

The Catholic Record.

Published Weekly at 424 and 426 Richmond street, London, Ontario.

Price of subscription—\$3.00 per annum.

EDITORS: REV. GEORGE R. NORTHRAVES.

Author of "Mistakes of Modern Ireland."

THOMAS COFFEY.

Publisher and Proprietor, Thomas Coffey.

Messrs. Luke King, John Nigh, P. J. Neven

and Joseph S. Kirk, are fully authorized to re-

ceive subscriptions and transact all other busi-

ness for the CATHOLIC RECORD.

Rates of Advertising—Ten cents per line each

insertion, space measured.

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, March 10, 1900.

MATCH-MAKING FOR MONEY.

It is stated on the good authority of a young American lady who was herself

experimented on that a regular business is carried on in France and some other countries of Europe by

ladies of high social position, to secure wealthy American brides for impecunious continental men of title. A heavy

fee is given should the negotiations prove successful. Through these a considerable number of marriages have

been brought about, and it is often found that the American brides while securing the titles they look for get worthless husbands by the same

stroke.

A SIGN OF THE TIMES.

An effort is to be made to make Good Friday a statutory holiday in the State of Massachusetts, a bill to that

effect having been introduced into the Legislature by State Senator Kelliber. We cannot of course prognosticate

what will be the result of the proposal, but the fact that such a thing is contemplated suggests to us some thoughts on the irony of faith. Among all religious

sects, Presbyterians and Puritans, who are the progeny of Presbyterianism, are the most opposed to the

observance of any holy days but Sundays, as being against the sixteenth chapter of the Westminster Confession. It will be something remarkable if the

Parliament by a vote of 100 to 100 appointing a Catholic day of special devotion to be a legal holiday.

A FICTITIOUS JESUIT "CONVERTED."

There has been some boasting in the American religious papers to the effect that "a Jesuit priest in good standing," by name the Rev. Theodore McDonald Stuart, has been received into the Protestant Episcopal Church. This

is taken to be an offset to the conversion of the Rev. B. F. de Costa from Episcopalianism to the Catholic Church. It is significant that it has not been

stated where the conversion of the Rev. T. McDonald Stuart took place, wherefore, in order to discover the facts it is

necessary to look into the lists of the Catholic clergy which are regularly published in the Catholic directories, being furnished officially by the Diocesan Secretaries. In these lists the name of Rev. Theodore McDonald Stuart does not appear, from which

fact the conclusion is inevitable that there is no such priest in good standing in the country, and that consequently no such conversion has taken

place.

THE STATUS OF CATHOLICS IN THE TRANSVAAL.

There has been a considerable amount of discussion in regard to the manner in which Catholics are treated under the laws of the Transvaal Republic, and the Rev. Father J. De Kanter of St. Joseph's Church, Spikane, Wash, accordingly wrote to Dr. Leyds, the Transvaal envoy to Europe, to ascertain authoritatively the truth of the matter. Dr. Leyds answers the Rev. Father's letter most courteously, giving the following facts as exhibiting the actual state of the case:

There is no truth in the assertion that Roman Catholics are barred from voting or holding office in the South African Republic. In 1894 a resolution was passed by the Volksraad that no Roman Catholics in future should be appointed as officials, but it was withdrawn in 1896. According to the Constitution, members of the Volksraad, and the President, and the Secretary of State must be members of a Protestant Church. During the last session, his Honor the President has proposed to do away with this restriction.

This puts the position of Catholics in the Transvaal clearly before the public view. That the restrictions on Catholics have not yet been removed, is clear from Dr. Leyds's letter, as he reports that their removal has merely been proposed by President Kruger.

This being the case, the inference drawn by Father De Kanter is not

warranted by the facts. Father De Kanter reasons thus:

"The Boers have seen their mistake, and are willing to correct it; and in that regard they are more intelligent than the English. The South African Republic has existed only twenty years, and discovered in those few years that such a law was an injustice; whereas it took the English Govern-

ment a few hundred years to repeal the law whereby Catholics were barred from entering Parliament or holding office. After that restriction had been taken away, the English Constitution is more narrow minded, as it requires the head of the Government, to be a member of the Episcopal Church of England."

Surely, it will be time enough to lavish superlative laudation on Boer tolerance, in comparison with English intolerance, when the Boer laws shall be brought at least to the same plane with the tolerance of the laws of England, which is not as yet the case. The Rev. Father is evidently carried away by his personal, and perhaps national prejudices. It is true, he may and actually does say the Boers are about to make the requisite changes in their constitution; but it does not necessarily follow that this will be done because their President proposes it, for that is not the way in which Republics manage their

business; and at present, even according to Dr. Leyds's letter, members of the Volksraad or Parliament cannot be Catholics. There is no such disqualification as this under British law, nor has there been during more than two generations.

We have not a word to say in defence of the unjust treatment of Ireland by the Government and Parliament of Great Britain; but neither must we forget that many of the hardships under which Ireland has suffered have been moderated, and we yet have hope that the reunion of the Irish Nationalist factions will be a great step toward securing the full justice for Ireland which she demands; and it is still possible that this justice may be obtained before the Boers remove the religious disabilities now found in their constitution, even if, after the close of the present war, they retain their practical independence.

There are, it is said, only about six thousand five hundred Catholics in the Transvaal, and if these be placed upon a level with their Protestant fellow-citizens, we shall then give due credit to the Boers for that act of justice and for their spirit of toleration. But it is as yet premature to go into an ecstasy of admiration in their regard.

ANGLICANISM AND ITS FOUNDATION.

"Never forget that it was the Church which in 1531 petitioned the King to do what the Church itself could not do—to decline the payment of first fruits to the Bishop of Rome, and to say that the Pope had no longer any jurisdiction over the Church in England."

We learn by the Montreal Star of 21st Feb. that this was the chief point insisted upon by the Right Rev. A. Hunter Dann, the Anglican "Bishop of Quebec," in a lecture delivered in the Parish Hall of St. John's Church, Montreal, on the 20th ult., the subject of the lecture being "The Need of the Reformation of the Church, and How it Really Came About."

The pre-reformation Church of England, which was simply that part of the universal or Catholic Church which was in England, had not and could not have the right to substitute another supreme authority over the Church, or any portion thereof, than that which was divinely instituted and universally recognized.

The Council of Sardica, at which British Bishops were present, in A. D. 451, declared that it was within the duty of the Bishops of Rome, as successors of the Apostle Peter, to appoint judges to review the judgments of all other Bishops. This was no more than the authority always exercised by the Popes, and it is evident that good order in the Church required that no local Church has the right to take away the authority which the whole Church recognized as existing in its supreme head. The Council of Arles, at which there were also British Bishops, toward the beginning of the same century, as well as the General Council of Nice, also acknowledged the Pope's universal jurisdiction.

It is no easy matter to follow, or even to enumerate, all the absurd theories on the origin of the Church of England, which the divines and dignitaries of that Church put forward in justification of its rebellion against lawful authority in the sixteenth century, and to show that the modern Church of England is identical with the Church of England of the ages preceding the so-called Reformation.

But this effort of Bishop Dann to show this to be the case surpasses in effrontery anything we have hitherto met of this nature. Let us examine the real history of the matter.

As early as the year 1528 Henry VIII. made his demand of Pope Clement VII. to dissolve his marriage with Queen Catherine. The Pope in that year despatched Cardinal Campeggio to England with full powers to examine the case and to pronounce judgment in accordance with the laws of God and of the Church.

The Cardinal, in conjunction with Cardinal Wolsey, made a careful investigation into the matter, but it being one on which there could be no doubt, and yet being fraught with consequences of the gravest character, he would not take the responsibility of pronouncing judgment, so he referred the whole case back to the supreme authority of the Pope for a final decision.

Cardinal Wolsey was blamed by Henry as being the cause of the failure of his scheme, and was in consequence banished from the court.

He was not left more than a few months, however, to the peaceful performance of his archiepiscopal duties, after which he was arrested on a charge of high treason, and was saved from the scaffold only by his death on the 29th of November, 1530.

After Wolsey's death, Henry found a convenient tool in Thomas Cromwell to bring his wicked designs to a successful issue. Cromwell's creed was simple.

It was to ride to wealth and power by doing the behests of the king, but to the restraints of morality and religion he was an utter stranger.

It was at the suggestion of this panderer that the king assumed the title and prerogatives of "Head of the Church." Cromwell reasoned:

"Is it to be endured that so great a sovereign should be thwarted in his desires by the authority of Rome? Germany has thrown off that authority, and why not England? Let the king declare himself head of the Church within his own realm, for so long as the Pope is master England is little better than a monster with two heads."

We do not deny that even before Henry VIII., especially during the century previous, laws had been enacted by Parliament which infringed on the lawful authority of the Pope, but we do emphatically deny that any parliament in any country has the right to interfere with the divine constitution of the Church of Christ. Such laws were, therefore, of no more authority in conscience than the laws of Nero or Domitian, which required Christians to renounce their faith, or to offer sacrifice to idols or false gods.

Under one of these laws, Henry VIII., at the instigation of Cromwell, determined to force upon the clergy the acknowledgment that he alone was supreme head of the Church in England.

Under the pretence that Wolsey had unlawfully acted as the Pope's legate, he was convicted. The pretence was a false one, as he had acted under a royal patent permitting him to do this; but he had abstained from pleading in the belief that with such a tyrant against him, it was more prudent to throw himself on the king's mercy.

Wolsey's conviction was made a pretext to charge the whole body of the clergy with a misdemeanor for having recognized him as the Pope's legate. The Bishops offered Henry £100,000 for a pardon, but Henry refused to grant this unless they declared in their offer of the money that he was "the protector and only supreme head of the Church and clergy of England."

For three days they held out against this in spite of all threats, but at last a majority reluctantly compromised the matter by adding the clause "in so far as the law of Christ will allow."

It is evident that with this clause the recognition of Henry's supremacy was nugatory. Yet this is the whole basis for Dr. Dann's assertion that "the Church petitioned the King to take from the Pope his supremacy over the Church."

We admit that it was a weakness for the Bishops to submit to this tyranny, but the terrorism to which they were subjected would be enough to invalidate their act, even if they had the right to do away with the laws of the universal Church, to say nothing of the divine constitution of the Church. But it is clear they have no such right. Several of the Bishops refused most heroically to the end to admit the King's pretensions, amongst whom were Archbishop Warham, and Bishops Gardiner and Fisher, of whom the last named was executed on the 21st of June, 1535, for maintaining the Pope's authority.

But Bishop Dann's own admissions

prove that his statement of the case as quoted above is a distortion of history; for a little lower down he admits that "the actual throwing off of an un-Catholic yoke was due to the shameful and cruel action of a shameful and cruel king."

It was, in fact, because Henry's only hope to be allowed to give free rein to his lustful passions was that he should have a Church completely under his thumb; and he succeeded in his purpose by establishing the royal supremacy, an act in which Bishop Dann glories as having made the Church of England the "Catholic Church" named in the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds. The new fangled Church thus constituted, of course, gave Henry all the permissions required when he wanted to be free to marry a new wife, whether by divorcing or murdering the one by whom he was already encumbered.

If there were no other reason to show that the whole Church of Christ requires a head whose authority is not limited by any national boundaries, that very page of history to which Bishop Dann so confidently appeals would be sufficient to demonstrate it beyond cavil; and as no one but the Pope has ever claimed such authority, it must follow that he alone possesses it.

THE BROOKLYN REVIVAL.

Quite a storm was created in the teapot of Evangelicalism in Brooklyn by the announcement of the Rev. Len. G. Broughton, a revivalist from Georgia, to the effect that a revival which was begun about the end of January would be specially directed toward the overthrow of Unitarianism, as the most dangerous enemy to real Christianity at the present time.

This announcement made by the leading preacher of the revival created considerable ill-feeling, and as Unitarianism is practically preached in many New York pulpits outside of those which are professedly Unitarian, it may be imagined that the revivalists found the cold shoulder turned to them in many quarters in which Evangelicalism is supposed to be the staple spiritual nourishment furnished to the congregations, and in some of the Churches of these congregations the revival was bitterly attacked.

The Rev. Mr. Broughton, however, was not so easily to be turned from his purpose, and he announced in some of the New York papers his reasons for his course in the following strong terms:

"The revival is a war on all forms of infidelity and sin. Before God, infidelity is the most damning sin of all. Jesus said: 'He that believeth not the Son, the wrath of God abideth within him.' The rejection of Jesus Christ as the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world is the one sin for which men go to hell, because it includes and fosters all other sins. . . . Now Unitarianism is only one form of infidelity, but it is the form which just now poses under the guise of culture and religion, and through pulpits and press during recent months has been insulting believers in the deity of Christ by asserting that there is little need of multiplying Unitarian Churches, because orthodox Churches are full of such unbelievers."

In another statement, issued to the press after his former announcement had been unfavorably commented upon, he took an equally firm stand, saying:

"I repeat that the man who believes in Unitarianism and sticks to it will go to hell. All sinners are Unitarians. All Unitarians are sinners, because they deny the deity and divinity of Christ and His atonement by blood. Unitarians would go up Calvary's hill and tear down the cross of Christ himself. I don't run much on scholarships, but place my theology on the Bible. I claim to be as broad as my opponents. But I am narrow when it comes to the upholding of the Word of God. . . . To the minister who says that I am one of those sleepy Southerners preaching a medieval theology, I will say that I preach to more people in one night than he does in a month. He says I am asleep, does he? Well, let him follow me and I'll keep him awake. I'm in this fight up to the chin, and I repeat that the man who denies the divinity of Christ cannot be saved."

Another of the Evangelists announced plainly that the revival would be a campaign against Unitarianism, and the gauntlet thus thrown down was taken up not only by the Unitarian ministers and papers, but even by some of the Evangelicals as well as the secular press, and for the most part the public sympathy is on the side of the Unitarians. The Literary Digest gives in a recent issue extracts from a number of prominent papers which show the general trend of public opinion in the matter, and from the symposium furnished, we may readily draw the inference that the Unitarians who make the boast that their teachings have per-

meated Protestantism of all forms, are by no means over confident in their view of the case.

The Rev. Charles H. Eaton, a New York Unitarian clergyman, to whom Mr. Broughton refers in his allusion to some one who had said he was asleep, says:

"Ministers of the Southern type have been asleep while the world has moved forward, and the weapons used by them would be about as effective, in the light of modern warfare, as the gun of Rip Van Winkle, and its watch-dogs about equal to Rip's dog Saldor."

The Brooklyn Eagle and the Boston Transcript also take side with the Unitarians.

We must say in regard to this controversy, that we fully agree with the Revivalists in the opinion that Unitarianism, notwithstanding its profession that it is a form of Christianity, does not in its unbelief fall at all short of absolute infidelity. But what remedy for it can Protestantism afford? It is a logical sequence of Protestantism, and owes its existence to the same principle on which all Protestantism is founded, the supremacy of individual or private judgment as the arbiter of all controversies of faith.

The scriptural proofs of Christ's divinity are no stronger than those which sustain many Catholic doctrines which Protestants reject, and to which they apply such opprobrious names as "superstition and idolatry." But constant tradition coming down from the Apostles, and the living voice of an intangible Church instituted by Christ, establish equally the Unity and Trinity of God, the Incarnation of God the Son, and our redemption by His blood. But these testimonies to the "faith once delivered to the saints," are equally strong and decisive in establishing the real presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist, the Catholic priesthood, the Sacrifice of the Mass, the reverence due to the Blessed Virgin Mary and the Saints of God, the efficacy of prayers to the saints to obtain their intercession, and other Catholic teachings. Thus the great St. Leo expresses the faith of the Church of all the ages, when in his sermon on the Passion of Christ he says:

"Because Thy cross is the fountain of all blessings, the cause of all graces, through which strength comes to be-lievers out of weakness, glory out of reproach, life out of death. Now also, all carnal sacrifices coming to an end, one offering of Thy Body and Blood supplies all the diversities of sacrifices; for as Thou art the true Lamb of God who takest the sins of the world, and so makest all mysteries complete in Thyself, and as there is now one sacrifice substituted for all victims, so of all nations there must be one kingdom."

The essential unity of Christ's Church, the Sacrifice of the Mass, Christ's real presence in the Eucharist, are here taught just as plainly as the efficacy of our redemption through the shedding of His Blood on the altar of the Cross, a doctrine which also admittedly implies His divinity. His divinity is, however, still more clearly and directly asserted by numerous other passages of the earliest Fathers.

"ON DECAYING NATIONS."

We have received from the Rev. L. S. Hughson of the Baptist Church, Lindsay, the following reply to some comments of ours on a recent sermon of his which appeared in the Watchman-Warder:

To the Editor of the CATHOLIC RECORD: Sir—By your courtesy, I have received a copy of the CATHOLIC RECORD in which reference is made to a sermon that I preached recently. I do not wish and I do not suppose you would permit me to discuss your article, but I wish to correct a mis-statement of my position.

I was treating of some of the perils that at present threaten the Empire, and mentioned the war in South Africa, intemperance, the luxury of certain of the aristocracy, the anarchism of certain enthusiasts and the ritualistic movement in the established Church.

In referring to the war, I expressed my opinion that it was not at first a political necessity, but had been precipitated because neither side had used a patient diplomacy. Chamberlain and Kruger both were unfitted for correct diplomacy by natural temperament and from former personal antagonisms. They brought their Governments into war. In this they erred, but that is no reason why England should now repeat her costly magnanimity under Gladstone and avoid the horrors of continuing the war by yielding everything to the Transvaal. When the antagonists at the beginning chose to fight for the interests at stake, Britain must not take her hand from the sword just because her armies have met with reverses. That would now be cowardice and a confession that she was wrong, not simply in the method of her diplomacy, but in the matter of her contention as well. In this there is no immoral advocacy of continuing an injustice. England and the Transvaal could drink the bitter cup. Now that they find it bitterer

than they expected they must yet drink it to the dregs. For the wrong in beginning war, both peoples are being terribly scourged by the wounds and death of their sons, and all who love their kind should pray for peace, as soon as it may come honorably. But one cannot stop alone. Hence England must go on till by war they have accomplished what they did not effect in peace.

Will you permit me to refer briefly to my assertion that degeneracy awaits countries where Romanism prevails? In my sermon I discussed this with expressed regret. I take no satisfaction in contemplating the utter fall of Spain, once the mistress of the seas, but whose best fleet could not stand an hour before that of our youngest nation. Italy is less decayed, but what is she compared with Imperial Rome when she embraced Christianity? The signs of decay in France are less conspicuous, but, without effrontery, we may feel that they are real. Surely she is in the beginning that it is a form of Christianity, does not in its unbelief fall at all short of absolute infidelity. But what remedy for it can Protestantism afford? It is a logical sequence of Protestantism, and owes its existence to the same principle on which all Protestantism is founded, the supremacy of individual or private judgment as the arbiter of all controversies of faith.

The scriptural proofs of Christ's divinity are no stronger than those which sustain many Catholic doctrines which Protestants reject, and to which they apply such opprobrious names as "superstition and idolatry." But constant tradition coming down from the Apostles, and the living voice of an intangible Church instituted by Christ, establish equally the Unity and Trinity of God, the Incarnation of God the Son, and our redemption by His blood. But these testimonies to the "faith once delivered to the saints," are equally strong and decisive in establishing the real presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist, the Catholic priesthood, the Sacrifice of the Mass, the reverence due to the Blessed Virgin Mary and the Saints of God, the efficacy of prayers to the saints to obtain their intercession, and other Catholic teachings. Thus the great St. Leo expresses the faith of the Church of all the ages, when in his sermon on the Passion of Christ he says:

"Because Thy cross is the fountain of all blessings, the cause of all graces, through which strength comes to be-lievers out of weakness, glory out of reproach, life out of death. Now also, all carnal sacrifices coming to an end, one offering of Thy Body and Blood supplies all the diversities of sacrifices; for as Thou art the true Lamb of God who takest the sins of the world, and so makest all mysteries complete in Thyself, and as there is now one sacrifice substituted for all victims, so of all nations there must be one kingdom."

The essential unity of Christ's Church, the Sacrifice of the Mass, Christ's real presence in the Eucharist, are here taught just as plainly as the efficacy of our redemption through the shedding of His Blood on the altar of the Cross, a doctrine which also admittedly implies His divinity. His divinity is, however, still more clearly and directly asserted by numerous other passages of the earliest Fathers.

It is necessary now that this war shall be carried to its end. The war was not necessary, and the objects for which it is being waged could have been attained in peaceful ways. That is my opinion—possibly I am wrong. Not till diplomacy has been exhausted is war ever justified. In my judgment it was not exhausted by Chamberlain and Kruger. . . . In South Africa these people (the Boers) through no consent of theirs, came under the British rule. They did not like it, and withdrew, but the ever restless and active Empire followed them. They moved again and crossed the veld. There the British followed them, and now there is no place left to go, and they have turned at bay. Much that has been said against the Boers is true. They are ignorant, reactionary and stubborn—the British soldiers are finding that out—and they do not want to be put under our institutions. We sympathize with them, but are glad that the same time that British rather than Boer ideas will prevail in South Africa. I believe that but for Cecil Rhodes' idea of a Cape to Cairo railway, there would have been no war. However, it is on, but the Empire is not in danger. . . . If England is being punished for her sins, as Dr. Carman was incorrectly reported as saying, I believe she will come out at last successful, for I do not believe Providence will cause her to yield to any other nation in the world. . . . No other flag that floats beneath the heavens stands for so much honor as the Union Jack. . . . Many must die, many homes be desolated, much money and time wasted, but Britain will come out of this victorious, unless complications arise. Of that there is no whisper at present."

It is plain that Mr. Hughson here maintains that the Boers, looking for a quiet home, were harassed by the British in their greed of territory, until having been penned in a corner from which there was no further means of escape, they at last turned to bay, and hence came the present Transvaal war.

What greater injustice than this could be inflicted on a people? And yet Mr. Hughson declares "it is necessary now that this war shall be carried to its end," and asserts the monstrous proposition that "Providence" will bring victory to the oppressor as a reward for her insatiable pride and that the war should go on lest England should be accused of cowardice!

This is the morality we condemned. Messrs. Chamberlain and Balfour pointed out a few days ago that some of the Liberal leaders in the British Parliament had taken exactly the same stand, and justly ridiculed such morality as that of the highwayman.

We are not greatly surprised that Rev. Mr. Hughson should fall into such an ethical cesspool, for his religion has no fixed moral code, any further than to leave it to each individual minister as may suit his own fancy, and at the same time be acceptable to the leading members of his congregation for the time being. But we, certainly, did not misrepresent him, and we had no desire so to do. We must remark here, however, that Rev. Mr. Hughson maintains thus the very doctrine which gentlemen of his profession are usually so fond of

falsely attributing to the Jesuits, that "the end justifies the means."

The Rev. Mr. Hughson returns his contention that Catholic countries are decayed and degenerate, but puts his assertion in a new form. He speaks now as a prophet saying:

"Degeneracy awaits countries where Romanism prevails."

We shall not delay to make remarks upon the rudeness of applying names to the great Catholic Church of nineteen centuries, but we would like to know whence he obtained the aptness of a prophet.

The subject of the degeneracy of Catholic nations we already treated some length, showing the prosperity of some Catholic countries, and giving reasons why in some cases the temporal prosperity of nations may be interrupted for a time. This was explained in the case of Spain, as well as of the foreign and domestic wars into which that country has plunged almost continuously for more than a century.

The temporal prosperity of a country depends upon many complicated causes, upon which it would take much space to dwell here, yet we mention one which has frequent considerable share in producing it, and that is a people completely ignorant and devote themselves entirely to the worship of Mammon. This produces the wealth of Imperial (Pagan) Rome, of which Rev. Mr. Hughson speaks enthusiastically. Does he forget that at that very time the Jews, who the people of God, were passing through a period of temporal affliction which lasted over six centuries?

In fact, under Christianity, as God has made no promise of temporal wealth as the reward either to nations or individuals who serve faithfully. On the contrary, according to Christ's oft-repeated teaching the rich are in that most perilous position which requires the special position of divine Providence to about their salvation, for "it is for a camel to pass through the needle than for a rich man to enter the Kingdom of Heaven." (Matt. xix, 24) It is true, he immediately afterward that it is possible for God, though impossible man, to bring this about, yet it is tainly not what we would expect a minister of the Gospel to so riches as to make them the object by which the true religion is known.

Nevertheless there are several Catholic countries which stand in the rank of nations as far as temporal prosperity is concerned, such as Spain, France, and Austria, by no means make this fact the of the truth of their religion, and morality are a more sure test we say repeat what we have quoted from Mr. Tieblich's book on Spain:

"The total of prostitution in the country is, I believe, much the number we can daily meet leading street of London, or New York or Chicago might have been added.

The same author says: "The comparative percentage of professional vice and of generalness of morals is much lower than in any other country in

THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AND CATHOLIC ALIENATIONS—HISTORY REVEALING ITSELF.

An Ottawa correspondent the following letters, the first by Professor Goldwin Smith, Globe in January, 1895 and from Mr. G. L. P. O'Hanly which appeared in the Empire 12th of the same month.

Goldwin Smith's letter to us is as follows:

SIR JOHN MACDONALD AND PHILIP TO THE EDITOR OF THE GLOBE:

Sir—You quote from Mr. Macdonald's interesting article in The Canadian on Sir John Macdonald.

Sir John was timid until death; committed to it by others. He thought it grown, he used it as a reach the power he liked to wield.

Sir John Macdonald was in 15 days before the election of 1878, and continued till after the keep Protection at arm's length, declared only for Readjustment, attention to the fact that some porters were holding Protection, and ventured to point out while the United States, with its varied area of production, and its home market, might not suffer from the Protectionist system, that never do for Canada. "No," I reply, "and you needn't fear going to get into that hole."

He finally declared for Protection help rallying him on his own answer was that "Protection much for him that he had to do for Protection."

It was curious that in his own day before the election he seemed much on the National Policy day in his favor. His chief reason to be on the Irish Catholic vote