

SHALL ROME MUZZLE FREE
SPEECH?

REV. ED. RANSFORD, M. A.

IN the continued recalcitrancy of Dr. McGlynn of New York, who refuses to go to Rome, Pope and Archbishop being set at defiance, and in the desposition of Dr. Burtzell from the dignities he held under the Roman Archbishop of New York, for the only crime of presuming to be present and to speak at a meeting in favor of Dr. McGlynn, as well as in the open adhesion of so many of the laity, and the very thinly veiled countenance afforded the suspended and the deprived priest respectively, we read the handwriting on the wall, though Rome shuts her eyes thereto. It is true that Dr. McGlynn's more consistent course as a priest vowed to obey only his bishop and his successors in all matters pertaining to the doctrine and discipline of the Church of Rome, as interpreted and administered by virtually irresponsible bishops, would be either to eat humble pie and submit, or to leave the Roman Communion. But it argues very badly for a system and its pretensions to the truth, that it can maintain those pretensions only by driving out from its midst all those who presume to exercise their private judgment in matters which are contrary neither to the Catholic Faith nor to morals, or by forcing them with their lips to feign a submission which they do not feel; to utter a recantation which, in their heart of hearts, they know they do not mean, and to accept as God's truth what they are fully aware is either arrant nonsense or a dangerous error, perhaps a blasphemous fable. Such a process of sitting on the safety valve can end only in a sudden blow up, whose results may shatter the whole figment of Papal authority to pieces. Already thousands of the more intelligent laity, and scores of devout and learned priests on this continent—even in Canada, and not least, in the province of Quebec, are ripe for revolt, and it needs but a few men with the same courage of their opinions as possesses the soul of Dr. McGlynn, for the revolt to come to a head at once. Cardinal Gibbons will find it an infinitely easier task to appease with the sop of the Papal blessing the Knights of Labor, and to conciliate, as it is the interest of the Roman Church to conciliate the brutish and unintelligent Anarchists—many of whom are its own offspring, than to muzzle American citizens of piety and bright understanding whose freedom of thought demands, and will speedily find some outlet for its expression, in spite of an iron despotism which would fain bind both soul and body to the chariot wheels of Vaticanism, and subject free-born and high-souled men to the picayune narrowness of a few self-seeking prelates, and the high-handed pretensions of an alien power to domination over the persons and intellect of a large number of the subjects of the United States and Canada. If the Pope were not the tool of absolutistic Jesuits, and did he not go in fear for the consequences to his own life, if he did not give the "Black Pope" liberty to do as he

pleases, his aforetime clear-headedness would show him the folly of taking up the position he has lately been driven into assuming; and yet an excuse for his line of action may be easily found in that truckling to the Roman See, which is the distinguishing difference between the sturdy Anglo Saxon statesmen of by-gone days and the weak-kneed politician of the present, who to keep in power, or to oust his rival from the leadership, would sacrifice everything that was dearest to him, the religious education of his children and the freedom of his country on the altar of Popery—provided only its high priests would aid him in the accomplishment of his nefarious designs. It is a evidence of the truth of the Church's claims to be the God-given guide to men, that she alone has faith enough in the promises of Christ that the gates of hell shall not prevail against her and her children, to stand in the breach against the double assault of Romanists and secularists, allied for the nonce in an impotent assault upon the Lord and upon His anointed. It is a sad spectacle, indeed, to see that in Canada the sects are, nearly to a man, on the side of the enemy, as if they thought thereby the better to help in the destruction of the Church, while in the United States, the supineness of the respectable and intelligent non-Romanists and the consequent monopolizing of the direction of all political matters, afford the Jesuit party the opportunity of driving in more than the thin edge of the wedge, and so of rending the Constitution asunder in their own favor. In the United States, however, men are beginning to see the danger of permitting the Romish hierarchy to have it all their own way, and are organizing accordingly. It would be well if Canadians were even beginning to awake out of their sleep.

A NATIONAL CHURCH OR CONGREGATIONALISM?

IN commenting upon the Bell Cox case, some papers have taken up the line of argument that Mr. Bell Cox was a very good man, and that as his congregation did not object, but rather approved of his proceedings, outsiders (as they are called) had no right to interfere. Now, against the personal character of Mr. Bell Cox we have not a word to say. Undoubtedly he is a very misguided man, but that does not prevent his being a very earnest one. But in questions of breach of contract we do not quite see how questions of character are involved. When Mr. Bell Cox was ordained he undertook to teach the doctrines of the Church of England according to the law of the land. For the sake of argument, we will assume that at the time of undertaking this solemn responsibility he was thoroughly in sympathy with the doctrines of the Church. Since then, however, he has changed his views, and consequently he can no longer continue to fulfil his contract. That being the case, there is but one course open to any man who looks at the matter fairly—he ought to resign his position as a teacher commissioned by the

Church of England to propound her doctrines. He may be a very excellent man, but that does not absolve him from the duty of resigning a trust he is unable conscientiously to fulfil. There are many excellent Nonconformists in the country with whom, in many ways, we have the greatest sympathy, but whose teaching we could not accept. No one would question that the Quakers are, on the whole, a very worthy body; but who that values the teaching of the Church of England would like to have a clergyman, however holy a man he might be, holding Quaker views and teaching young people that the outward and visible signs of an inward and spiritual grace are useless, and that the Sacraments should therefore be abolished. Common sense would say, immediately that such a man had better propound his doctrines to the members of the Quaker community. In the same way, when a man dissents from the fundamental teaching of the National Church and accepts the tenets of Rome, why should he, because he is a good man, not act in the same way as one who dissents in an opposite direction? To use a homely illustration, surely sauce for the goose is also sauce for the gander?

The mere fact of a particular congregation not objecting does not affect the question, unless Churchmen are prepared to abandon the principle of Episcopacy and to become Congregationalists.—*The Rock*.

SECRETS OF THE PROOF ROOM.

THE editor of the enterprising *Bungville Bugle of Freedom* recently confided to his readers the fact that "The total depravity of the types, and not the pen of the reporter, was responsible for the startling assertion in the last issue of the BUGLE that 'Neighbor Johnson's handsome barn had been reduced to a mess of onions.'" The editor plaintively added that the intention had been to inform the public that the unfortunate Mr. Johnson's barn had been reduced to a "mass of ruins."

"The Relations of Prince Beeswax to the Vatican" startled, recently, the readers of a Boston daily paper, who had to read below the headlines to discover that "Prince Bismarck" was intended. The point made by the *Boston Herald* that the Legislature ought to think of adjournment because the "dandelions were peeping up through the grass," was transformed by the man who manipulated the types into the announcement that the "chandeliers" were "peeping."

Imagine the feelings of a writer of a sensational story of interrupted domestic bliss, whose thrilling head, "A Honeymoon Cut Short," is transformed into "A Hungarian Cut-Throat;" or of a writer on French politics, who discoursed on "Gallic Bluster," only to find the *Boston Herald* next morning printing it "Garlic Chester." A guardian "de bonis non" masqueraded in the *Globe* as "Dr. Bones now" of Taunton, and "Mutton in Parvo" became "Mutton in Paris;" while "O Salutaris" appeared before a devout public as "O Saleratus." Lovers of the drama