the feelings of gratitude entertained by the nation towards Bismarck, notwithstanding the differences of opinion which led to the withdrawal of the Prince from the Chancellorship of the empire. Both the emperor and the empress visited Friedrichsruhe to see the ex-Chancellor's corpse, and manifested sentiments of respect for the departed statesman's memory.

THE IRISH LOCAL GOVERNMENT BILL.

The Irish Local Government Bill which has been passed by Parliament, though it grants a modicum of power to the Irish County Councils, falls very far short of meeting the demands of Ireland for a Home Rule measure which will make the country self-governing.

The right to make roads, to build and repair bridges, to maintain the poor in workhouses, to levy certain rates which have hitherto been struck by the Grand Juries, and to expend them according as localities have need, is conceded to the County Councils. The councils will also control lunatic asylums, subject to supervision by the authorities of Dublin Castle. No other power is granted to the Councils, and the police are still to remain subject to Dublin Castle. By this provision the police will still be, as they have been hitherto, an unpopular organization, with an anti-national spirit.

Another very objectionable feature to the bill is a provision by which £350,000 will be given annually to the landlords, ostensibly as a compensation for the powers of which they will be deprived by the bill, and for the overtaxation to which Ireland has been subjected ever since the Act of Union was passed. Four hundred thousand pounds are also apportioned

to the tenants with a view to compensating them.

Mr. Michael Davitt has called attention to the fact that the amount apportioned to the landlords is really a bribe to induce them to waive their objections to the concessions which have been made to the popular demands, and to support the bill. He maintains, very justly, that the whole £750,000 should be apportioned so as to benefit the tenants.

One of the radical members, Mr. Lambert of South Moulton, pointed out that several Irish peers who are landlords will receive £3,000 annually under the bill, and that these peers are the descendants of the very men who, when the Act of Union was passed, received bribes to induce them to sell the liberties of their country.

It cannot be doubted that the bill with all its defects will be of great benefit to Ireland, and so it received the hearty support of the Irish Nationalist members. It was plain that the defects would not be remedied by the Tory majority, and it was therefore accepted by Mr. John Dillon's following as an instalment of the justice which Ireland demands, but not as a substitute for Home Rule.

It is humiliating to the Nationalists of Ireland that some of the factionist Irish members who follow the lead of Messrs. Healy and Redmond joined with the Government to pass the clause when several Liberal members pointed out the defects of the bill, which they lauded as being of far more value than it really is.

The Tory members did not hesitate to assert that this bill gives all the Home Rule which will ever be granted to Ireland. We may, however, rest assured that it will not satisfy either the Irish Nationalists or the Liberal party.

Should the Liberal party succeed in coming again to power, it is almost certain that an honest Home Rule Bill will be part of its programme. The party cannot consistently drop a measure of reform which they have already proclaimed to be a necessity for the peace and consolidation of the Empire. In addition to this consideration, it must be borne in mind that the Liberals cannot attain power without the Nationalist support, and this will make them more anxious to conciliate the Nationalist party. In the present attitude of the House of Lords, it may not be possible to secure a Home Rule Bill all at once, but we cannot doubt that the Liberals, having set their minds upon passing such a measure, will do so at the earliest possible moment after they attain power.

In the course of the debate, Mr. Lloyd George, the member for Carnarvon, turned the tables completely on the Government in regard to an argument which had been freely used against Home Rule during the last general election. He said that members of the Government and their supporters had represented to the Orangemen that if popular government were granted to Ireland, the Catholic majority would tyrannize over the Protestant minority. He asked, where are these absurd predictions now? The same Unionist party which thus raised a religious cry, against the tyrannical and lawless Catholics, now combines to give Catholics that very power of oppressing Protestants, the fear of which was before declared to be a sufficient reason why Home Rule should not be granted. He added: "There is only one explanation for this inconsistency, which is that the fears so frenziedly expressed from 1886 to 1895, were groundless."

THE MARKS OF THE CHURCH.

In last week's issue of the CATHOLIC RECORD we made some comments upon an article from the pen of Rev. W. D. Armstrong of Ottawa, which appeared in the Presbyterian Review. The article in question was under the heading, "The One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church." Our remarks last week were confined to the consideration of Mr. Armstrong's definition of the Church of Christ, and to its characteristic of catholicity or universality. It remains that we should now consider what he says of the other three characteristics which are also called the marks or signs of the true Church. These are Unity, Holiness and Apostolicity.

It is admitted by Mr. Armstrong that the Nicene Creed rightly describes the true Church as One. In what sense must this term be taken? Mr. Armstrong says:

"If its unity be in external organization, the Roman Church aims at this whether it attain it or not. It is a strange kind of oneness that leaves outside the Church more good Christians than are within. The Roman Catholic Church is in this simply schismatic. The unity Christ prayed for

was not—could not be in this. The source of our unity is in common relations to Christ. There may be different Church policies and different modes of expressing the life within. The oneness is in the indwelling spirit. We are one as 'the communion of saints' of every name."

We refuted in our former article the notion that the Church of Christ is an invisible body composed of those who believe or claim to believe in Christ, to whatever sect they may belong outwardly. The unity of the Church, therefore, does not consist in mere unity of the soul with Christ, as maintained by Mr. Armstrong, but it implies unity with and obedience to an outward authority instituted by Christ to teach His doctrine and to give us precepts conducive to our salvation. This is clear from many passages of Holy Scripture, one of which will suffice to be quoted here. The Apostles and ancients assembled in Jerusalem, soon after the Church had been well established, to settle a disputed point relating to circumcision, and they made a law for the guidance of the faithful:

"For it hath seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us to lay no further burden upon you than these necessary things; that you abstain from things sacrificed to idols, and from blood and from things strangled, etc."

The outward unity of the Church, therefore, consists in belief in the same revealed truths, participation in the same sacraments as instituted by Christ, and obedience to the one supreme authority of the Church, which is not limited to any particular nation, but extends over the whole Church.

We do not read that Christ instituted more than one Church with one supreme head. All other pseudo-Churches, are, therefore, man-made and have no authority to teach, or to make laws binding on the conscience, and it is not enough that the Church should be one to-day or yesterday. She should be one at all times, and in all places: One, as teaching always the same truths, one in obedience to the same supreme head, in whatever country local churches may be established. Mr. Armstrong admits that the Catholic Church aims at this unity. She not only aims at it, but it is an undeniable fact that she possesses it, and in the course of ages no doctrine taught by the Catholic Church has ever been reversed. The Protestant Churches have all changed their doctrines in the course of time, because they have no solid foundation in the unchangeable truth, but Catholic doctrine is the same always and everywhere, because it is the truth which has been handed down from Christ Himself. No false Church can claim this unity.

The Catholic Church is holy. Her beautiful system of doctrine, self-consistent as it is, cannot be changed in any part without destroying the superstructure. We are taught the efficacy of God's grace, emanating from the Redemption which Christ brought to mankind through His death upon the cross, yet on the other hand we are taught that God has given us free will that we may co-operate with His grace and save our souls. This is the teaching of Holy Scripture, that "God has left man in the hand of his own counsel" to choose between "life and death," blessing and cursing."

This doctrine has made thousands of saints, and all who put it into practice, obeying the laws of God and of His Church, may become saints. How different is the effect of this teaching from that of Presbyterianism, which dooms some from the moment of their birth to reprobation, in spite of all they may do, and selects some for salvation, independently of their good or bad morals. Such a doctrine leads to despair, on one hand, and to a foolish presumption on the other.

Mr. Armstrong points out that there have been wicked Catholics, and therefore declares that the Church is unholy, whereas in his theory only holy people belong to the Church. We have shown that his theory of the invisible Church has no foundation. We admit that the Church has had disobedient children who were wicked because they refused obedience to the Church's holy teachings. This is blameable to their own perverseness, not to the Church whose teachings are holy, and have brought forth good fruits in the multitude of her children who have been eminent for holiness in all ages. No pseudo-Church can point to such results—and no pseudo-Church has the divine sanction of holiness through miracles such as have been wrought by the hand of God down to the present day in testimony to Catholic faith and devotional practices.

Lastly, the true Church is Apostolic. Mr. Armstrong imagines he has made a huge point by asking: "Would Peter recognize himself in

Pope Leo? Could they persuade to wear a Cardinal's hat? Would they do with a preacher Paul?"

Preachers like Paul, animated the same spirit, ready to endure same labors, "in stripes, in prison, in seditions, in labors, in watchings, in fastings," are not infrequent in the Catholic Church. Only a few days we had an example of the devotedness of the Catholic clergy to their office, and to the work of saving when ten priests on the ill-fated gonne, which sunk near Sable Island, went down with the passengers were lost, making no effort to themselves, but devoting themselves to the work of absolving those who perishing, and giving spiritual consolation.

And why should not Peter recognize himself in Leo XIII., the Pontiff so gloriously rules the Church present day? It is true that the Church of two hundred and fifty millions of souls, there is more respect shown to Leo, even by emperors, than was shown to him in his poverty, but this is a material circumstance. The of modern times have shown the firmness in maintaining truth, propagating the gospel, as was by Peter and his fellow-apostles.

As regards the Cardinal's robes, it is true the particular dress did not exist till a period than the Apostolic age, is according to the spirit of truth that the priesthood should special vesture suited to command respect for the office, for we read the commands given by God to "Thou shalt make a holy vestment Aaron thy brother for glory and beauty." (Ex. xxviii, 2.) We doubt that as far as the poverty early Christians would allow, S and the other Apostles observed direction of God, especially in the tribulation of the divine mysteries.

Mr. Armstrong continues: perpetuity of the Church does depend on prelatical succession, such succession could not be dashed."

This is a mere assertion, but futed by St. Paul who says: "doth any man take this honor (priesthood) to himself, but he called by God as Aaron was we find that Christ gave Apostles His powers to the Church, and the prelate and prelate must come to through them. All priests dained by them. In Acts xiv. read that "they ordained pre every Church." St. Timothy at received their ordination to the pte from St. Paul, who exhorted to stir up within themselves the received by ordination. In the Church this ordination or cation has been kept up by the s of Popes, Bishops and priests, notorious that in Protestantism no such succession. We have proved that the doctrine of the Church must be apostolic. The case with Catholic doctrine, which changeable. It cannot be true byterian and Anglican doctrine have been changed from time Further, the identity of Cath trine with that of the Apostles by the constant teaching of the as shown by Christian writers early ages. The teaching of Irenaeus, Tertullian, Origen and of other writers up to the ver the Apostles have been show identical with that of the pre It is, therefore, Apostolic, as Catholic priesthood. It is evi this cannot be predicated of P ism in any form, and Mr. A himself concedes this by der necessity of an Apostolic su Thus it follows from what we that the Catholic Church, alone, has the four marks of the enumerated in the Nicene Cre alone is One, Holy, Catholic and tole.

AT ST. PETER'S.

A large number of the e London visited Toronto last day and Thursday for the paying their last tribute of veneration to the remains lamented Archbishop, and the solemn funeral ceremony.

Beginning at 10 o'clock on morning the solemn tolling of bell vividly impressed upon of the faithful that to day consigned to mother earth remains of him who laid thion-stone of our beautiful and who spent over a third in our midst, guiding and ing us in the practice of eve And countless were the earnest and heartfelt prayers to the Mercy Seat of Our