

THE CATHOLIC RECORD

Published weekly at 251 and 253 Richmond street, London, Ontario.

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

REV. GEORGE B. NORTHGRAVES, Editor. REV. WILLIAM FLANNERY, Editor.

Catholic Record.

London, Sat., Jan. 12th. 1889.

THE PROTESTANT CRY.

A Catholic clergyman of our acquaintance, when speaking lately with a few Protestant gentlemen, made reference to the panic which seized on the Protestant public some twenty years ago, at the time of the so-called Fanfan raid. He instanced the fact that during the few weeks or months of the panic's reign every Catholic in the country was under the ban of suspicion. It was the general belief among Protestants in those days that every priest's house was stocked with fire-arms, and that the basement cellar of every Catholic church was an arsenal in which rifles and bayonets were stored away ready for use, and that no one could tell at what hour of the night all the Papists would rise up and massacre every Protestant in the country. The Protestant gentlemen who listened said they "remembered all that very well, but that people are now a-days better informed and not so easily imposed on by fanatics and alarmists, and it is not likely the Protestant public shall be gulled so easily at any future time."

county and township election in this Dominion. The man of worth and merit will be elected by Catholics, no matter the size, or the shape, or the color of the altar at which he may think fit or convenient to worship. And, strange to tell, from the accusations generally made against Catholics and published in the press and heralded from the pulpit, one would expect a very different state of things. The Catholic Church is pronounced the most intolerant of all institutions and her people the most priest-ridden of all Christian communities, while the Protestant system is based on liberty and freedom for every man to read the bible and judge for himself. How, then, explain the strange anomaly that, in spite of all this, intolerance is to be found only on the side that proclaims toleration as its shibboleth? No one who did not know the facts of ever-recurring Protestant panics and periodical fanaticism would admit the possibility of occurrence that we all know of, and that honest men have to suffer from, on every possible occasion. It may be there are mistaken notions about toleration and liberty, that, if set right, would soon and easily unravel what seems a high unattainable goal. The Church of God can never tolerate error. If she could admit or allow her children to be taught that "two and two make five," or that "two angles equal to a third angle equal to each other," she might pass for being tolerant, but she would forfeit all claims to the distinctive title of being "a teaching Church." Did she permit any sacred truth to be perverted or any lie to live, she would belie all her professions of teaching in God's name, and of teaching all things whatsoever had been revealed to her by Him. But she knows, to her grief, that all so-called Catholics are not necessarily good men, and that honest, great, and able men are to be found in the ranks of Protestants. Hence it comes that Mr. Parnell is honored and supported by priests and bishops in Ireland, as the memory of George Washington is revered by Catholics as well as by Protestants the world over.

In the south and west of Ireland, where Catholics are in the immense majority, we never hear of the religious feuds and disturbances so prevalent in the north. And it is a shame and a disgrace to our civilization that such incendiary broils should be dragged into politics in Canada, and that such bitter feelings be periodically engendered and set asunder on every occasion that a Catholic presents himself before the electorate for any position of dignity or emolument, in the land of his birth or of his adoption. In his great speech at the East End, London, on the night of December 15th, Mr. Gladstone made the following remarks, which we are glad to be able to quote as substantiating all we have just written on the subject of Catholic versus Protestant toleration:

"But, then, we are threatened with a disloyal Ireland. Gentlemen, not only a more ungenerous, but a more absurd imputation never was made (cheers). . . . You have this ground of certainty that the Irish people will be a loyal people—it is that they are a truthful people. . . . Look at the way in which they trust their leaders, and look at the way in which they choose their leaders (loud cheers). Three-fourths or four-fifths of the people are of the Catholic religion and differ considerably from the people who live among them. What leaders have the Irish people chosen? They followed Mr. Flood, Mr. Grattan, Mr. Butt, Mr. Shaw, and Mr. Parnell (loud cheers), the last and not the least competent or least distinguished man, and every one of these men were Protestants. And men are trusted every one of these Protestants and followed them as loyally and as truthfully as if they had been of their own religious persuasion. That is the stuff and the material that makes a man disposed to loyalty (cheers), and which justifies the words of O'Connell that 'our disposition truly leans to loyalty.' True, O'Connell was their leader, and O'Connell was a Catholic. But why was he their leader? Was it because he was a Catholic? No, because I have shown you that other men that can be called their leaders have been of the Protestant religion. But he was their leader because he was a man incomparably elevated in talent, power and devotion to his country over every contemporary, whether Catholic or Protestant, throughout the length and the breadth of Ireland."

A CATHOLIC GOVERNMENT.

The straightforward Catholic Parliament of Belgium is exhibiting great energy in passing legislative enactments for the benefit of the people. The whole subject of the relations between labor and capital has been carefully investigated by the Government, and already action has been taken on the result of their inquiries, which have been conducted on a large scale. Among the enactments passed one is for the regulation and payment of wages, another for the establishment of trade and labor councils. There has been no law passed for facilitating divorce, but by a special enactment arrangements are made to facilitate the marriages of the poor. The labor of women and children is regulated by a new law which is now under consideration, and many other useful measures have been passed, or are to be passed shortly.

The number of pupils attending school

has increased wonderfully owing to wise provisions in the school laws. The present Cabinet has been in power only four years, but the number of pupils in the communal schools has risen during that time from 345,678 to 422,083, beside which 1,450 private schools have been placed under Government control with an attendance of 164,226 children. These vigorous measures have rendered the present Government very popular throughout the country.

INFALLIBILITY OF THE POPE.

None are so blind as those who will not see; so it is not surprising that the Catholic doctrine of the Pope's infallibility is misrepresented by those polemicists who deny its truth. An article in last week's Christian Guardian masses together an immense number of references to a jumble of facts and fancies, with the general assertion that none of them can be reconciled with Papal infallibility.

One of these references is, of course, to the bull of Pope Clement XIV., which, according to the Guardian's article, "appressed the Jesuits forever," while a bull of his successor, Pius IV., "appressed their suppression and declared their reinstatement." We have shown in another column that neither the suppression nor the establishment of the Jesuits has anything whatsoever to do with the infallibility of the Pope. The infallibility of the Pope regards doctrine only, whereas the existence of the Jesuits, or any other religious order, is merely a matter of administrative discretion. The Church has existed without these orders, and upon the existence of any one or of all of them no doctrine whatsoever of the Church depends.

The infallibility of the Pope is thus defined in the decree issued by the Vatican Council in 1870:

"We teach and define it to be a dogma divinely revealed that when the Roman Pontiff speaks ex cathedra, that is, when in the discharge of the office of pastor and teacher of all Christians by virtue of his supreme apostolic authority, he defines a doctrine regarding faith or morals to be held by the Universal Church, he enjoys by the divine assistance promised to him in blessed Peter that infallibility with which the Divine Redeemer willed His Church to be endowed in defining a doctrine regarding faith and morals."

It will be remarked from this definition that it is only when the Pope defines a doctrine of the Church that he is said to be infallible. He is, therefore, not infallible in his judgment in civil matters, nor on the prudences of adopting or rejecting certain measures for the propagation of the faith. To this category belongs the question of the suppression of the Jesuits. It is to be remarked, also, that even in matters of doctrine, when the Pope expresses a private opinion, he is not declared to be infallible, but only when he makes a definition of doctrine, as pastor and teacher of all Christians. It is, therefore, the belief of the Catholic Church that God gives a special assistance to the Pope when he issues a definition of doctrine, at the same time commanding the whole Church to accept his teaching. This special assistance preserves him from teaching error.

All those passages of Holy Writ which provide the prerogatives of St. Peter as to be held by the Universal Church, be enjoyed by the divine assistance promised to him in blessed Peter that infallibility with which the Divine Redeemer willed His Church to be endowed in defining a doctrine regarding faith and morals."

This has been the constant teaching of the Church throughout all ages, as attested by the writings of the Christian Fathers from the beginning.

We shall not at length develop this argument. We shall merely state shortly the character of the difficulties which are brought against the doctrine and are supposed to disprove it.

The Guardian's article states that infallibility is disproved "by the circumstance that the Popes have contradicted themselves and each other." We assert that in all the course of history no example can be found of a Pope contradicting any other Pope in his ex cathedra teaching; that is to say, when promulgating a doctrine to be believed by the universal Church.

The Guardian's article says "the line of canonical succession was broken in 903." The pious Pope Benedict III. died in 903, in the month of August. He was succeeded in the same month by Leo V., who was seized by Christopher in October of the same year and thrown into prison, where he died within nine days. Christopher assumed the Pontificate unlawfully, but he was never recognized as Pope. Sergius III. assumed the Pontif-

icate in January, 904, also irregularly, but his Pontificate became afterwards regular and canonical when the universal Church confirmed it. There was, therefore, no breaking of canonical succession.

We are told next that "Liberius subscribed to an Arian creed." This statement is untrue. The Emperor Constantius by violence endeavored to induce Pope Liberius to condemn St. Athanasius on account of the eschaton's vigor in refuting Arianism, but Liberius was so faithful to his duty that the Emperor sent him as an exile to Berea, in Thracia, for two years. He then returned to Rome amid the acclamations of the people, and administered the affairs of the Church with ability and zeal. Szymon, the Eastern historian, relates that he signed a creed in which the word consubstantial did not occur, but the creed in question contained no false doctrine. Szymon states that the creed in question was strictly orthodox, teaching thoroughly Catholic doctrine respecting the divinity of Christ. The Arians tried to torture this creed into a meaning which it would not bear, but this did not make of it an "Arian creed." It is not true, therefore, that Liberius subscribed to a heretical formula.

The letter of Liberius to the bishops, who were thrown into prison for their constancy in the Catholic faith, ought to set at rest forever the accusations which are so frequently brought against them. In that letter occurs the following passage: "It is given to you, ye good confessors, to offer to your person the spectacle of an invincible faith, crowned by martyrdom. What words, what praises can equal the heroism of your conduct? Believe that in spirit I share your exile. I know that the thought of this will be a soothing balm to your sufferings; but it is for me a real torture, for I would wish to be at your side and to share your afflictions."

Notwithstanding that Pope Liberius has been made the target for false accusations, no one has been more completely vindicated from such than this same Pontiff. The next statement of the writer in the Guardian is that several Popes were deposed, and intruders placed in their stead. During the many vicissitudes through which the whole of Europe passed in nearly nineteen centuries, it is no wonder that the Holy See met with troublesome times, and even many times anti-popes were placed upon the seat of the true Pope. But these anti-popes were never recognized by the Church as having Pontifical authority. The prerogative of infallibility was not with them, but rested with the legitimate successor of St. Peter. Not one of the lawful successors of St. Peter ever taught false doctrine to the Church. The statement made by the writer of the Guardian's article that fourteen Popes denounced as heresy the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception is without foundation. The one faith of Peter and the Church has always been vindicated by the occupants of the Holy See, thus fulfilling the promise of Christ that the faith of Peter should not fail.

We may, in fine, remark that there is also in the Guardian's article a covert general reference to immoralities committed by some Roman Pontiffs. The prerogative of infallibility has no reference to the morality or immorality of their conduct, as it refers solely to their public teaching. At the same time we may remark that though the vast majority of the Popes have been men of undoubted sanctity, many of them being recognized as saints of God, it is not very surprising if, out of about 260 occupants of the Pontifical throne, the private conduct of a few should have been reprehensible. There have not been more than six or eight of the number against whom such charges can be sustained. It is not necessary we should vindicate them against a charge so vague. The characters of many Popes have been most unjustly attacked, and true history has vindicated them against these false charges; but in no case has it been shown that they have ever taught any other doctrine than that which "was once delivered to the saints."

A TRAVESTY OF JUSTICE.

It will be remembered that policeman Swindell, who brutally stabbed Patrick Ahearn at Middleton, with the result that Ahearn died next day, was found guilty of murder at the Coroner's inquest, and that the Attorney-General entered a *nolle prosequi*. This masterly inactivity of the very impartial law authorities of Ireland gave occasion to the declaration of Chief Baron Palles that in the absence of action on the part of the Attorney-General for Ireland, he was prepared to consider an application for a trial, provided the next of kin would move in the matter. It may be believed that the Attorney-General was meditating to reward Constable Swindell by promotion—or perhaps by a money recompense levied on the people, as was the case for Constable Leahy on account of the Mitchelstown massacre. But the pronouncement of the Chief Baron upset such calculations. At all events it was the avowed policy of the Government to treat the verdicts of Coroner's juries in Ireland with contempt when the constabulary or other Government officials were arraigned by them. It was so with the Coroner's jury on occasions of the Mitchelstown massacre, and of John Mandeville's death. In this

Middleton case, Swindell was allowed to go free on his own recognizance.

The declaration of Baron Palles, however, has brought the Attorney-General to bay. Besides, the next of kin was about to act on the Chief Baron's suggestion, by moving for a trial; so, lest everything should not turn out according to the liking of the Government, the Attorney-General has stepped in to take the case out of the hands of the next of kin, and has announced that he will himself conduct the prosecution! Of course every one can see that it is the Attorney-General's intention to conduct a sham trial in the name of "law and order," and to have Constable Swindell honorably acquitted. The man who was murdered was only a Nationalist and an Irishman, so of course the constable must go scot free.

Meanwhile Baron Palles thinks it necessary to apologize for having supposed that the Attorney-General would not do his duty. He says:

"I am very clear that but for the intervention of the Attorney-General, the next of kin would have the right to appear before the grand jury, and in the language of the law inform them by information on oath as to the circumstances of the case, in order that the grand jury may do what is right in respect to it. I was not aware on the first day of the assizes that the Attorney-General contemplated any other action in the case."

It is perfectly clear that the Attorney-General began to "contemplate any other action" only because he found that action would be taken whether he liked it or not. The whole transaction is on a par with the usual course of the Government in their administration of law in Ireland. It is but a "mockery and a snare." The police have immunity to commit what barbarities they please.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

W.—The ordination of priests and the consecration of Bishops in the Greek schismatical churches are valid. But as the Bishops and priests of those churches are separated from the centre of unity and Apostolic jurisdiction, they have no right to exercise any ecclesiastical functions, having no jurisdiction from the Supreme Head of the Church. They are in the position of excommunicated or suspended bishops and priests. How it happens that they retained valid orders will be clear when it is considered that before they became separated from the Catholic Church they were really bishops and priests of the Church, and as they retained the valid forms of consecration and ordination when they became schismatics, their successors were bishops and priests also, though deprived of ecclesiastical jurisdiction.

From this it will be seen that the Anglican ordinations rest on quite a different foundation, and the inference of your friend that after a while Anglican ordinations will be recognized by the Catholic Church, is altogether unwarranted. The Church always recognized the validity of the Greek schismatical orders, because the fact of the continuity of their orders is indisputable. This is not the case with the so-called orders of the Anglican Church, and hence these orders were never recognized by the Catholic Church as valid. If they had been validly conferred, in the beginning, there is no doubt the Catholic Church would have recognized them from the beginning as valid. The single fact that the Church never so recognized them is, therefore, by itself, a strong proof that orders were never validly transmitted to the Anglican bishops or clergy, so that they can never be recognized in the future, any more than in the past. The chain of succession can never be any stronger than its weakest part, and as there is a broken link in the very beginning, Anglican orders never can be valid, and there can be no claim to Apostolic succession, even in ordination, in the Anglican Church.

The Lambeth records which are appealed to, to show that the Anglican bishops appointed by Queen Elizabeth were consecrated by four Catholic bishops, are for the best of reasons held to be a forgery. They were unknown during the first fifty years of the existence of the Anglican hierarchy, and were never appealed to to prove the validity of their orders, though the Anglican controversialists were frequently challenged to produce proofs that their hierarchy had received valid consecration. Their defence usually was that such consecration is unnecessary to the pure Reformed Church. Dr. Lingard, in his history of England, does state that it is probable that there was a consecration ceremony; but he himself explained afterwards that he referred here merely to the fact in its historical aspect, that some form of consecration was used. He did not speak of the theological question of valid consecration by validly consecrated Catholic bishops.

It is besides a certain fact that the ordinal of Edward VI. instituted a form for the consecrations, which in no wise can be regarded as valid. It not only departed substantially from the tradition of the Church, but it did not specify the essential functions of a bishop. The century and a half during which this defective form was used would have sufficed to destroy

valid ordination in the Church if it had ever existed.

THE RITUALISTIC TROUBLE.

We mentioned a few weeks ago that the Bishop of Lincoln was summoned before the Archbishop of Canterbury for ritualistic practices alleged to be unlawful. He maintains in a letter addressed to his clergy that the rubric on ornaments fully justifies the use of all such church ornaments and vesture as he has made use of. He points out that clergymen of every shade of opinion in the Church have violated the rubrics, who, however, have not been prosecuted for so doing. He maintains also that for himself, he has not broken the law at all, and declares that he is in every respect loyal both to the kingdom and to the Church. He declares that he shares in the conviction which is the general conviction of Church members; that a rightly enforced uniformity in external is not the best way to ensure real unity and that therefore reasonable toleration should be shown in regard to the external details of worship.

The rule under which the ornaments are determined which are to be used in the Church of England is thus given in the prayer book as now used: "And here is to be noted that such ornaments of the Church and of the Ministers thereof, at all times of their ministration, shall be retained, and be in use, as were in this Church of England, by the authority of Parliament in the second year of the reign of King Edward the Sixth."

As the ordinal of Edward VI. prescribes all the paraphernalia of chasubles, dalmatics, stoles and other vestments quite similar to those which were used in the Catholic Church, it would be a considerable surprise to the Low Churchmen to find that they have been breaking the law by not using these ornaments, to a greater extent than the Ritualists have broken it by using such vestments lavishly. It is not at all unlikely that the Bishop of Lincoln may surprise his prosecutors to the full extent of his expectations, and that instead of his being restrained in the use of these ornaments, the result may be that an injunction may finally be issued prohibiting their introduction into those churches which have looked upon their use as rank Popery.

PROFLIGATE EVICTIONS.

The Government officials are very anxious to make it appear that the farms of evicted tenants are ready to let to other farmers who wish to take their place. Even if this were the case, it would be no reason of justification for the heartless barbarity with which evictions are carried out by the military and police. It would, however, prove that their policy of exterminating the present Nationalist tenantry, and replacing them with Orangemen is proving successful, and it would be some encouragement to landlords to prosecute the work of eviction with energy, so as to meet the views of the Government. So many landlords have been forced by the resolute stand which the tenants have taken to yield to their tenants' demands for reduction, that there is a fair prospect that in the near future the condition of the people who remain in the country will be much improved. This does not suit the views of the Salisbury Government, so the landlords must be made to believe that their revenues will be perfectly safe if they persevere in the exterminating process. Hence the Lord-Lieutenant boasted at Belfast not long ago that four hundred farms of evicted tenants had been taken by a more desirable class.

This statement of the Lord-Lieutenant has, however, been subjected to rigid investigation by Professor Stuart, M. P., and has been proved to be mere empty bragadocio. He has shown that, taking sixteen counties of Ireland alphabetically, out of 268 holdings just twelve were re-let to new tenants. This is under 4 1/2 per cent.

Testing the matter in another way, the professor took 108 districts in 30 counties, one-eighth of the centre of Ireland, with the result that out of 687 holdings, from which the tenants had been evicted, 30 have been re-taken. This is a percentage of less than 4 1/2. The professor declares that his statement is perfectly accurate, and that he made the test with "strict impartiality." It will be seen that the results of the two methods of calculation do not differ widely, and he is convinced that the tests illustrate fairly the percentage of re-let farms throughout Ireland. The farms which have not been re-let are, of course, left waste and uncultivated, and the landlords get from them little or no revenue, though they have been at heavy expense in having their tenants evicted.

It would in fact be more to the landlord's interest even to make fair arrangements with their tenants, and to take such a reasonable rent as the latter can afford to pay. More than this concession the Nationalists have never asked, and if it were granted they would not go back to the question how the landlords obtained their proprietorship. It is well known that most of the proprietors of Irish estates hold their rights from unjust confiscation, while the unfortunate tillers of

the soil were left to starve under orbitant rents imposed on them by Possession, under such circumstances never constitute a just prescriptive proprietorship, as long as the proprietors or their heirs live to their ancient rights, and it is so unfair for the tenants to insist upon recognition of these rights. The merit of the respective rights of the classes, Irish landlords and Irish properly belongs to the representative of the Irish people in a National Parliament, and the sooner the law recognizes this as the solution of the problem, the better will it be for all.

A circumstance which makes Professor Stuart's figures more significant is that they do not merely cover the case of eviction which have occurred recently. Out of the 268 farms which the first calculation is 107 evictions took place previous to the year 1885. In 1888 there were 64 evictions; in 1887, 62 evictions; in 1886, 40 evictions; and in 1885, 40 evictions. This proves that it is a mere fact that a very small proportion of the farms on which evictions took place, find bona fide tenants. The farms all sizes, varying in their rental from £400, and the average rental of the farms which are not re-occupied temporarily by emigration and police. Out of the 268 evicted under the first test, there are 90 so re-occupied, and of the 687 under the second test 230 are occupied similarly.

SENSATIONAL NEWS MANUFACTURERS.

It is not long since a telegram published from Rome, stating that American Bishops, then in the City, had presented to the Pope a protest, on the part of the American Bishops, against favors being granted to German Catholics on this occasion. It was said that they remonstrated the promotion of German priest ecclesiastical dignities, and against establishment of churches for Germans. This dispatch was emphatically denied by several who declared that no such document issued by the episcopal body United States, and that the whole was a fabrication.

Another telegram was also published, stating that Leo XIII. had blessed a quantity of medals which were intended for distribution in Ireland; that he stated for the reason of refusal that the Irish are disobedient rebellious against his authority, "they seem to prefer the gospel and O'Brien to the gospel of Christ."

This cable dispatch, which was generally published by the newspapers, was also published as news throughout Great Britain and Ireland. The Archbishop of Dublin, who was notified with the fact, telegram was intrinsically absurd, on its face, sent to Mr. Parnell, copy of the paragraph, and asked whether or not there was any truth in it. Dr. Kirby promptly replied that it was entirely false and an "impudent fabrication."

This contradiction was immediately published, and so the false statement died speedily.

Soon after this occurrence another report was telegraphed to England in regard to a report said to have been sent by Mr. Parnell. This was equally imaginary with two mentioned above. It is that there is a manufactory of false telegrams in connection with the telegraph communications to the press, and that the telegrams are fabricated in among the various national opposition especially with the Irish against the Church of Rome. It is a very safe rule to trust of all these Roman which are intended to excite national feelings against them. They are most likely to prove fabrications like the three referred to above. Especially in Ireland there has been an attempt to send false news, which has been either to prevent National movement or to irritate against the Holy Father. If these objects could be attained, the fabricators of false news would be satisfied.

CHURCH OF OUR LADY.

The following are the winners in the drawing of prizes at the Church bazaar, Guelph, on the 27th inst. The winning number is first, the number second:

| |
|--|
| Series A—565, 5; 845, 35; 2300, 41; 2416, 37; 2467, 14; 2782, 44; 2831, 45; 3201, 7; 3320, 43; 3321, 27; 3544, 21; 4381, 18; 5215, 3; 5497, 23; 6616, 50; 7937, 2; 7954, 19; 8026, 4; 8174, 9; 8233, 6; 8238, 46; 01189, 31. |
| Series B—570, 35; 580, 3; 1569, 40; 1687, 29; 1757, 11; 2702, 8; 4082, 39; 5059, 17; 5387, 15; 5580, 33; 6562, 20; 9592, 22; 9986, 49; 0476, 26; 01542, 33; 01678, 30. |