

The Catholic Record.

Published Weekly at 46 and 48 Richmond street, London, Ontario.

Price of subscription—\$2.50 per annum.

Advertisements—Ten cents per line each insertion, arithmetical.

Approved and recommended by the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa, and St. Boniface, and the Bishops of London, 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. 3, 1894.

LENTEN REGULATIONS FOR 1894.

(OFFICIAL.)

The following are the Lenten regulations for the diocese of London:

1st. All days of Lent, Sundays excepted, are fast days.

2nd. By a special indulgent from the Holy See, A. D. 1884, meat is allowed on Sundays at every meal, and at one meal on Mondays, Tuesdays and Saturdays, except the Saturday of Ember week and Holy Saturday.

3rd. The use of flesh and fish at the same time is not allowed in Lent.

The following persons are exempted from abstinence, viz., Children under seven years; and from fasting, persons under twenty-one; and from either or both, those who, on account of ill health, advanced age, hard labor, or some other legitimate cause, cannot observe the law. In case of doubt the pastor should be consulted.

4th. Meat may be used in preparing fasting food during the season of Lent, except on Good Friday, as also on all days of abstinence, throughout the year by those who cannot easily procure butter.

Pastors are required to hold in their respective churches, at least twice in the week during Lent, devotions and instructions suited to the holy season, and they should earnestly exhort their people to attend these public devotions. They are hereby authorized to give on these occasions Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament. Besides the public devotions, family prayers, especially the holy Rosary of the Blessed Virgin, should be recited in every Catholic household of the diocese.

M. J. THOMAS, Sec.

HOW TIGERS ARE TAMED.

In our last issue we announced that we had been credibly informed that the Archbishop of Kingston had given instructions to a prominent firm of lawyers in his city to notify the editor of the Toronto Mail of his responsibility for criminal libel on account of the shamefully slanderous letter published by him in the name of an ex-priest on the 18th inst., and the equally slanderous preface with which the editor, speaking for himself, introduced that letter to his readers. We now print the letter of His Grace's lawyers, as published in the editorial columns of the Mail:

Kingston, Jan. 29, 1894.

The publisher of the Toronto Mail, Toronto:

Sir,—We have received instructions from the Most Reverend the Archbishop of Kingston, relative to your publication of a very scandalous libel against the Roman Catholic Archdiocese and Bishops of the Province of Ontario in general, and against himself in particular, on the signature of "Ontario Priest," on the 18th inst.

Although history takes no notice ordinarily of anonymous revilers, he deems it right to call attention to this attack upon him as being directed, not only against himself personally, but against the character and prestige of the episcopate.

The ex-priest who figures as your correspondent makes several charges which the Archbishop declares to be notoriously false, calumnious, and derogatory to his sacred office; and you appear almost to emulate him in the desire to injure the Archbishop when you head his letter with the extraordinary language which you have used, and which certainly justifies the Archbishop in regarding you as conspiring with the writer to reflect upon his character, and the administration of his sacred office.

On behalf of the Archbishop, we warn you that should you publish any more libels against him, he will in his own time, and in such manner as he may think fit, take such legal action against you as he may be advised.

Yours truly, WALKER & WALKER.

It is exceedingly interesting, and not allitheatring, to observe the wriggling of the doughty champion of all anonymous slanderers of the Catholic Church, when brought face to face with Messrs. Walker & Walker in sight of the public. Nervous prostration, resulting from a guilty conscience, was never so fully displayed by a journalist. The significant hint at prosecution for criminal libel contained in the lawyer's letter, and the prospect of two or three years' convict labor in the quarries of the Kingston Penitentiary, had plainly terrorized the amiable editor's soul; whilst, on the other hand, the continued support of his paper by the secret societies, whose favorite organ it is, and by whose patronage it lives, would most surely be forfeited, if he were to make an open, candid act of contrition for his flagitious abuse of the liberty of the press, as against the Hierarchy of the Church. Self-condemnation and Christian self-humiliation were not, however, demanded of him by the considerate and tender-hearted Archbishop of Kingston; who, reserving his right to choose his own time and

his own method of punishing his inveterate maligner for his iniquitous libel of the 18th ult., gives him no peremptory order to humble himself then and there, but only a formal notice of prosecution before the criminal courts of the Dominion at a future day, should he presume "to publish any more libels against him," what was the poor editor to do in such straitened circumstances, placed, as he was, between the devil and the deep sea?

After forty-eight hours' consultation with his legal adviser, he puts forth the following pleadings for merciful consideration, which, we suppose, would be substantially his pleadings from the dock before judge and jury:

1st. He avers, with dove-like simplicity that the headlines (his prefatory statement to his readers in presenting the ex-priest's letter) to which exception is taken, were simply a summary of the letter. Here is the editor's preface: "A ruthless despot in an Ontario diocese! Insults and degradations from an Imported Ruler! Accuser, judge and executioner! A mitred Czar! Catholic priests down-trodden and abused." This lovely description of the Archbishop, who, by peremptory order of the Holy See, and despite his repeated remonstrance, was indeed most happily "imported" from the Green Isle, which we all lovingly call our own, to rule and govern the flock of Christ in the Mother-diocese of Ontario, under the special conditions of the hour, is admitted by the editor of the Mail to be his own production, his key-note to all the secret societies for the orthodox appreciation of the anonymous libel, and the ante-prandial whetting of their no-Popery appetites in anticipation of the delicious feast provided for them. With piteous appeal to the public to surrender their mother-sense through commiseration for him in his sad straits, the broken-hearted editor asks old and young to believe that he meant nothing at all by this innocent preface; he did not mean to stamp the Archbishop with all those hideous characteristics; in fact, he did not intend to convey any opinion at all; he would have written the same preface in double-headed capitals if he were His Grace's best friend; he merely gave a summary of a sweet paucy upon the Archbishop of Kingston! Oh! all ye gods and little fishes! what weak cobwebs will not a distressed editor grasp at for sustenance when his reason is perturbed by fear, and the ways of escape are barred against him on every side! If an unscrupulous pill-maker went round the country, advertising and vending some deleterious nostrum in all the towns and villages, and for the purpose of cajoling the farmers, hired the services of a licensed druggist, who came forward on every platform and professionally announced the all-curing properties of the nostrum, albeit in the language of the pill-maker's advertisement, does any sane person imagine that, in case of loss of life resulting from the use of those poisons, the professional druggist, who, with mighty appreciation, recommended them to the farmers, would not be held responsible by judge and jury and by the common sense of mankind as an accomplice in the destruction of human life?

2nd. That first pleading of the editor of the Mail was ludicrous enough; but the second is the very climax of drollery. Here it is:

"As the letter (the ex-priest's libel) dealt with a matter of interest, it received publicity, without the slightest suspicion that His Grace could be reviled by it, or that Dr. Cleary's prestige would be impaired."

Truly a guileless, unsuspecting individual is this darling gentleman who fills the first chair in the Mail office! He is so cloistered and so completely sequestered from all commerce with this mundane sphere of nature and natural feeling, and so wrapt up in the ecstasies of the third heavens, that, on reading the ex-priest's disgusting medley of blasphemy and calumny which he was asked to fling in the face of a most honored prelate of God's Church, he barely perceived that certain friends of his among the P. P. A. and other secret societies would read it with "interest," and therefore he gave it publicity in his journal. By some sort of supernatural influence it happened, however, that "not the slightest suspicion" was awakened in his sublimated soul aching the possibility of the Archbishop taking offence at the outrage. Why should the Lord's anointed ruler in Israel give way to the instincts of flesh and blood and common humanity, and proceed to declare to the world through his lawyers that

the libellous statements so published are "notoriously false and calumnious, and derogatory to his sacred office?" We speak in the hearing of all Canadian citizens, and we make bold to assert that not one in the Dominion—not even the shifty editor himself—gives the least credence to this cowardly excuse. It sounds too like the culprit's pleading of "not guilty" from the dock, that is, not guilty before the court, until the crime be established by legal evidence. We have sometimes seen a big school-boy maltreat a little fellow and brag of his unmanly performance until a policeman appeared on the scene and collared the big bully. Then were heard cries of sorrow and loud supplications for pardon and promises of future good behavior. The editor of the Mail is the sole big bully we have ever heard pleading for mercy on the ground that he thought his maltreatment would not give offence—that, in fact, the little fellow should have liked to be kicked and cuffed. Just think of the awfully wicked things written in the libel against His Grace the Archbishop of Kingston, and endorsed by the pious editor in his preface! How is it possible for any one to believe the Mail man's plea, that "the slightest suspicion" of giving offence never crossed his mind? Nothing less than an innate consciousness of guilt combined with a lively appreciation of the horrors of the Kingston Penitentiary could impel a man to fall back on so silly an excuse for his evil-doing.

3rd. The editor's third and last pleading is put in these extremely modest words: "The announcement by the Archbishop that he will take action against the Mail, should any more libels be issued against him in its columns, is an unnecessary warning." Oh! yes, wholly unnecessary. Doesn't the world know that the Mail's journalistic morality repudiates and abhors the use of the press for purposes of detraction or calumny? Far be it from the editor's honorable mind to allow any desperate ex-priest or ex-nun or secret society man to pour out the venom of a self-degraded and vindictive spirit upon the pages of his immaculate journal. But, jokes apart, was there ever since the days when Voltaire used to publish his articles against Our Divine Lord Jesus Christ, denouncing Him as an "infamous wretch," a more bare-faced system of calumny of the highest and best and most respected members of society, than has been practised by the Mail throughout the past eight years? One, two, or three of his daily issues every week abound in it. Oftentimes, indeed, he guards against the penalties of the law by the vulgar artifice of slandering the Catholic Church in general, or the Hierarchy in general, or the priesthood in general, these being, it is supposed, barred from prosecuting him, because they are neither individuals nor legalized corporations. But very frequently he has forgotten to employ the stale artifice, and has filled his columns with most atrocious and revolting fabrications against the best and most useful members of the community. It was enough to stimulate his malice, that they were consecrated dignitaries of the Church of God, honored and loved by all classes of society for their sanctity and usefulness of life. It was deemed quite safe to publish most evil things against them, inasmuch as every one is aware of the extreme reluctance of high ecclesiastical dignitaries to make complaint in courts of law. Their personal reputation, moreover, needed no defence, and they did not want revenge. Shall the citizens of Toronto and of the Province of Ontario ever till their latest breath rid their minds and memories of the loathsome heaps of foulest reminiscence forced upon them by the Mail's unparalleled vituperation and repeated slanders against the late Archbishop Lynch? And are they not edified by the tradition of the saintly example of the venerable prelate's patience and piety when, the day before his death (about a week after the Mail's latest outrage upon him) he made public declaration of his thankfulness to God for having kept him innocent of those horrid charges of the Mail, and then added a profession of his whole-hearted forgiveness of his calumniators, in imitation of Jesus Christ on the cross and St. Stephen while being stoned to death. We might adduce other and more recent instances of equally base and even more wicked defamation of those whom Catholics revere and love the most as pastors, fathers, friends. But our profound respect for the feelings of the living restrain us here. We will only say of them, in the language of

Swift, "The worthless people are the most abused by slander, as we usually find that to be the best fruit which the birds have been pecking at." The Archbishop of Kingston's legal admonition to the Mail man was not, therefore, "unnecessary," but rather of supreme necessity; and, furthermore, as we declared last week, most opportune, and is sure to be effective. This is why all the Catholic of Ontario, from end to end of the Province, are so delighted at his action—just the right thing at the right time. May His Grace never fail to take a foremost place in meeting the onslaughts of the enemies of the Catholic people, and bravely defending our civil and religious liberties!

The Mail man, having thus nobly delivered his three omnipotent pleadings, bursts forth into a long and exceedingly stupid peroration on what? do you think—on the liberty of the Press and the right of free discussion of public questions of state in newspapers. He does not intend his rhodomontade to have any weight with common-sense people, but only with the P. P. A. and other secret societies, whom his frequent appeals to them plainly insinuate that he believes them utterly devoid of judgment and honesty in the plainest matters, and that he regards them simply as his dupes and automata, greedy to swallow the most disgusting literary food he can supply. But, in the midst of all this vapoury stuff, he exhibits the fear of God or of somebody else, by carefully withdrawing from his programme of future behaviour the hitherto unlimited right of "slandering and calumniating" good men and honored citizens. This remarkable exception to his ordinary rule of action he very markedly enunciates twice in the course of his boisterous blustering. He merely imitates in a feeble way the role of Vaillant before the Supreme Court of Paris, when, fully conscious of the presence of the guillotine, he boasted and roared out that his voice is "not to be gagged" and he will die a martyr to freedom of speech and the right to assassinate every good man who differs from him. Liberty of the Press, free discussion in newspapers, is not disputed by any one, so long as it is legitimately conducted. The legitimate bounds are fixed by the law of nature, by the Divine law, by the manifest requirements of social life, by the constitutions of all civilized countries, and by the judicial decisions of our courts of justice. And should the Mail man plead from the dock that he advocates the liberty of the press, he will be condemned to hear the presiding judge instructing the jury that this is wholly irrelevant to the issue, since the prosecution does not charge the prisoner with defending the liberty of the press by any means, but with abusing it and try to overthrow it by publishing malicious libels that are "notoriously false, calumnious and derogatory to the plaintiff's sacred office."

THE RECALL OF THE JESUITS TO GERMANY.

The vote of 173 to 135 in the German Reichstag for the repeal of the law by which the Jesuits were expelled from the country under the influence of Bismarck has raised quite a commotion among the Evangelical League, which is in Germany a body resembling the P. P. A. of Canada, in its intense hate towards Catholics. This organization is at present engaged in obtaining signatures to a vast petition against the recall of the Jesuits; but though this recall is not yet accomplished, it is morally certain that it will take place in the near future.

The National Liberals, the party which is chiefly engaged in this anti-Jesuit agitation, believe that the Federal Council will not approve of this last action of the Reichstag; but this is only speculation. The vote shows at least that there is a great change in public sentiment since the Bismarckian laws of 1872 and subsequent years were passed. The Catholics of Germany have a right to congratulate themselves on the recent vote as a great victory achieved. The victory was gained only by the determined stand taken by them against the persecuting laws, and one by one they have all disappeared from the statute books.

It was on the 15th of May, 1872, when the anti-Jesuit Bill was brought before the Reichstag. The Catholics defended the Jesuits triumphantly from the false charges which were brought up against them, and exposed the iniquity of the proposed law by showing the great services which the order had rendered the country in

ministering to the people and in educational work for the twenty-five years they had been in Germany, and even in attending on the sick and wounded during the Franco-Prussian War; but all this could not at the time change the determination of a fierce majority, servile as it was to Bismarck's dictation.

The expulsion of the Jesuits was but the prelude to a series of hostile measures against the Church. But a short time elapsed before most of the religious orders were treated similarly to the Jesuits, and even those which were allowed to remain in the country were shut out from the Public schools, and harassed on the most flimsy pretexts, their property also being confiscated. In 1873 and 1874, other laws followed under which Bishops and priests were thrown into prison.

This state of affairs did not continue long, however. Persecution made the Catholics more and more resolute, until the Government in 1878 found itself face to face with the Catholic party in the Reichstag under Herr Windthorst, the most powerful and compact party in the Chamber; and notwithstanding Bismarck's boast that he would rule by blood and iron, and that he should never retrace his course by "going to Canossa," he soon found that he must adopt a policy of conciliation. The Socialists became stronger every year, and there was no power which could restrain them within the bounds of moderation, except that of religion; and Bismarck was glad enough to conciliate the Catholics whom he had persecuted relentlessly for six years. From that time the Falk laws have been disappearing from the statute book one by one, until the last one only is to be found there in the shape of the anti-Jesuit law. This also is now bound to disappear. The present Emperor is more amenable to reason than was his grand-father, and Chancellor Caprivi is also more moderate than his predecessor. Hence both recognize that it is wise to make Catholics as free as Protestants in the exercise of their religion. We have, therefore, every reason to believe that the efforts of the Evangelical League to perpetuate the last law of the persecuting code will end in failure.

ROME AND THE PAPACY.

The Italian anti-clerical press are, after all their abuse of the Pope and the clergy, much alarmed over certain rumors now afloat that the Pope has some intention of leaving Rome on account of the petty persecutions to which he is constantly subjected by the Italian Government. They are now endeavoring to convince the Holy Father that Rome is his proper place, and that by his removal therefrom the Church would lose much of its historical prestige. The Piedmontese Gazette thus moralizes on the subject:

"The Catholic Apostolic Roman Church was founded by St. Peter in Rome. *Tuus Petrus et super hanc petram edificabo ecclesiam meam.* Thus spake Christ to His great Apostle. How is it possible that a Church which is so largely based on historic tradition can renounce the place where she was born and whence she has taken her name and form, without interrupting a portion of her own tradition and relinquishing a part of her own dogmas? What is a Church without tradition and without dogma derived therefrom?"

It is refreshing to find such sentiments uttered by journals which have hitherto made it their occupation to try to show that the Church is not a divine but merely a human organization; and that the Pope is not St. Peter's successor. Other journals of the same class echo these sentiments, because they feel that the presence of the Pope is the greatest possible bulwark against anarchy and revolution, from both of which organizations Italy is seriously threatened.

There is no fear that the Holy Father will move from Rome if his living there be rendered endurable. No one is more conscious than himself of the importance of his remaining in St. Peter's own See; and in a discourse delivered in St. Peter's church on the 17th of December, he made known his keen feeling of the importance of Rome as the centre of Catholic unity—Rome, where Sts. Peter and Paul and millions of martyrs sealed in their blood their testimony to the truth of the Catholic religion.

On that day the ceremonies of his jubilee, the fiftieth year of his consecration as Bishop, were ended, and he took occasion, in answer to an address of congratulation presented to him by the Federation of Pius IX., and read by Prince Francesco Massimo, President of the Federation, to show what

the world owes to the Papacy, and the important part which Rome has had in Christianizing and civilizing mankind.

The reply was not read by the Pope himself, but by Mgr. Radini-Tedeschi, but it was nevertheless his own reply, and it was a most important deliverance. He praised the Federation for their tribute of filial piety freely accorded and bringing great consolation to his soul. He said:

"It is most just that Rome should be distinguished for manifestations of homage to Blessed Peter, who in Us lives and governs. To Peter in fact and to his successors she owes it that she arose from her ruins to a new life, which as far surpasses the ancient life as eternity does time, and spirit matter. From being the metropolis of the Roman Empire she was elevated to be Queen of all the world, wheresoever there is a soul which believes and hopes in Christ the Redeemer. She was the seat of a kingdom which disappeared, and she became the seat of a kingdom which will never have an end, whence to her is given a title of glory unique throughout the whole world, the name of the Eternal City."

He explained that it was not the Rome of earthly warriors—the Scipios and Cæsars, but the Rome of Christ which made shine from pole to pole the star of true civilization. He continued:

"And in regard to benefits of the temporal and civil order, you know also, beloved sons, that if Italy and Europe did not fall into irreparable ruin amidst the darkness and infinite miseries of barbarism, it was the work and the merits of the Rome of the Popes. Even in internal disorders, amid warlike factions, she, at one time arbitrator, set herself to compose the differences between peoples and princes; at another, to prevail by her moral force in the raising of the oppressed and in restraining the proud. And what is it that she has not done to comfort suffering humanity, and to the development of the arts and the sciences? She was the first to come efficaciously to the aid of those in poverty, to the sick, to the aged, to the abandoned, and to every class of misfortune; it was she alone who in the ages of ignorance maintained alight the torch of learning, who gave fruitful impulse to its revival, who founded renowned universities, and an infinite number of educational institutions."

The title "Roman and Catholic" is a proud distinction of the Church, though the enemies of the Church endeavor to make the title Roman one of ill repute. The Prince of the Apostles, divinely appointed to the office, fixed his See in Rome. By the blood of martyrs who suffered in Rome, in the Coliseum, and in the public places, the Church was watered and nourished, and from Rome set forth the zealous missionaries who bore the standard of the cross to the most distant countries, and brought them to the knowledge of their Saviour. Rome witnessed the trials and the triumphs of the Faith, and for nearly nineteen centuries the Roman Pontiffs have watched over the interests of the Church throughout the world.

In Rome, too, the earth can scarcely be cut with a spade without giving forth new proofs of the antiquity and unity of the faith. The archives of the Church are also there preserved, so that the loss of Rome as the seat of the Pope would be almost irreparable. Yet should it so come to pass that it be necessary for him to depart for a time it will not be necessary for him to come to America for an asylum, as the Liberal press appear to imagine must be the case. There will be more than one noble residence offered him to choose from should it ever be needful for him to make such a selection. In the event of a war between Italy and France, it may become necessary to make the choice.

A HUMPTY-DUMPTY SHOW.

Humpty-Dumpty on the wall, Humpty-Dumpty got a great fall; All the king's horses and all the king's men Couldn't raise up Humpty-Dumpty again.

The convention of the P. P. A., held recently at Hamilton, is described by the Mail as a powerful organization. We have no inclination to belittle the power of the P. P. A. We are fully aware that there is plenty of material in this Province to respond to any appeal to bigotry, and we do not deny that in the present instance the appeals which have been made so persistently by fanatical clerics and scheming politicians have had a certain amount of success; nevertheless, we have not lost faith in the good sense and good will of the people of Ontario to such an extent as to suppose that the organization we speak of will succeed in getting control over the Government of Ontario, and much less over that of the Dominion.

Is it necessary that Catholics should establish a counter-organization to meet this new foe, somewhat with its own weapons? We think not. We

shall not say the g not claim generos and liberality of Province, we thi baffle the efforts society, and for t we advise our c entertain any suc In saying that was farcical we a as the mere statu doings will show

The convention cular, which was Globe in the ord This fact alone ap the fanatics, and of having done a act. Was not the one? And how violate that ecce survives the ange trated against it temerity afterwar into the inner tem to disclose the bus the few days But, horror of Toronto organ wa captive during the convention and le important secrets. A terrible commo the betrayal of se some members of was supposed, th transactions to th the press. The called the meeting "We have a to give delegate secrecy of our or as we will be s enemies who will word that may le We have nothing mar of the circul being of like ch the poor foreign drowned," and ingly, it indicate at least, the Ma organization is namely, in intell a word caught mission," we shall plain.

The circular g observing the ab be able to condu the utmost secrec

The conventio press representa lucky enough to gates, accusing and one member a certificate from Hamilton exoner in this respect. ative, who by so member of the c difficulty free h imputation. W himself to see to publish little mo ing proceedings so carefully; fo day's doings wer upon in the Frid nal. With all th disposal, we do r sists the terrible secrets, as the r its time in electi ing frantically a

And when So sad was The sun it And the m As they sobbed And the poor little this eried.

The only toler which occupie motion by a mem oath the obligati olies. It seems motion was defe was to be expect ber who made it its present form leagues, and it from the Ethiop pig—pig—pig— The number nearly so large being only 376 instead of 439 existing in all these is outside the Northwest.

Very many a ashamed to ack bership, and th the hotels unde men were from London men from men from Norva Glencoe, etc. J Mercier, Major John Thompson, are said to have recorded by del isters. Ex-Alderman refused admitt