

The Catholic Record.

Published Weekly at 434 and 436 Richmond street, London, Ontario.

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

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

THOMAS COFFEY, Publisher and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY, MESSRS. LUKE KING, JOHN NICHOL, P. J. NEVIN and W. A. NEVIN, are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transact all other business for the CATHOLIC RECORD.

Rates of Advertising—Ten cents per line each insertion, 15c for second, 10c for third, 5c for fourth, 3c for fifth, 2c for sixth, 1c for seventh, 1c for eighth, 1c for ninth, 1c for tenth.

Approved and recommended by the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa, and St. Boniface, and the Bishops of 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.

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

London, Saturday, Feb. 6, 1897.

A CHRISTIAN'S REVENGE.

An incident which occurred recently at Elkhart, Indiana, is well worthy of being recorded in the ecclesiastical history of the continent, as an example of the true Christian's revenge which, in the words of Holy Scripture, "heaps coals of fire upon the head" of one's enemy. The story is vouched for by unquestionable authority.

The notorious Margaret L. Shepherd recently visited Elkhart to deliver a course of lectures in her usual style of abuse against Catholic religion, and especially against nuns, as a matter of course, as in her pretended character of an ex-nun it is her special mission to vilify the exemplary religious ladies to whom more than to any one else in the world she owes the deepest gratitude for the efforts they have made to rescue her from the sins and miseries of the depraved life she led before she was mercifully received as a Penitent into a House of the Good Shepherd. It will be borne in mind also, that she relapsed into evil courses again after she left that haven of peace and safety.

White at Elkhart she delivered her lectures before large audiences, and there was one lady who became especially intimate with her, believing all her vile stories about nuns and nunneries, and who did all in her power to make her lectures a financial success, by securing the co-operation of citizens of the town towards promoting Mrs. Shepherd's interests.

We give no more than the simple facts of the case, but these are a sufficient commentary on the lies everywhere repeated by the notorious lecturer.

Mrs. Shepherd had scarcely left the town when her friend had a severe attack of diphtheria, and the lady's husband telegraphed at once to South Bend for a Sister of the Holy Cross to attend his sick wife. There were no Sisters to spare at the House of the Assumption there, and the applicant was directed to apply to the larger House of the same order at Mishawaka. He did so, and the same evening a Sister was sent to give her services as desired, and she immediately entered upon her dangerous duty.

We are informed that the sick lady who is being devotedly nursed back to life by one of the kind nuns whose good name she had so recently endeavored to destroy, is heartily ashamed of the part she took in giving countenance to Mrs. Shepherd.

THE DECRETALS OF ISIDORE.

We have already made reference in our columns to various aspects which the religious controversies which are now being conducted in the columns of the Toronto Mail and Empire have assumed under the manipulation of a great diversity of writers, especially under that of the Rev. Dr. Langtry.

In our last issue we dealt with the question of the forged decretals said to have been issued by an almost unknown Spaniard called Isidore Mercader, who was certainly over anxious to maintain the authority of the Pope, for truth does not require the aid of falsehood and forgery to sustain it.

For these forgeries Dr. Langtry blamed the Church, and especially the successive Popes who at times quoted them while asserting their authority.

We explained that the authority of the Pope did not depend upon Isidore's fraud, inasmuch as that authority was fully recognized by the Church throughout the world many centuries before Isidore promulgated his writings, if he was really their author.

The Isidorean decretals appeared about the middle of the ninth century, but the Pope's universal authority was recognized from the beginning, and the evidences of it are to be found in the very earliest writings of the Christian fathers which have come down to the present day. Thus the supremacy of the Pope is clearly attested by Irenaeus, Cyprian, Clement and Dionysius of Alexandria, all of whom lived in the second and third centuries, to say nothing of the host of Fathers who in the fourth century

acknowledged most unequivocally the authority of the Pope as chief Bishop of the universal Church, and successor of St. Peter. So plain is this fact that even Moshelm, whose Church history was written to uphold Protestantism, while writing concerning the position of the Pope during the third century, admits that his authority was then everywhere recognized, though he endeavors to minimize its extent. As an instance of this universal recognition we may here refer to the passage from Tertullian, written while he was a Montanist heretic, and in which he reproaches "the Supreme Pontiff, Pontifex Maximus, that is, the Bishop of Bishops" for sending forth a "peremptory edict" wherein he claims authority to forgive certain specified grievous crimes. His sarcasm would be without meaning if the Catholic Church did not recognize the Pope as Head of the Church.

It is evident, then, that the false decretals were not the origin of the Pope's authority, as Dr. Langtry and another writer in last Saturday's Mail and Empire would have us believe: but the false decretals were not the work of the Church nor are the Popes to be blamed for them.

But the writer in last Saturday's Mail asks why did Popes quote these decretals? To this we need only to answer that they were so like the truth, and so consistent with the accepted doctrine of the Church, that they were regarded as authentic. In fact these decretals were not altogether spurious, but they were in a great measure the decrees of councils and Popes which were either fully or substantially genuine, though they were in some cases attributed to the wrong authors. At other times they were correctly attributed to the authorities who had really issued them.

It was only because the decretals of Isidore contained the real teaching of the Church, that it was rendered possible for the writer to pass them off as genuine in an age which was not so critical as are the investigators of the present day.

UNNEIGHBORLY LEGISLATION.

Canadians are the greatest of all bugaboos to many people in the United States, and there are plenty of politicians who pander to the feelings of those who entertain such horror for the people of Canada. There has been a law for some years against admitting into the States any foreign workman attempting to enter the country under contract to labor, and any one who wears a workman's dress is rigidly scrutinized at the frontier to ascertain whether he comes under the category, and unless he gives full satisfaction on the point he is rigidly ordered back.

It has been the law also that no foreigner can be given a contract by the American Government, and a new law has just been passed whereby no foreigner can be employed upon a Government contract. But our cousins to the South of us are apparently not content with these Chinese provisions for non-intercourse, for there is a bill now before Congress, introduced by Mr. Corliss of Detroit, to prohibit foreigners resident in a foreign country from holding any employment in the United States.

This bill has been introduced into Congress every session for several years, and though it has not hitherto become law there is no assurance that it may not come into force at any moment.

Of course all these laws are aimed chiefly against Canadians, as in the border cities where intercourse is easy, there are a good many on either side of the boundary line who find employment in the neighboring country, and return home at night.

But it is not Canadians alone who thus do their daily work outside their country. It has been found recently that the Americans finding employment in Canada are probably even more numerous than the Canadians who reverse the conditions. This is especially true of Michigan workmen who labor in the Canadian lumbering districts, which are nearer and more convenient for them than the lumbering districts of the far West.

Our Government should watch narrowly the progress of the Corliss bill, and should take care that all the advantages be not given to Americans. There is no just reason why Canadian Government contracts should be awarded to Americans in preference to Canadians, as has been frequently, and even very recently, the case. Thus the work of lithographing Dominion notes has been given to a New York Bank-note Company.

Should the Corliss bill become law it

is well worth our while to consider whether for self-protection a similar law should not be passed in Canada. But even as matters stand we would be justified in passing laws similar to those which are now in force in the United States. Reciprocity is a very good thing, but to be desirable it should not be all on one side.

THE EMIGRANTS TO BRAZIL.

Our readers will remember that in September last a Brazilian Immigration Company induced about three hundred Canadians, or rather residents of Canada, to emigrate to Brazil, under promise of plenty of work, and free grants of land, or grants at nominal prices, offering also other inducements which were dazzling to those uninitiated in the wiles of such companies. Many entire families were included among the number deported.

The promises were too lavish to be reliable, and we took occasion to warn those who might be duped into accepting such offers that in all probability they would be imposed upon, and would soon discover that the inducements offered were fallacious. This has turned out to be the case, but the discovery was not made without much suffering on the part of those who were prevailed upon to take passage in the steamer provided by the Company to bring them to the port of Santos.

Several of the emigrants who have relatives in or near Montreal wrote, during the past few months, giving the information that they had been subjected to grievous disappointment and great suffering, and the desire was expressed by them to return to Canada if they could procure the means of so doing.

It appears that the British Consul at Santos has come to the assistance of a large number of these unfortunate whom he found in a state of absolute destitution, and has furnished them with means to return to Canada. Fifty-four reached New York on the 21st ult., and are probably housed in Canada by this time.

It may be at first sight perplexing to understand what interest the Brazilian Company had in deluding these people with false hopes, but the story told explains the matter.

It is very true that there is plenty of work to be had in Brazil, but the wages offered are wretchedly small, and scarcely afford the necessaries of life to the laborers. In fact the dearth of laborers in Brazil at present arises from the indolence of the slaves who were recently emancipated, and who now work for wages, if they work at all; but the wages of these ex-slaves are very low, and even many of them prefer to live in idleness rather than to work at all. Hence the scarcity which the Immigration Company is endeavoring to supply; but those whom they induce to immigrate must be content with ex-slave wages for the ex-slave work they are required to perform. As a consequence, they have nothing but hardship to expect, and they are obliged to work without being able to obtain the commonest comforts of life to which they have been accustomed in Canada.

Very cheap labor is a necessity in Brazil, especially because the price of Brazilian coffee is low, and a rise in the price of production would close the market to the product, and ruin the planters. It was, therefore, in the interest of the planters that the Immigration Company induced Canadians to go with them.

There are still many of the emigrants who have not been able to return, but the report is that they would all gladly do so if they had the means. Those who left Canada were not under the pressure of want, but were deluded with glowing accounts of the prosperity they might expect, all of which were false representations. Those who succeed in returning, we have no doubt, will be wiser in the future, not to accept such representations so readily again.

We notice that several of our contemporaries speak of these emigrants as French Canadians, as if only French-Canadians could be so easily imposed upon. The fact is, as was stated at the time of their departure, they were of various nationalities, and though leaving from a port of the Province of Quebec not more than about one half were French-Canadians, the remainder being English, Irish, Scotch, Germans, etc., residents of the neighborhood of Montreal.

We deeply sympathize with the unfortunate individuals and families who were thus duped, but there is no law existing or possible to prevent

people from deluding themselves when they are bent upon so doing.

Since the return of the fifty-four persons already mentioned, eleven families more have been discovered who are also in destitution, and are desirous of getting back to Canada. The British Consul has interested himself in their case also, and on communication with the Canadian Government, has received the assurance from the Premier that the Government will defray the expense of sending them to their Canadian homes. They may therefore be soon expected back.

IRELAND'S OVER TAXATION.

A correspondent, referring to some of our remarks on the Irish taxation question, calls attention to the fact that there are two sides or two opposite points of view from which the matter may be considered. In proof of this he directs our attention to the speech recently delivered by Mr. Arthur Balfour at Manchester, giving the Government view of the case, and he requests us to give our view of Mr. Balfour's argument.

Mr. Balfour states in the first place that England and Ireland are under an identical system of taxation, except certain taxes from which Ireland is exempt, but which England bears. These are the land tax and house duty, and so he contends that Ireland has no reason to complain.

Mr. Balfour does not deny that the taxation of Ireland is excessive in proportion to the means of the country, and the fact is indeed undeniable, as the Commission of Enquiry into the financial relations of the two countries has given the figures from official statistics. According to these figures, Ireland is paying one-thirteenth of the tax of the United Kingdom, whereas the wealth of Ireland is only one-eighth of the total wealth of the United Kingdom.

From this it might appear at first sight that justice would be done by reducing the taxation of Ireland by twenty-seven and four ninths per cent. but a little reflection will show that the overtaxation is considerably greater than this percentage.

A man whose total income is \$400 or \$500 is not in a position to be taxed at the same percentage as one who receives \$1,000 or \$2,000 per annum. This is a truth so evident that it needs only to be stated plainly that it may be understood. The fact is that to estimate the taxable capacity of an individual, or a community, we must begin by deducting from actual wealth or income, the necessary expenditure of each individual before reaching the correct taxable capacity. This principle is recognized in the levying of income taxes, which are imposed only on the excess of the incomes over a certain fixed amount, which is regarded as necessary for the sustenance of the persons taxed.

Sir Edward Clarke, speaking at Plymouth on January 4, stated that this principle was fully understood and recognized by Mr. Pitt, who, while framing the Act of Union between England and Ireland, said, in 1785, that a country which has double the resources and trade of another country might have the capacity of paying ten times as much in taxes. Mr. Clarke said that this was putting the estimate of capacity too high, but it is to be noted that Mr. Pitt only stated a possible case, and his statement would be perfectly true, if, in the case of the poorer country, the absolute wealth were comparatively close to the amount necessary for sustenance.

The Parliamentary Commission was very moderate, and was certainly not over-favorable to Ireland in estimating that the taxable capacity of Ireland is one-twentieth of the United Kingdom.

But what are we to say to the contention of Mr. Balfour that the tax laws are nearly the same for both countries? We have this to answer: this being supposed to be the case, it is clear that these laws were framed precisely in order to throw the burden of taxation upon Ireland, so as to benefit England at the expense of the poorer partner in the Union. It is evident that the taxes ought to be so adjusted upon the various products of both countries that the heaviest burdens shall not be thrown upon the poorer nation. As the case stands the excess of taxation imposed on Ireland, at the very lowest computation, amounts to over \$2,700,000 per annum, and it is this fact that has opened the eyes of the Irish landlords to the injustices which Ireland has been subjected during the whole century, and especially since 1860. Thus the Duke of Aber-

corn stated in a letter to the National Convention of Landlords last Wednesday that the landlords are the greatest sufferers by the financial legislation.

But there is another point in Mr. Balfour's speech which has been made a source of much amusement, supposed to be at Ireland's expense. Mr. Balfour asked: "How is this \$2,700,000 obtained? (A voice: whiskey; and laughter.)"

It is true that Ireland manufactures a large amount of whiskey which is regarded as of superior quality, and it appears that a large part of the over-taxation of Ireland is on this article. But Mr. Balfour admitted that it is not entirely derived from this source. He said: "It is obtained by taxation upon commodities, and principally, as my friend has observed, from the duty on whiskey."

The inference that has been drawn by some journals, and which was also suggested by the persons in the audience who laughed so heartily, as well as by Mr. Balfour's subsequent remarks, is that Ireland is a great whiskey-consuming country. This is not the case, for the liquor is manufactured in Ireland chiefly for outside consumption.

Sir Edward Clarke being an Englishman and a Conservative, is certainly not to be suspected of being over-favorable to Ireland. Yet he admitted in his Plymouth speech that the average expenditure of the people of Great Britain is much greater for intoxicating liquors of all kinds than that of Ireland. He said that the total expenditure of the people of Britain on this account is \$4 2s per head, while the expenditure in Ireland is only \$2 13s per head. But here, too, the injustice done to Ireland is apparent, for the tax levied upon the 82s worth of liquor consumed in England is only 15s, while the tax upon the 53s worth consumed in Ireland is 13s.

But here it may be asked, why is it that Ireland has so extensive a trade in spirits, and so small, comparatively, in other manufactures? The reason for this is that the whole aim of British legislation in the past has been to discourage Irish manufacturing interests which might compete with those of England. This aim is visible even in the greater tax levied on Irish spirits, and the product is so superior, and the demand for it so great, that it is able to bear the excessive strain to which it is subjected.

Mr. Balfour also stated that more is expended in governing Ireland than she pays in taxation. This is little to the purpose, for if Ireland had self-government she would suit the expenditure to the capacity of the country, and the enormous expenditure lavished in sustaining greater police and military forces than the country really needs would also be spared on account of the great prosperity and peacefulness which would thereby result.

If the Government really believes that the Legislative Union is a burden on England, it ought not to hesitate about granting Home Rule, whereby England would be delivered from its burden; but the fact is that by the Union England is enabled to regulate the laws of both countries to its own advantage. If England so legislates as to impoverish Ireland and enrich itself, it should endure without complaint the consequences of its own doing. It is no wonder, therefore, that Mr. Balfour's statements have had but little effect on the most earnest and thoughtful of the Irish landlords, who are now clamoring for justice even more loudly and more threateningly than the Irish Nationalists have hitherto been doing.

This we say even on the supposition that Mr. Balfour has given the figures correctly. But it appears that his statement is merely a doctoring of the accounts to suit his purpose. The official reports for 1896-97 show that Ireland's contribution to the Imperial exchequer for the year exceeded the expenditure for Irish purposes by \$1,070,000, and the reports for other years regularly show a similar excess. Lord Farrer has also added to this consideration the further answer that under the present system of making and administering the laws outside of Ireland the cost of government is excessive. The money spent on Irish services does not return to the people of Ireland, but to a horde of extravagantly paid officials.

A pious, learned and zealous priesthood is the glory of the Church of God. By our personal holiness we work out our own salvation and edify our neighbors: by our erudition we enlighten them; and by our zeal we make them partakers of the precious heritage of Christ.—Cardinal Gibbons.

A CATHOLIC ON THE SCHOOL QUESTION.

An esteemed correspondent, over the signature "Catholic," writing on the school question, makes some very appropriate remarks from which we cull the following:

"For the last thirteen years I have been a constant reader of your sound Catholic paper, and have always derived great pleasure from the manly, fearless, and upright stand you have taken against all comers whose purpose was to slander our blessed religion."

Regarding Mr. Laurier's statement in Montreal that "in every rural municipality where there are 25 Catholic children, and in every town where there are 50 Catholic children, the School Commissioners will be obliged, on petition of the parents, to provide a Catholic teacher," "Catholic" says very pertinently:

"These are not at all the words of Mr. Laurier's compromise. It is only where there is an average of 25, or in towns 40 children, that parents are to have this privilege. I am living in a prosperous section of country with Catholic schools all around me. If we were to have Catholic teachers by virtue of an average of 25 children, we would not have them at all. It is well known that to get up an average of 25 in rural districts, there must be a roll-call of at least 75 children. Of course in towns and cities this average would be more easily attained, but even in this case, mark the wisdom of Mr. Greenway in putting the average up 40."

The fact is that Mr. Greenway does not concede a Catholic teacher except under conditions in which there would be one in any case; that is, when the parents desire one, and they form a large majority in the school section.

In regard to the clauses requiring the teaching of French to French children, or of any foreign language to foreign children, our correspondent points out the difficulty of providing polyglot teachers even in Ontario.

"It is absolutely impossible to put these clauses to practical use in a new country like Manitoba, and it will be so found when an attempt is made to carry out the Laurier-Greenway compromise. Mr. Greenway knows this perfectly well, and he knew when making the compromise with Mr. Laurier that it was merely a delusion and a fraud."

"In what, then, is this compromise advantageous to Catholics? There is absolutely nothing in it—not even in the clause which provides for the appointment of Catholic teachers, for the required average is not attainable; and we are to have no control over our books, no Catholic Inspectors, no representation on examining Boards; I therefore ask any honorable man, Catholic or Protestant, what is offered us in lieu of what was taken from us by Mr. Greenway's legislation."

Our correspondent contrasts the treatment of the Catholic minority of Manitoba with that accorded to the Protestants of Quebec, and appeals strongly to all Catholics in the Dominion to maintain the Constitutional rights of their co-religionists in the former province which have been so grossly violated.

THE IRISH UNION MOVEMENT.

Mr. Arthur Balfour is doing his best to thwart the prospective union of Irishmen of all creeds and parties in a movement for redressing the grievance of Ireland on the financial question, and when it is considered that the Irish Unionists have hitherto turned a deaf ear to all proposals to better the condition of the general population of the country, there is some reason to fear that a very cordial union may not take place.

It is stated that the Government have succeeded in convincing Col. Saunderson, the leader of the Irish Unionists, that it is not to the interest of that party to co-operate with the Nationalists, and in order to induce the Saunderson faction to continue their adhesion to the Government policy, Mr. Balfour has promised to take into careful consideration the question of the financial relations, which are at the bottom of the new Irish movement.

This promise may not be very sincere, but it may have the effect of putting off the day of a general union of Irish parties.

Mr. Balfour asserts that the Commission which made the report that Ireland pays \$2,750,000 in excess of a just rate of taxes, refused to discuss large classes of facts which should have been investigated before making the report. This is scarcely to be credited, for though there were three Irish Nationalist members of the Commission, it was composed for the most part of English and Scotch members, and the Unionists and Conservatives had a considerable majority in its composition. It is not to be supposed that a Commission so constituted should favor Ireland specially, and there is no

room for doubt what it reported... text may, how mollifying most party, who were the grievances but were always the most pronounced, and except on Mr. T. W. Russell and because the Government a member of the to be very lam that his support is not likely to be he will assist Balfour proposed Commission to and it is probable appoint very who will bring Government v seems to be in igation will from that w made. Never the to put off Irishmen. whether Colo followers will lay pro Nationalists will urge the scarcely will ernment will tion in amen is to be se will support ment, as they ly to do dur the subject. If there is attitude of the nevertheless, Nationalists more Irish their intenu movement, recently gi Lord Rosse, great Rosse the Duke of Londond... EDI... By requi issue the Ryan, entitled "Thus" W. perused w scribes, in have read... A NEW... the diocese Ridgeway, admitted, later appointed Rev. Father markedly been placed has been care welfare of charge, but have also Father Mc had charg now trans may justly good priest strength their holy... Among who subm influence been deve at James injuries state. A dence giv panelled boy was ling map him to br backs w him. Th experiment other a further... THERE... dence of Catholic ure in r dent occ \$100 wh Col. Wn written schools tion for didate eighteen Brother essay is ing a the cot on a p ware it... Mr. most p bers of Redmo