

The Catholic Register,

PUBLISHED EVERY THURSDAY,

AT THE

OFFICE, 40 LOMBARD STREET, TORONTO.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION:

TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM.

FOR ADVERTISING RATES APPLY AT OFFICE.

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 12, 1893.

Calendar for the Week.

- Oct. 12—Votive Office of the Most Blessed Sacrament.
 13—St. Edward, King, Confessor.
 14—St. Callistus, Pope and Martyr.
 15—Twenty-first Sunday after Pentecost. Feast of the Purity of the Blessed Virgin Mary.
 16—Blessed Victor III., Pope and Confessor.
 17—St. Hedwige, Widow.
 18—St. Luke, Evangelist.

"The Evangelical Churchman."

In its issue of the 5th instant, *The Evangelical Churchman* gives expression to its feeling with quite a rhetorical flourish, and with a credulity which the sequel did not warrant. Opening an article upon "The Doctrine of Papal Infallibility and its results," it assures us:

"The news flashed across the continent that Archbishop Kenrick, of St. Louis, Mo., has been deposed by Mgr. Satolli, and that his condju Archbishop Kalin, has been vested with all power in the archdiocese, recalls the attitude taken by Archbishop Kenrick in opposition to the doctrine of the infallibility of the Pope at the Vatican Council."

That report concerning the deposing of Dr. Kenrick was not true, and was contradicted the following day over the hand of Mgr. Satolli's chief secretary. How very nervous the *Churchman* seems to be. If news manufactured out of whole cloth so affects its mind that it sees in this report revenge on the part of Rome against a venerable prelate of eighty years we might expect the Delegate's official denial to be equally impressive, and show our contemporary that it would be more prudent and charitable, more in accord with dignified journalism not to believe every Catholic item that happens to flash across the continent.

It is claimed that "the practical politics of the Roman communion" are of interest to the members of "the Protestant and Scriptural Church." We are at a loss to know what church is meant; for a unified Protestant church is a myth, a Scriptural church is a body without a head, and a Protestant and Scriptural church will be as difficult to find as a square circle. But if it means that our politics are of interest to those outside of the Catholic Church we have a right to ask that no assumptions be made which are not true, and no arguments advanced upon premises which are false. When, therefore, this organ of the *soi-disant* "Protestant and Scriptural Church" assures its readers that "the results that brought about the deposition (of Archbishop Kenrick) had a beginning as long ago as the Vatican Decrees of 1870," it shows a perfect incapacity for interpreting the primary relation between the See of Rome and the various bishops of the world. For Rome to wait twenty-three years to depose a recalcitrant bishop—even supposing he was really recalcitrant, which Mgr. Kenrick was not—would be contrary to the first principles of

Church discipline: it would be conniving at schism. Was Rome's power less when, several years ago, the present Archbishop of Philadelphia was coadjutor to Mgr. Kenrick, that it did not depose him then? Rome had no wish to depose him at that time, and it has had none since, as the *Churchman* would have known if it had not been too eager to have a little fling at Rome.

The fact is that Dr. Kenrick, now too feeble (being 87 years of age) to administer a Diocese with a population of 250,000, has resigned his bishopric. He was consecrated Nov. 30th, 1841, and is therefore a bishop nearly fifty-two years. A man who has borne the burthen for such an exceptional length of time might well retire in peace without his superiors being misinterpreted for accepting his resignation. The opposition which this venerable prelate made to papal infallibility terminated after the Vatican Council; he sent in his *Placet*, and for twenty-three years administered his diocese undisturbed. Now because he resigns visions of persecution haunt our contemporary, and we have a Low Church journal acting as champion to a Catholic Bishop.

The lecture on infallibility which the *Churchman* undertakes to deliver is a hotch-potch of historical inaccuracies, theological errors and gratuitous statements. We are reminded by it of what Cardinal Manning says: "When English Protestants undertake to write of an Ecumenical Council of the Catholic Church, nothing less than a miracle could preserve them from making themselves ridiculous." To state that "the doctrine of papal infallibility is one of the most powerful weapons ever forged by man against the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free;" to tell us that "it is the mightiest foe to Christian union at work in the world," shows an entire misconception of Christianity, infallibility and Catholic discipline. When a journal tells us that "Professor Mivart, a Romanist and a scientist, who has been writing on 'The Happiness of Hell,' finds to his cost that under an infallible Pope he cannot think for himself," it is acting a ridiculous part. He can think a great deal more for himself under an infallible Pope than he could under a fallible one. Can any one think for himself that two and two are five? Professor Mivart would not thank the *Evangelical Churchman* for his sympathy. We are told likewise in this article "that there was almost a unanimity of opinion against the infallibility of the Pope before the Vatican Decrees." The best answer to this is what Cardinal Manning writes upon the Vatican Council: "I have never been able to hear of five Bishops who denied the doctrine of Papal Infallibility. Almost all previous Councils were distracted by divisions, if not by heresy. Here no heresy existed. The question of opportunity was altogether subordinate and free. It may truly be affirmed that never was there a greater unanimity than in the Vatican Council."

What we presume to be the climax or anti-climax in the article is an extract from a Catholic catechism which is supposed to prove the lack of

unanimity upon the infallibility of the Pope:

"Q. Must not Catholics believe the Pope in himself to be infallible?"

"A. This is a Protestant invention; it is no article of the Catholic faith; no decision of his can oblige, under pain of heresy, unless it be received and enforced by the teaching body; that is, by the bishops of the Church."

We assume that this extract is correct and that Keenan's Catechism, from which it is taken, had the approval of the Scotch Bishop and was recommended by the Irish Bishops. There is clearly a *non sequitur* in the argument of the organ of "the Protestant and Scriptural Church." The Catechism in question was written before the Vatican Council, and therefore it was quite right in saying that Papal Infallibility was not an article of faith; and right also when it stated that no decision of the Holy Father's could oblige, under pain of heresy, unless received and enforced by the teaching body. Whatever the opinion of bishops upon the subject might be they could condemn no one of heresy who might deny it. It by no means follows that the bishops who gave their *imprimatur* to this Catechism were opposed to papal infallibility. The contrary was the case; for either they themselves, or their immediate successors, all signed the decrees of the Vatican Council. Let us grant, with the *Evangelical Churchman*, that this was the opinion of Bishop Kenrick, we deny most emphatically "that punishment is being meted out more than twenty years after his speech." This statement is not borne out by fact or precedent. Bishop Kenrick exercised to the full the liberty of debate granted by the Council. When he had done that, he submitted and lived for more than twenty years, enjoying the respect of his superiors for his life and his labors. The *Evangelical Churchman* is the very opposite of Brutus, who did not love Caesar less but loved Rome more—the *Churchman* loves Rome less and Caesar more, though it has no great affection for either the Rome of the Vatican or the Caesar of St. Louis.

Gladstone's Pronouncement.

It must be admitted by the present as well as future generations that Ireland had never a more staunch, a more fearless, or more devoted champion of her righteous cause than she has found in the person of England's purest and most noble statesman, Hon. W. E. Gladstone. Like most Englishmen he was inclined to consider the problem of Ireland's restoration to internal peace and contentment as impossible of solution. For many years, aye, even until he reached a patriarchal age, was he convinced of the hopelessness of attempting the serious application of any remedy for the nation's ills likely to be attended with lasting results and satisfaction to all concerned. After a desperate and fruitless attempt in 1881-82 to coerce into willing submission the restless and disaffected masses of the Irish people it dawned upon him that the Celtic race is indomitable under violence, and that coercive measures and unjust laws must cease to exist if peace and contentment may be secured. The events and experience of ten

years have justified the conclusions of Mr. Gladstone. The majority of the three kingdoms and of the empire are a unit with him in the conviction that home legislation is the true and only means of exit from that labyrinth of difficulties with which the problem of Ireland's peace and happiness has been surrounded during past generations and for centuries.

It was simply heroic on the part of Mr. Gladstone to proclaim the doctrine of Home Rule in face of the ingrained prejudices of Britishers in general, and of the utter aversion and open hostility of the privileged classes, both in England and Ireland. But it was a Herculean task which that fearless statesman proposed to himself when he undertook to remove those prejudices and defy that opposition. The feat, however impossible, has been successfully accomplished, and not by a fabled semigod of antiquity, but by the most accomplished and most eloquent of England's living orators and statesmen.

The perfect triumph of Mr. Gladstone over all harrassing difficulties and persistent, unscrupulous opposition, was accentuated on the night of the ever-memorable 8th September, when a majority of Great Britain and Ireland's representatives, after a long and searching discussion, deliberately and advisedly passed a bill of such vast importance that no deliberative body or future legislation can presume to ignore the fact, or face the consequences of disregarding its pronouncement.

What England's incomparable Prime Minister has done with the prejudices of the dominant race is but a hopeful augury of the success he is determined on subduing the passions and riding over the opposition of the titled peers of the realm. What little weight he attaches to the overwhelming vote given against Home Rule in the House of Lords may be gathered from the admirable and outspoken deliverance he uttered at an immense meeting held in Edinburgh on the evening of the 27th ult. "The fact is," he there declared, "that the present paltry institutions are too weak for their purpose. They outweigh and do not meet the demands of the country. There is something wrong and defective in the present Constitution. The condition is intolerable and demands the concerted attention of the nation with the view of the removal of its defects. The evil is immeasurable. On one hand is the nation expressing its just demands; on the other hand are the necessary measures to satisfy those demands. But between the two there is a great barrier, viz: the Irish Question, which has taxed the energy and mortgaged the time of parliament generation after generation. Why has this question continued to exist so long, and who is answerable for its remaining before us? There is one reply: the responsibility rests with the House of Lords."

The contrast between the two Houses is then most tellingly put forward: "The House of Commons thinks and speaks for the Nation. The Lords form their opinion for themselves. They are responsible to nobody, and if their opinion proves wrong they will be neither abused nor