

**The Catholic Record.**  
 Published Weekly at 424 and 426 Richmond street, London, Ontario.  
 Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.  
 EDITORS:  
 REV. GEORGE R. NORTHRAVES,  
 Author of "Mistakes of Modern Invidia."  
 THOMAS COFFEY,  
 Publisher and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY,  
 Messrs. LUKS, KING, JOHN NICH, P. NEVES and M. C. O'DONNELL are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transact all other business for the CATHOLIC RECORD.  
 Rates of Advertising—Ten cents per line each insertion, a rate measurement.  
 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.  
 Arrears must be paid in full before the paper can be stopped.

London, Saturday, Jan. 6, 1894.

**IS HE A QUIZ?**

A correspondent of the *Globe*, who signs himself "Equal Rights," writes from Fergus an amusing letter, though evidently intended seriously, which appeared in the issue of that journal of the 23rd of December, in defence of the P. P. A.

In reference to the praiseworthy stand taken by the *Globe* against any such a proscription society as the P. P. A., "Equal Rights" says:

"You appear to believe a society having such obligations is a menace to the State, and ought not to be countenanced by Christian men."

He then asks:

"Is there anything in the obligation of the P. P. A. of which you appear to know so much, which will all compare with Chapter xxv., section vi., of the Westminster Confession of Faith, in which it is stated that the 'Pope of Rome is that anti-Christ, that man of sin and son of perdition that exalteth himself in the Church against Christ and all that is called God?' Every minister of the Presbyterian Church believes that: for it is the Standard of the Church, and he also believes the Bible teaches that doctrine. Every clergyman of the Presbyterian Church makes his solemn declaration that he believes that, and if any minister of the Presbyterian Church, from Professor Caven down, states openly that he does not believe it, he will be promptly dealt with by the Church courts. If then this doctrine that the Pope is Anti-Christ be true, is any man to be blamed for doing all in his power to break down this anti-Christ? Is not every man who claims to be a Christian not culpable who does not strain every nerve to resist and destroy the power of the Pope who, according to the Presbyterian Church, is anti-Christ? Do you believe the followers of anti-Christ should be allowed any part in the Government of a Christian country?"

"We fear, indeed, that it must be admitted that Presbyterianism, rigidly interpreted, is, as Equal Rights maintains, quite as harsh against Catholics as are the principles of the P. P. A. But unless this writer is prepared to maintain that Presbyterianism is the established Church of Canada, we do not see how it follows that the doctrines of the Westminster Confession are to be made the standard of final appeal in the administration of Canadian law. If such is to be the case, what becomes of the loud professions which have been so frequently heard during the last few years that the anti-Catholic agitators are the advocates of Equal Rights to all Canadians?"

If the Presbyterian standards are to be made the supreme law of our Dominion, we foresee that Catholics will not be the only sufferers. The same General Assembly of the Presbyterian kirk which on the 30th of Aug., 1639, decreed the law of subscription to the Westminster Confession, at Edinburgh, decreed also "the government of the kirk by Bishops is declared to be unlawful," and ordained "in all humility to supplicate his Majesty's High Commissioner, and the honorable estates of Parliament, by their authority to ratify and enjoin the same under all civil pains; which will tend to the glory of God, preservation of religion, the King's Majesty's honor, and perfect peace of this kirk and kingdom."

In accordance with this request of the Assembly, the Parliament of Scotland decreed on the 11th of June, 1640, that "all refusers to subscribe and swear the same (Confession of Faith) shall have no place nor voice in Parliament;" and that "all judges, magistrates, or other officers, of whatsoever place, rank or quality, and ministers at their entry, swear and subscribe the same Covenant." This Covenant, in addition to what is said in the Westminster Confession, in regard to the Pope, adds that "we abhor and detest all contrary religion and doctrine, but chiefly all kind of Papistry in general and particular heads, even as they are now damned and confuted by the Word of God and Kirk of Scotland;" and "that Papistry and superstition may be utterly suppressed. . . . to that end they ordain all Papiats and priests to be punished with manifold civil and ecclesi-

astical pains, as adversaries to God's true religion preached, and by law established within this realm; as common enemies to all Christian government. . . . and as idolaters."

We rather suspected at first that the *Globe's* correspondent was in a covert way poking fun at those ministers who uphold the P. P. A. movement when he intimated that they are bound by the doctrine of their Church to do so; but has shown that he is in downright earnest; for the *Globe*, no doubt seeing the ridiculousness of its correspondent's contention, retained the letter in its pigeonholes for a considerable time, probably with the intention of consigning it finally to the wastebasket; whereupon the writer wrote indignantly to the *Mail* complaining that the *Globe* had not inserted it.

The *Mail*, however, is not so solicitous that its patrons should find something worth reading on its pages. Any argument is good enough to appear in that journal, provided there is a possibility that some one may be roused to fanaticism by means of it; and so the Fergus letter was readily admitted into its columns. Subsequently the *Globe* published it also.

We admit that the Presbyterian standards sound very similarly to the P. P. A. oath; but it must be borne in mind that the Covenant and the decrees of that General Assembly are aimed almost as directly against Prelatists, or members of the Church of England, as against Catholics. If, therefore, the writer of the letter in question is really in earnest, as we have no doubt he is, in requiring Presbyterians to be guided by their standards in their treatment of Catholics, he should equally insist upon their following the same guide in their treatment of Episcopalians, Methodists, Baptists, Quakers, etc. In a word: let Presbyterianism be established at once as the only religion to be tolerated in Canada; in other terms, let Catholics, who are over 41 per cent. of the population, and the other denominations numbering 43 per cent., be all dominated by the dogmatic standards of less than 15 1/2 per cent. of the population of the Dominion. Surely this is Equal Rightism with a vengeance! But it is the Equal Rightism which the P. P. A. would like to secure, each man for his own denomination.

But our Fergus Equal Righter assumes that Presbyterians still believe in the infallibility of their standard: especially in regard to this article of their belief. He says:

"I cannot see how any conscientious Presbyterian can shirk the duty of working hand-in-hand with the P. P. A. in destroying the powers of anti-Christ, the Pope. If it be villainy to act with the P. P. A., then it is villainy the Church has taught us, and on the Church rests the responsibility. We would be traitors to the cause of Christ if we did not make every effort to resist and overthrow anti-Christ, and every Presbyterian at least will aid the P. P. A. in its struggle against 'that man of sin and son of perdition, that exalteth himself in the Church against Christ and all that is called God.' In attacking the P. P. A. you are attacking the pupil and letting the teacher (the Church) go free. You are assaulting what is only the legitimate result of the Church's teaching, and you do not appear to have a word of condemnation for the Confession of Faith, which makes the Pope's identity with anti-Christ a matter of primary faith and truth."

He therefore concludes by expressing his conviction that the exposure of the persecuting principles of the P. P. A. will result, as it ought to result, in numerous accessions to their ranks from among Presbyterians!

It is not our province to defend Presbyterianism from the charges of mutability and inconsistency. We leave this task to the theologians of that denomination itself; but we give credit to the many Presbyterians who have, like the Rev. Dr. Herridge, of Ottawa, raised aloft the banner of religious toleration. However intolerant may have been the framers of the Confession of Faith and the Covenant of 1639, we are happy in having it to say that there are many Canadian Presbyterians who will not be bulldozed by their authority to be intolerant also. There are many who are politically Equal Righters in the true sense of the term, and not in the sense of the bogus Equal Righter of Fergus. They may or they may not endorse the doctrinal statements of the Confession regarding the character of the Pope, but as long as they do not draw the practical inference that Catholics are to be civilly ostracized, we are willing to let them enjoy their speculative opinions as they deem fit. We may remark, however, that the Fergus man seems not to be aware of certain recent Presbyterian movements having in view the revision of the Confession of Faith. If the Presbyterians, of to day

were fully in accord with the Confession, they would scarcely demand its revision now: and this very article which attributes the name anti-Christ to the Pope is one of the articles which the revisers have proposed to cancel. This does not look as if they are still of opinion that the belief of the framers of the Confession is a dogma deducible from the Bible, and "of primary faith and truth."

The Presbyterian Church of England has already eliminated this article from their Confession of Faith. The American Revision has not yet been fully adopted by the General Assembly; but it also proposes to reject the doctrine on which the Fergus writer lays so much stress. To this we may add the publicly expressed opinion of the late Rev. Dr. Philip Schaff, one whose scholarship is undoubted, a thorough Presbyterian, and one whose hostility to Catholics is as great as his learning. Dr. Schaff declared that the anti-Christ dogma of the Confession of Faith is based upon an erroneous interpretation of the Apostle's words; and in reference to the proposition to revise the Confession of Faith, he stated that this was one of the portions of the Confession which needed revision. That this belief is widespread even among Presbyterians is clear from the fact that the Revising Committee agree with Dr. Schaff. The Fergus Equal Righter is therefore very much astray in his statement that

"Every minister of the Presbyterian Church believes that (doctrine), for it is the standard of the Church, and he also believes that the Bible teaches that doctrine."

If our Equal Righter is disposed to defend the principles of the P. P. A. he should seek some more solid ground for the defence than that which he has put forward so confidently. Besides, it should be remembered that though the Presbyterian "standards" at times claim to be the only truthful doctrine, elsewhere they admit that they are liable to error, for "the purest churches under heaven are subject to mixture and error." Why may it not be the case that it is precisely in this doctrine that the Westminster Confession's error lies?

**A PROPOSED PATRIARCHATE.**

There is something very absurd in the idea which is now being entertained in Anglican circles in England to reconstitute the Patriarchate of the West, with the Archbishop of Canterbury as the Patriarch. The Patriarchate of the West has never ceased to exist, so there is no need of reconstituting it. The Pope has always held that office, and he cannot be deprived of it by any private arrangement among Anglicans. There is, however, a special incongruity in the new proposition, coming from Anglicanism. The Church of England was founded on the principle of National Churchism, independent of any common bond of union between different countries.

The total independence of the Church of England from any un-English ecclesiastical authority has been to this day the boast of English Churchmen, and the whole Anglican clergy are sworn to that "no foreign prince, prelate, or potentate, hath or ought to have any jurisdiction, spiritual or temporal, within this realm." If it is thus essential to the Christian Church in England to be free from the control or supremacy of any foreign prelate, it must be equally essential to the Christian Church in all other countries to be free from the supremacy of an English prelate.

If the Church were not chafing under the Royal Supremacy, such a proposition would never be thought of. The numerous contradictory decisions of civil judges which have been arrived at during recent years on ecclesiastical questions have shown in a clear light the absurdity of having the doctrine and discipline of the Church dependent upon the decisions of a lay tribunal, however respectable; and this accounts for the present aspiration to make the English Church a universal Church, a thing which can never be accomplished, and which if it were accomplished would set forth more plainly than ever the absurdity of the principle upon which Anglicanism was founded, and which it still proclaims the subjection of the Church to the State and the system of independent national churches.

The Archbishop of Canterbury is not the head even of the Church of England, but the Queen, as the head of the State, is also head of the Church. The only Anglican authority in England which can decide controversies of faith or establish Church discipline is the Parliament, and it is absurd to suppose that the churches of foreign

countries, as of the United States, will submit to accept the decisions of a British Parliament as Supreme, when even the English Church itself feels the incongruity of being subject to such a supreme authority. Still less would Germany, Sweden and Denmark submit to such an authority. If they ever come to look for a Pope they will look for one who has better claim to the title than that founded on the lust of a Bluebeard like Henry VIII.

**BIGOTRY AT A DISCOUNT.**

A striking evidence of the waning influence of bigotry on the people of the United States is to be found in the commentary of the *American Illustrated Weekly* upon the violent attack recently made by Bishop A. Cleveland Cox, of Western New York, upon Mgr. Satolli, the Pope's representative. The *Illustrated Weekly* takes Bishop Cox severely to task for impertinence, ignorance, and an ill-temper which is unsuited to a Christian. The *Weekly* says that Bishop Cox "has no right to employ terms of such obvious discourtesy. And as for his observation to Mgr. Satolli, that 'you are evidently as ignorant of our institutions as you are of our language'—it is difficult to comment on its impertinence in terms of becoming patience. Suffice it to say that Bishop Cox is himself sadly ignorant of the attainments and erudition of men who rise in the Catholic Church to the rank achieved by the present Papal ambassador to the United States." In regard to Bishop Cox's statement that the Order of Jesuits "is a band of secret conspirators against all liberty and all laws, and that it is the duty of all free people to banish the Jesuits from their coasts," the *Weekly* says: "But after all, what have the Jesuits to do with the case? It isn't possible, is it, that Bishop Cox and his congeners entertain any real fear that the Vatican is plotting against the constitutional liberties of the American people? Surely they are not seriously disturbed over the existence of some Middle Age scheme to destroy the Republic and replace the White House by a modernized Vatican."

Monsieur Satolli's epigrammatic utterance at the Chicago Catholic Congress, and on the occasion of his recent reception at St. Paul, is quoted by the *Weekly* to prove how thoroughly he falls in with the requirements of American citizenship, and encourages the Catholics of the United States to be loyal to the country in which they live. "Go forward with the Book of Truth, the Bible in one hand and the Constitution of the United States in the other."

On these words the *Weekly* says: "There is nothing of the hidebound Churchman in that observation, nor is there any reason to doubt its sincerity. . . . The American Catholic is just as good an American citizen, as loyal and law-abiding as is the American Protestant. A learned critic of this subject has observed of American Catholics in these columns: 'They are not only willing, but anxious for the guidance of the Church in spiritual matters, and few sects conform to the laws and requirements of their authorized spiritual guardians as do the Catholics. But in temporal matters they are determined to seek their own paths in accordance with their own judgment. . . . No Bishop Cox will be able, even by indulgence in virulent rhetoric, to convince the great body of the American people that the position of the Catholic Church in these matters is other than it really is. We repeat that whatever may have been the ambitions and purposes of the Church of Rome in the past, it stands to day for liberality of opinion and freedom of personal life.'"

Bishop Cox has within the past few weeks no fewer than three times made himself ridiculous by his Quixotic tilting against objects of his spleen who are beyond the reach of his blunted lance. Monsignor Satolli can well afford to treat his tirades with silent contempt, but the Poles of Buffalo, by a public indignation meeting which they held, resented an insult which the pseudo-Bishop uttered against their nationality, and brought him to his knees with a humble apology for his indiscretion, an apology, however, which was given with a very bad grace. He recognized that he had made a blunder, so now he endeavors to make it appear that he spoke not of Poles merely, but of "illiterate and venal classes of divers nationalities."

The *American Illustrated Weekly* is not the only prominent journal which brings Bishop Cox to task for his folly. The *New York Recorder* deals with him also in the following style, handling him without gloves:

"What's the matter with Episcopal Bishop A. Cleveland Cox? It's sad enough and undignified enough for a man in his line of life to be writing letters to gentlemen prominent in other sects to which no attention is paid.

One would suppose such a marked snub as Satolli, by his utter ignoring, gives Cox would be sufficient to quell him. Cox apparently is not built that way. He is a dissatisfied entity. He began when quite a young man. He wasn't satisfied with the name borne by his honored, respected and influential father, the Rev. Dr. Samuel Hanson Cox, but, having forsaken the faith in which he was born, added an "e" to his name, and with various other frills, amused the public and somewhat disturbed his friends. It would be very much better taste if our reverend brother would content himself with building up his own church and not distract his mental abilities and moral sensibilities in a vain endeavor to destroy that of other people.

To show that the position of the Catholic Church is one of loyalty to American institutions, the *Illustrated Weekly* further quotes the letter not long since written by Pope Leo XIII. to Archbishop Corrigan, in which the illustrious Pontiff says:

"We confidently hope (and your devotedness to us and to the Apostolic See increases our confidence) that, having put away every cause of error and all anxiety, you will work together with hearts united in perfect charity for the wider and wider spread of the kingdom of God in your immense country. But while industriously laboring for the glory of God and the salvation of souls intrusted to your care, strive also to promote the welfare of your fellow-citizens and to prove the earnestness of your love for your country, so that they who are entrusted with the administration of the Government may clearly recognize how strong an influence for the support of public order and for the advancement of public prosperity is to be found in the Catholic Church."

Notwithstanding the virulence of the A. P. A. movement, we have every confidence that all the efforts of fanaticism will be unable to produce any lasting impression upon the people of the United States, whereas we find so large a proportion of the independent press setting themselves in earnest to the work of combating the bigotry which such men as Bishop Cox are endeavoring to excite and stimulate. We have similar reason for believing also that the strenuous efforts now being made in Ontario with a similar purpose in view will also be rendered futile, in spite of any temporary local successes which the bigots may achieve.

**A FALSEHOOD NAILED.**

We mentioned in our columns a couple of weeks ago a statement made by Rev. Dr. Burrell, a Presbyterian clergyman of New York city, to the effect that "the Church of Rome is in alliance with the worst elements of that city," and that through that alliance the "great Cathedral on Fifth Avenue had been built with the city's money." He added that "instead of being called St. Patrick's, it should be called St. Boodle's Church."

This statement was made at the annual meeting of the Presbyterian Union, and advantage was taken of it by the A. P. A. to circulate venomous appeals to the Protestants of the city to oppose the election of Catholic officials, as all Catholics in public offices might be expected to apply public moneys to Catholic Church purposes, if they could in any way lay their hands upon them.

A specific refutation of Dr. Burrell's statement was scarcely needed, as it is well known to all who know anything about the building of St. Patrick's Cathedral, that it was built just in the same way as all other Catholic churches in this country and the United States, by the contributions of the people, and especially through the generosity of the working classes, mostly young men and young women who devoted part of their hard-gotten earnings for the erection of that noble edifice to the honor of Almighty God. It is, therefore, evident that the Rev. Dr. Burrell and the Apaiats who assisted in the circulation of the statement, are all alike liars and calumniators.

It is gratifying to observe that even Protestants manifest their disgust at the un-Christian conduct of these slanderers, and among others, the editor of the *New York Examiner*, after having stated in the first instance his conviction that the Rev. Mr. Burrell was in error, made enquiries in the proper quarter concerning the matter, with the result that he obtained a letter written by Mr. Smith Ely, who was a former mayor of New York, denying the Rev. Mr. Burrell's statement.

Ex-Mayor Ely is himself a Presbyterian, like Rev. Dr. Burrell; nevertheless he could not endure that falsehoods should be told at a Presbyterian meeting for the purpose of causing religious dissension; he therefore wrote a contradiction of the statement to the Rev. Dr. Field, who is also a Presbyterian, who was present at the same meeting. The letter says:

"Dear Dr. Field: As I saw you this evening among those present at the dinner of the Presbyterian Union, I take the liberty of saying that I was sincerely grieved by the assertion of the Rev. Dr. Burrell, that St. Patrick's Cathedral was constructed at the expense of the city treasury. This statement, I think, is a mistake on the part of Dr. Burrell. I am informed on good authority, and I believe, that the ground was paid for and the cathedral erected in the same honest manner in which the church of which Dr. Burrell is pastor was constructed. Very cordially, Smith Ely."

Dr. Burrell's calumny will, of course, be repeated hereafter by other ministers and Know-Nothings, as it is customary with many among these two classes to propagate lies, for they know well that truth would not suit the cause they try to promote.

**MARGARET.**

The Stratford *Beacon* makes the following editorial reference to the letter recently written by Rev. Mr. Macdonald concerning that bold and shameless woman, Margaret L. Shepherd, which appeared in the last issue of the CATHOLIC RECORD:

"Elsewhere in this issue is reproduced an article from the *Canada Presbyterian* of this week, written by Rev. J. A. Macdonald, of St. Thomas, entitled 'A Word of Warning.' No one, we presume, will question the veracity of so widely-known a minister of the Presbyterian church or the genuineness of his Protestantism. He uses strong language, but he feels justified in doing so, and, as he says, he leaves much unsaid because it could not be said in a paper printed for decent readers. Rev. Mr. Macdonald's article is no revelation to the *Beacon*. When Mrs. Shepherd was in Stratford some time ago the *Beacon* was fully acquainted with the story of her life, and for the sake of decency refrained from noticing her and refused her the use of its advertising columns. We refused to notice her, for we well know her fact for turning even the strongest condemnation into what Rev. Mr. Macdonald calls 'useful advertising matter.' Her addresses here were a series of vicious attacks on Roman Catholics, and although no one could rationally believe most of the charges to be true, we are sorry to say that the attacks were applauded by a few. The *Beacon* has an active appreciation of the fundamental principles of Protestantism, but it does not believe that any good cause could be advanced by creatures of the Margaret Shepherd type. It believes that Roman Catholics are as much entitled to justice and respect as any other class of the community, and will never allow its columns to be used by those who seek to make religious strife for the revenue to be derived from it. There are too many professional Protestants; Protestants for revenue only. There are times when, perhaps, silence is the best course; argument is of little use in the face of a wave of fanaticism; and, therefore, the *Beacon* was silent regarding the woman Shepherd when it felt like speaking out."

We again direct the attention of our readers to Rev. Mr. Macdonald's article; we believe it will be found to be a complete vindication of the *Beacon's* conduct in respect to Mrs. Shepherd.

**EDITORIAL NOTES.**

MR. G. STERLING RYERSON, of Toronto, persists in writing letters to the press, and does not seem to realize the fact that he is making for himself a discreditable record. No sooner does he launch on a patient public a goodly array of statements than some person walks forth and proves that to be mis-statements. For some time Mr. G. Sterling Ryerson has been trailing his coat-tail in front of Mr. Peter Ryan, of Toronto. Mr. Peter Ryan is a peaceably disposed man, and for a long while he allowed Mr. G. Sterling Ryerson considerable latitude. At last his patience gave way and a letter appeared from his pen in the Toronto papers a few days since—quiet, dignified, manly and accurate in statement—which gave Mr. G. Sterling Ryerson the same sensation as that experienced by the small boy who happens to be in close proximity to a prematurely-discharged cannon fire cracker.

But Mr. G. Sterling Ryerson's greatest talent is in the line of tracing up relationship. He has made the discovery that Sir Oliver Mowat has been too liberal altogether with his kinship as well as with Catholics. Mr. G. Sterling Ryerson's discoveries are somewhat after this fashion: Mr. John Brown is a second cousin of Lady Mowat's aunt's niece's son-in-law's son-in-law, and draws a salary under the Ontario Government of \$200 a year. Mr. Thomas Smith is a ninth cousin of Sir Oliver Mowat's brother-in-law's brother-in-law, and the said Thomas Smith is on terms of intimacy with a man who is known to have bought his groceries from an Irish Catholic named Patrick O'Reilly.

How frequently do we hear from the lips of the P. P. A. conspirators the expressions: "Romish aggression," "Rome's pretensions," "Popish privileges," etc. If any of our readers, upon hearing a member of the order talk such nonsense, will ask him to give particulars, it will be amusing to note his confusion and embarrassment. Strange to say, even some ministers of the gospel have taken up this parrot cry; but they, too, as well as the ignorant portion of their following, have never yet attempted to give facts and figures in proof of their wild ranting.