

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

10th April, 1889.

The arrival of Archbishop Duhamel from his six months' trip to the Eternal City is an event so significant and too worthy of notice at the present time to pass over in silence. No such reception was ever before tendered to any one in Ottawa. A large body of delegates went to Montreal yesterday, where they met His Grace, and with him returned to Ottawa by a special train. They arrived at the Union depot exactly at seven o'clock in the evening. From six o'clock the wide thoroughfares of Sussex, Wellington and Queen (west) streets were crowded with spectators. Contingents of delegates from Aylmer and several other surrounding parishes were on hand, and four bands accompanied the different societies and the college students. The throng was great and enthusiastic. The lengthy procession reached the Basilica to Pooley's Bridge, a distance of over a mile. Midst strains of music and joyous demonstrations of welcome His Grace was conducted back to his home. It was a glorious evening—no Italian sky was ever bluer and more cloudless, the Appennines never reflected the golden sunset more gorgeously than did the far-off Laurentides, no Roman congregation ever displayed deeper enthusiastic affection and joy, and to use the words of Denis Florence McCarthy:

“ Though grand are the bells that ring out  
From the grand Campanilli of Rome,  
They are not the deader, the sweeter ones,  
Tuned with the memory of home ; ”

thus, midst the clash of chimes and the blaze of electric splendours the Basilica was entered. In the words of Chateaubriand, “ the sun had not quite set, and the moon hovered along the east; it would seem as if the Almighty was bending over the abyss,” staying the sun with one hand, in the west, raising the moon with the other, in the east, and lending through all immensity an attentive ear to the *Te Deum* that ascended from His over-joyed creatures on earth. Addresses of welcome were read in both languages, and in reply His Grace spoke feelingly of his great pleasure on finding himself home again, and his deep appreciation of the reception tendered him by his flock. He briefly referred to the manner in which His Holiness anticipated the request to canonically erect the University of Ottawa; and he expressed in graphic words, the sense of uneasiness one feels in Rome when the knowledge dawn upon the traveller that the Sovereign Pontiff is virtually a prisoner. He likewise referred to the great joy which the old man in the Vatican experienced when the Catholics of the world gave vent to their sympathy. But, I must break off abruptly this very congenial subject. It was refreshing, however, to behold so much faith and devotion in the Capital. And when such is displayed in the case of a prelate of the Church, it is but the index of what the feeling must be towards the head of that Eternal establishment. In the words of Charles Phillips, “ we may see him with his crown crumbled, his sceptre a reed, his throne a shadow his home a dungeon, but if we do, it is only to prove that the simplicity of the patriarch, the piety of the saints, and the patience of the martyrs, has not wholly vanished from the earth.” We shall yet behold him gorgeous with the dignity of ages, every knee bending and every eye blessing the prince of one world and the prophet of another. We can see him even now like the last mountain of the deluge, majestic not less in his elevation than in his solitudes, immutable amidst changes, magnificent amidst ruin, the last remnant of earth's beauty, the last resting place of heaven's light.

J. K. F.

#### THE SUPREMACY ACT AND THE CATHOLICS.

The statement made by Sir John Macdonald on the debate on the Jesuits Estates Act that the Supremacy Act was practically obsolete in England and that it would be absurd to think of acting upon it now in this country is a very important utterance, and falling from the lips of the First Minister of the Crown one worthy of consideration. Such a statement, of course, does not make nor alter the law; but coming from one charged more than anyone else with the higher prerogatives of the Crown in Canada it is of more than ordinary significance. If this Act ought to be in force and is not, then the first Minister takes the responsibility, as he is liable

as well for omitted as for permitted legislation. He contented himself in the argument with the course of the various Canadian Governments since the settlement of the Clergy Reserves now nearly forty years ago, but it would have been easy for him to have shewn that many years before that, the Act in question was dead beyond legal or judicial resurrection.

The Act of Supremacy arose out of legislation passed in the reign of Henry VIII. to secure that monarch's second marriage from being annulled by the Pope. In 1531 all appeals to Rome from English ecclesiastical courts were done away with; and in the next session, in order to cut off all connection with Rome, an Act was passed rendering the papal bulls unnecessary for bishops or archbishops. In this Act the king is recited to be the supreme head of the Church in England. This Act, which in the mind of the king—the defender of the Faith had no appearance of separating the English from the Catholic Church, was the beginning of the great schism; but when the Act was revived in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, some years later, the English Church was no longer Catholic. A church with new doctrines stood in its place, and, as history informs us, every species of persecution that the State could enforce was applied to bring the English people into line with the English Court in religious matters. A church was established by law and the sovereign head of the Church were subject to pains and penalties without number. In process of time the State wearied or became ashamed of persecution—then it tolerated, then it recognized the Pope of Rome as the spiritual head of some English subjects. So long as the rigor of the Act was enforced there was no legal existence for a Catholic. When it was transferred to Canada in 1774 there was just enough of persecution left in it to work mischief. Sir John Thompson in his argument took the broad ground that if Catholics in Canada were to have free exercise of their religion such as they were entitled to by the Treaty of Cession, they could not have existed under the rigors of the Act of Supremacy. That was a fair, reasonable construction of the Act in 1774, but, as a matter of fact, for nearly fifty years after that date there was a constant struggle in the old Province of Quebec and the new provinces in 1791, to bring about the supremacy of the Crown over the Catholic religion and its priests and bishops. Successive governors tried again and again to obtain the appointment of the Cures and the nomination by Royal instead of by Papal authority of the Bishops—“ Ecclesiastical superintendents for the affairs of the church of Rome, &c. as Mr. Masere's draft reads. From the date of the Treaty in 1763 to the Quebec Act in 1774 the Government endeavoured to force the Catholics to take the oath of abjuration and other oaths required in the statutes of Henry and Elizabeth. When the Quebec Act modified the oath so that anyone might take it (as the bishops did down to the time of Bishop Gigués in 1848) there came in the very first Royal instructions under it, directions that “ no person should receive Holy Orders nor have charge of souls without a license duly obtained from the governor. The governor was strictly to safeguard the supremacy of the king to the exclusion of every power of the Church of Rome exercised by any of its ministers in the Province not absolutely requisite for the exercise of a tolerated worship.” What happened? Why the Catholics, people and clergy, refused to submit, though some of the clergy left the country and some were deprived of preferment. In 1801 Sir Robert Shore Milnes, the governor, complained that the Roman Catholic Clergy “ were accountable to no other authority than that of their own bishop,” and the Duke of Portland, his chief, is astonished that the Royal instructions under the Quebec Act had been disregarded. The bishops of Quebec at this time had been in receipt of two hundred pounds per annum, and the Colonial Secretary, in order that the matter could be prudently arranged, suggests that this sum might be increased almost to any extent if it can prove the means of restoring to the king's representative in Canada that power and control which are essentially necessary to his authority. “ The shilling,” as Mr. Lindsey in his “ Rome in Canada ” refers to it, was offered several occasions before the war in 1812; but it was not remarkable if Bishop Plessis should get one thousand when Bishop Mountain received three thousand pounds. After the war was concluded Lord