

MAY 6, 1898.

quence of his universal authority in the sphere of Religion, which ranks above all earthly things.

The naming of the Pope first is thus a recognition that God is supreme over all monarchy.

But it is not only among Catholics that the custom prevails to recognize this principle, and this fact brings into prominent relief the bigotry which prompted the complaint of the no-Popery association. "The Church and the Queen" is the style in which at all banquets the most loyal Protestants propose the toast when there is any reason to give special mention to the Church. There is, of course, no Supreme Head of Protestantism throughout the world, and so there is no individual who could be named as the representative of Religion, and it is highly proper that the Queen's name should be placed before that of any local churchman however high his office, such as the Archbishop of Canterbury, etc. But with Catholics the case is different, as the authority of the Pope is universal. Hence, though Catholics would name the Queen first in comparison with any local Archbishop or Bishop, the Pope would be always the first named as a recognition that Religion is of the highest importance of all things which concern mankind.

It is to be remarked, too, that the Queen is the head of the Church of England, yet in spite of this fact the name of the Church would take precedence among Protestants in recognition of the principle on which Catholics act. In the same way it is customary with them to speak of "Church and State, the Church and the Crown," etc., and it is in this style that such toasts are proposed at all Protestant gatherings, including Orange banquets.

Of course it is not to be supposed that the tag rag who are always endeavoring to find fault with Catholics, and to misrepresent them, will acknowledge the justice of our reasoning, but all thoughtful and properly educated Protestants will acknowledge that when Catholics give the priority to the Pope, there is no disrespect to the lawful authority of the State, but simply a recognition of eternal over temporal interests.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

It is quite apparent that many of the emigrants who have for a few years past been sent to Canada from England are not a desirable class. Like those other assisted emigrants, the sparrows, they seem to be possessed of a desire to expel or starve out all other living creatures. Canada being a colony of the mother country, they feel that they possess extraordinary powers and privileges the moment they set foot on its soil, and indeed it seems as though they hold the opinion that the old residents and natives have no rights which they are bound to respect. What makes the case more vexatious is the fact that we are asked to go down in our pockets to assist in paying the passage of these paupers over the ocean. If this is the work Sir Charles Tupper is doing, the sooner he is called home the better for Canada.

"A FRAUD UNMASKED. The Career of Margaret L. Shepherd, 'Ex-Romanist,' 'Ex-Nun,' 'Ex-Penitent' and Bigamist. Her own Confession Attested by Most Reliable Witnesses." Such is the title of a book just published, and which we have on sale. Price 25 cents. In quantities of 50 and over, 15 cents. It should have a large sale, as it is a most complete and damaging exposure of a reckless woman who has created much ill-feeling between Catholics and Protestants in various parts of the country by misrepresenting in the most shameless manner the doctrines and practices of the Church.

A RUMOR is current that Mr. Dalton McCarthy has become heart-sick of the Third Party business, and has returned to his home with the determination to attend solely to the practice of his profession. If such a rumor proves true, doubtless his visit to London has largely contributed to bring about the decision, he having found that those who are in favor of establishing an Equal Rights party in this city consist almost entirely of those belonging to the P. P. A., the spiritual adviser of which appears to be Mrs. Margaret L. Shepherd. Mr. McCarthy must, indeed, have felt very uncomfortable when he discovered what manner of persons constituted the rank and file of his army in London.

MR. DALTON MCCARTHY has a strong ally in the redoubtable Mrs. Margaret Shepherd. She believes that Mr. McCarthy is the man destined to put an

end to Popery in Canada. Perhaps she would be glad to live under Canadian law if Popery were abolished, and at the same time the Popish law of marriage which allows only one husband and wife to live together. We may wonder whether Mr. McCarthy's ideas of marriage are the same with those of his new patroness. And if so, what will the Protestant women of Ontario say about it?

CHURCH Union is the question now widely discussed in periodicals. Writers with more sentiment than theology are inventing schemes as futile as they are impractical. The case lies in a nutshell. Where is the Church founded by Him who may claim unquestioned obedience from mankind and which alone may hold out means of salvation? If there is one, then every one must yield unqualified assent to its every utterance, for surely it were absurd that man may choose his own code of belief. "Truth—and remember this is one of the great distinctions between Catholics and heretics—truth is not ours, but God's. Truth is not ours to baste and pare down. Truth is God's: it has God's majesty inherent within it, and it will correct the souls of men even when it seems rudest and most repelling; and it will do so for this one reason, that it is God's truth, and because we, through the grace of God, have boldness and faith to put our trust in it."

NOWHERE in the United States have the labors of the Catholic Church been blessed with more abundant fruit than in the New England States. When, in the early part of the century, Bishop Cheverus was consecrated Ordinary of Boston, Catholics enjoyed but little honor, and immunity from insult could scarcely be enumerated among their privileges; but to-day their voice is strong, and they claim attention. Every hamlet and town possesses its church, an eloquent testimony to the generosity and faith of Catholics. The Catholic population outnumbered by nearly a quarter of a million the combined membership of the Protestant Churches. On the other hand, Protestantism is rapidly decreasing, so much so, in fact, that the New York Herald does not hesitate to say that while the Catholic churches are filled to overflowing, the Protestant church attendance, all through New England, and particularly in the country districts, is constantly falling off. Many Protestant church buildings, like many New England farms, are practically abandoned.

A SHORT time ago the CATHOLIC RECORD called attention to the fact that no history of the early Catholicity of this country had as yet been given to the world. We did so fearful that the heroic and inspiring records of the early missionaries might for decades to come remain locked up in libraries to be looked upon merely by archivists, and not to be read by all true lovers of our country. Since then we have learned that in a few months "The History of the Early Missions in Western Canada" will be given to the public. The work is from the pen of a scholarly cleric, well known and endeared to many by his zeal and priestly virtues. He has well earned the meed of Canada's gratitude, and we predict for his history a most favorable reception. We have received a most flattering letter from the publishers expressing its thanks to the RECORD for its timely and prophetic reference.

POPE LEO XIII., eager to show his love for aught that concerns humanity, has sent some very interesting historical documents to the World's Fair at Chicago; and it were reasonable considering the large part the Church has taken in the discovery of America. The first is a paper, dated 1448, containing a description of America and granting power to the Norwegian prelates to ordain priests and to assign them missions in Greenland. The second document is the Bull of Alexander VI., conceding to King Ferdinand and Queen Isabella of Spain power over territory discovered, or to be discovered, through Spanish enterprise. The others contain an amplification of the preceding privileges. There is one that must arouse much interest—namely, the document granting Father Boyle, the priest who accompanied Columbus on his second voyage, power and authority to administer the government of the discovered islands in temporal and spiritual matters. The Brief is dated June 25, 1493. Besides these, His Holiness intends sending two ancient charts.

THE BROWNISTS, or Congregationists, of London, England, held a demonstration in Hyde Park on 8th April, in honor of Barrows, Penry and Greenwood, who were executed just three hundred years ago by Queen Elizabeth for following their own ideas on religion, and not conforming to the English Church, which the Queen helped to establish for the use of the people of England. They had surely as much right to make a religion to suit themselves, instead of the one made by God, as the Queen herself had. Nevertheless the fact is worthy of notice as it shows how truly we are told that the Reformation was brought about in the interest of religious liberty. The Brownists named above were hanged at Tyburn in 1593.

THE TORONTO MAIL has become very

solicitous for the welfare of the Irish Catholic Unionists who joined in petitioning the Government against the Home Rule Bill. It points to the fact that among the signers of the petition, which declares that Home Rule would be prejudicial to the Catholic religion, there is a son of Daniel O'Connell, which is true, but he is a degenerate son of a noble father. The number of signatures obtained to this petition after it had been hawked all over the country, was just forty; so there are forty Catholics in Ireland, including some landlords and landlords' agents, who think they know what will be injurious to the Catholic religion, better than practically the whole population, including the hierarchy, the priesthood and the laity.

THE BROWNISTS, or Congregationists, of London, England, held a demonstration in Hyde Park on 8th April, in honor of Barrows, Penry and Greenwood, who were executed just three hundred years ago by Queen Elizabeth for following their own ideas on religion, and not conforming to the English Church, which the Queen helped to establish for the use of the people of England. They had surely as much right to make a religion to suit themselves, instead of the one made by God, as the Queen herself had. Nevertheless the fact is worthy of notice as it shows how truly we are told that the Reformation was brought about in the interest of religious liberty. The Brownists named above were hanged at Tyburn in 1593.

MR. ARTHUR BALFOUR made an amusing blunder in sending to the Kilrush Town Commissioners his congratulations on a resolution which they had passed, which he had construed as against the Home Rule Bill. He wrote:

"I beg to acknowledge your letter of the 3rd inst., enclosing a resolution passed at a special meeting of the Kilrush Town Commissioners strongly condemning the Home Rule Bill. I note with great gratification the energetic protest which those who desire to see preserved unimpaired the existing constitution of the United Kingdom, on which the prosperity of Ireland so largely depends, have made against the ruinous proposals of Mr. Gladstone's Government."

The resolution of the Commissioners expressed great delight with Mr. Gladstone's Bill "as doing justice to a country that had suffered much from all forms of misgovernment during the past century." Mr. Balfour's letter first astonished and then amused the Commissioners.

COLONEL SAUNDERS, the political gymnast of the Tory party, is doing much good in bringing prominently before the public the services Irish Catholics have rendered to England. Not that he wishes to do so, but his exaggerations—to put it mildly—provoke now and then an article that disseminates prejudice and throws a strong light on the attitude of Irishmen. The valiant colonel said some time ago, in an address at Liverpool, that "it was not possible that this great nation who defeated the French at Waterloo was to fall at last victims to such an army and such a crew as was represented by the seventy priest-elects men below the gangway." A non-conformist, writing to the *Liverpool Daily Post*, shows, on the most unmistakable evidence, what little credence may be attached to the incoherent rhapsodies of Saunders. Addressing the British Parliament after the war, the Duke of Wellington said:

"It is already well known to Your Lordships that of the troops which Our Gracious Sovereign did meet he honor to entrust to my command at various periods during the year, at least one-half were Roman Catholics. My lords it is mainly to the Irish Catholics that we owe our proud pre-eminence in our military career, and that I personally am indebted for the laurels with which you have been pleased to decorate my brow. We must confess, my lords, that without Catholic blood and Catholic valor no victory could ever have been obtained, and the first military talents might have been exerted in vain."

These are words well worth treasuring, serving as they do as the strongest possible argument to the bigoted attacks of anti-Home Rulers.

IT IS A FACT worthy of notice that Queen Victoria during her recent visit to Italy did not go to Rome to pay her respects to King Humberto, though the latter invited her most cordially and did all in his power to obtain from England's sovereign even this dubious recognition of the base means by which his father, Victor Emmanuel, got possession of the Eternal City. It is said that Queen Victoria will never visit Rome, any more than the Emperor Francis Joseph, as long as the usurping king makes his residence there.

AN EPISCOPAL MINISTER

REBUKES THE CONSPIRATORS.

The Members of the A. P. A. and the P. P. A. Shown in Their True Colors—A Scathing Denunciation of Their Dark-Lantern Methods.

A few weeks ago we printed a condensed report of an article written by Rev. John Williams, pastor of St. Barnabas' Episcopal Church, Omaha, Neb., in his newspaper, the *Parish Messenger*. This week, by special request, we give the document in its entirety. It is a most learned, incisive and able production; and after a careful study of its arguments a P. P. A. man possessing a grain of intelligence and common sense should sever his connection with that abominable conspiracy which is degrading manhood and disgracing our country. It will be well to remember that although the rev. gentleman is dealing with the A. P. A. of the United States, every word he has written strikes with equal force the P. P. A. of Ontario, which is its counterpart:

The "patriots" who have all at once sprung up all over the land to save American institutions from the grasp of the Pope, have, or appear to have, a corner on all true American spirit and love of this glorious land of the free. He is an American and he only who stands opposed to the Pope, to save the land and its institutions from his grasp which is already stretched forth to enslave if not to murder us all. No matter where a man was born, or whether he has or has not taken the oath of allegiance to support the flag and the constitution of this land, or renounced his allegiance to every foreign prince or potentate, including William of Orange, he is a good enough American if he only hates the Pope and the priests, and is ready to take any public office, in sight, to rule over the land.

It is true the constitution and laws of this land make no such test of Americanism, and until they do it would seem perfectly competent for any citizen, native or foreign-born, to love or hate the Pope as he sees fit, provided he refrains from interfering with his neighbor's lawful right to do the exact opposite.

But our new "Americans" proceed solemnly to declare that every man who will not swear with them, and train with them is no true American at all. He is a slave to the Pope; he is a tool to the Roman hierarchy; he is 'bought up'; he is courting the favor of the Catholics; or, most dreadful of all, he is a Jesuit in disguise.

The American politely but firmly declares of us that we are "a Jesuit in the garb of a Protestant minister." Of course, that settles the question of our American citizenship, and of our power to speak the truth, once for all; and we feel very much like the man without a country or a religion. The American has read us out of the honored roll of American citizens, and from the only salvation insuring company of the Protestant churches, and yet we know we are resting under the Papal anathema, and the Jesuits, we are positive, would not acknowledge us. Surely we are in a strait betwixt two dreadful gulfs, and what we shall do we know not.

Well, if it actually lay between the two, between our becoming indeed a Jesuit, or becoming one of the secret, oath-bound political association whose only bond of union is religious hate, intimately bound up with the desire of public plunder, then we should not hesitate five minutes as to the resolution at which we should arrive. For whatever sins may be laid at the door of the Jesuits, no one can justly charge them with moral cowardice, or with the infamy of warring upon women, as is the case with those "American patriots" who are represented by such sheets as the *American*.

OUR POSITION. Our position is simply that of Christian manhood. For every purpose of this debate we stand simply as a man and as a Christian, utterly laying aside for the time every contention that may exist between Canterbury and Rome; just as we would lay aside every contention that might exist between Canterbury and Geneva, if it were the Presbyterian Church that was attacked by such anti-Christian defamation as that with which the *American* assails Roman Catholics week after week.

We are not in a position to speak for the Roman Catholic Church as an ecclesiastical organization, whose dominating head sits enthroned at Rome, supreme by Divine right, over all Christians and over all earthly powers. That goes without saying, or we would not stand where we do, not "in the garb of a Protestant minister," for it would be hard to determine just what that is, but in the vestments of an Anglican priest.

The Roman contention and the Jesuit position are perfectly open to the world. Neither Rome nor the Jesuits seek to conceal it. So far as that differs from Anglican Christianity, minus Anglican prejudice, we must relegate the task of defending it to other hands. But if to be an Anglican meant to be a Christian whose heart burned not with Christian indignation to see his fellow Christians slandered, and Christian womanhood insulted by every ruffianly assassin, then we would fling the name from us with utter loathing and contempt.

But over and above what it pleases the *American* to say of Roman Catholics, as to their personal character, it pleases it also to assail what is, or

what should be, sacred to every real Christian, of whatever name or country. The *American* is pleased to say that it will not impugn our motives or our Christianity. We care not. For our own personality in this debate we care not a straw. We stand simply as a man to denounce the unmanly warfare which the *American* wages on Christian womanhood; as a Christian to denounce its infidel attack on principles that are common both to Catholic and to Protestant Christianity; as an American citizen, not by the accident of birth indeed, but by the deliberate choice of our manhood, to denounce the utterly un-American methods of an alien organization, that seeks, not only to infringe the right of citizens of the Republic to earn their own living honestly, or to serve in public station, or to worship God as they see fit, but which also seeks to impair the liberty of other citizens by the imposition of secret oaths, so that they are no longer free and untrammelled, to vote as judgment and conscience may dictate, without having hanging over them the baleful shadow of a violated oath. If Roman Catholics are plotting, 10,000,000 of them, to destroy the civil and religious liberty of the other 60,000,000 of us, that should be susceptible of proof. It needs no secret oaths, no slanderous convales, to put real Americans on guard, or to arm them to make sure and swift warfare on the ungrateful minds who first found a refuge and an asylum from oppression and starvation under the broad, enfolding banner of this American nation, and then conspire to destroy it.

Accused surely would be the Irish heart, or the Irish hand that could plot or uplift itself against the sacred folds of the banner that floats in azure above the land that saved the Irish people from perishing wholly, on the bleak, wind-swept hillsides of poor, wretched, landlord-cursed Ireland. But if they are such doubly damned traitors to the land that sheltered and protected and saved them, as to plot, with arms in their hands, to subjugate America to an Italian prelate, then let their old-time Orange enemies come out into open day and present the proof of the conspiracy. The American people are not in the habit of dallying with treason from any source.

If the Jesuits are plotting, and the Irish are arming, and the priests and monks are making ready to exchange the surplice and the cowl for the sword and the rifle; if the Roman Catholic hierarchy are assassins and traitors, and the oath-bound patriots who tell us all this, know it, let them come out like men and declare the proof. If they have proof of Roman Catholic treason in the assassination of Lincoln and Garfield, the courts are open, and American juries can be readily found, without remotest taint of sympathy with Rome, to convict the priestly assassins. But if this new race of Americans, with an Orange hue, have no such proofs to offer, then let them and their abettors stand convicted of infamous slander and falsehood, of unlawful conspiracy against the reputation and liberty of citizens, and against the peace of the Republic.

But Roman Catholics are aiming to bring America into spiritual subjugation to the Bishop of Rome! Who ever doubted that? Of course they are. That is their sacred right, guaranteed them by the Constitution. But in this they are doing no more and no less than what any other class of religionists, or anti-religionists are doing, if they have a spark of earnestness about them. Only the other day some American came back from a foreign shore, fully resolved to convert us all to the religion of Islam, of which the Sultan of Turkey is the spiritual head. His right to do it is unquestioned, and when he wins over the majority of us, he shall make short shrift with the rest.

When the Roman Church wins over the majority in this land it will have the unquestioned right, on democratic principles, to govern the nation. If the rest of us are alive and do not like it, we can immigrate to Africa or elsewhere, where the Pope has not yet extended his sway, if there should be any such country left unconquered by the Omnipotent Jesuits.

The Roman Catholic Church and the Jesuits have the legal, the constitutional right to win America for the Pope by all lawful methods, just as Anne Besant has the legal rights to win it for Madam Blavatsky.

Whenever they resort to unlawful methods, the courts are open, and Americans have a very swift way of dealing with treason. As for accusing Roman Catholics of treason because they hope, and are seeking, to convert this land to their faith, that is the bitter prompting of their hereditary enemies. We are all seeking to win the land to our views, religious or otherwise. And the Roman Catholics would be doubly dyed traitors to their faith and to their country if they did not try to do it. If they are seeking to do it in any other way than as the laws of the land will permit then let it be proven against them, and let the unlawful crusade be brought to an end. But until the anxious patriots, who are trying to prevent the conversion, with force of arms and with Jesuit guile, of 60,000,000 by 10,000,000 can bring actual proof of our peril, we do not think that there need be any immediate alarm about the near future. As for the remote future we can trust that to God, and to our posterity. These can take care of the land with the starry flag still floating above it, we trust, without necessity of blinding its tri-colored symbol of love, purity and hope, in hateful alliance with the Orange symbol of jaundiced hate.

The *American* asks us to make answer to a long string of questions

which it says it asked Bishop Scannell some months ago without receiving reply. Of course it received no reply. It surely did not expect to receive a reply to its wretched, insulting questioning. Neither are we under any sort of necessity to answer it now, even if we held any faculty from Bishop Scannell to speak for the Roman Catholic Church, which we certainly do not. But if Bishop Scannell will permit us just for the time to stand in the place, we will consent to answer the *American's* questions:

Does not the Roman Catholic Church hold that persons married outside the influence of said Church—those married by ministers of other denominations and by civil officers—are NOT LEGALLY MARRIED?

Answer. No, the Roman Catholic Church holds nothing of the sort. But if it did, it would be doing nothing worse than that which William of Orange and his successors did, by English law, until a very recent period. Within our own lifetime it was necessary for Roman Catholics and other Non-conformists to be married by an Anglican clergyman in order to be legally married. Before the wife of even a private soldier who was fighting under England's flag, could draw half pay, she had to be married by an Anglican priest, even though she were already married by a Roman Catholic priest, or a dissenting minister. Her marriage was not legal otherwise.

Surely an Orangeman ought not to quarrel with the Roman Catholic Church for doing what England used to do. But the Roman Church takes no such absurd position. It would have to fling the dark stain of illegitimacy across the brows of too many illustrious sons whom it has won from Anglicanism and Protestantism if it did it.

Does it not hold that the wives of ALL men so married are CONCUBINES, and their children are illegitimate?

Answer. No; but if it did, that is what English law did a generation ago to Roman Catholics married outside of the pale of the Anglican Church. It is what the *American* would doubtless be glad to see done here and now to them, if its venomous hate could have its way.

Do you not believe and teach that the Pope has power to absolve from all sins, and FROM OATHS OF ALLEGIANCE?

Answer. Let the question be divided. To the first half, yes, subconditionally, as a Jesuit might say. When penitence intervenes between the sinner and his sin the Roman Church teaches that the Pope can absolve from all sins. Otherwise God Himself cannot absolve from sin, for it would be contrary to His justice and nature to do it. But the Protestant ministerial attache of the *American* would do as much as the Pope and more, for the latter generally suffers the transgressor to endure the pains of purgatory, while the Protestant ministerial attache sends him straight to heaven the moment he dies. If the editor of the *American* believes in a heaven or a hell at all, and had opportunity we are quite sure he would also send the vilest sinner straight to heaven as soon as he found grace sufficient to take the "patriotic" oath. But woe betide the unfortunate Jesuit, though he were a St. Francis Xavier in holiness of life, who had to depend on him for absolution in order to scale the heights of heaven!

As to absolving subjects from their allegiance the power to do that used to be asserted by the Popes and the right has never been formally abandoned; but if the *American* would only take the time to make a historical pause for a minute or two, the power to absolve subjects from their allegiance to their sovereign was not an exclusively Papal claim in these by-gone times. The subjects of Mary Queen of Scots were absolved from their allegiance by John Knox and the Scotch Presbyterians. The subjects of Charles I. of England were absolved from their allegiance by the Presbyterian divines, and Charles' own head cut off without the slightest question as to the Divine right of a Protestant minister to give absolution for treason to a sovereign. The subjects of James II. were absolved from their allegiance and his crown given without scruple to the *American's* patron saint, William of Orange, whose "glorious, pious and immortal memory" is being held in devout contemplation among us to this day, by processions, band, banners, and such like things.

In olden times Popes and other ministers used to claim extraordinary powers, which sometimes were used well, and sometimes not well. But to make bugaboos of these things when the world has swept by them is only worthy of "patriots" of the *American* order. There is not a Roman Catholic country in the world to-day in which the Pope would dare attempt to dethrone the ruler of it; and here in America when the citizens wish to be released from their allegiance to their own flag and constitution, they have already the power in their own hands. They will not be at all apt to go abroad a century ago for absolution when they released themselves from their allegiance to King George.

Do you not believe and teach, that all who die without embracing that religion are damned, and that they all go to hell?

Answer. No, the Roman Catholic Church teaches no such merciless doctrine. John Calvin it was and his disciples who taught that the vast majority of the human race were hopelessly condemned to eternal flames. William of Orange was a disciple of Calvin, and as he is the *American's* patron saint, by whom it swears, it ought to be fair-minded enough to admit that according to Roman Catholic teaching an "innumerable host will be among the redeemed in Heaven, who are often