

The Catholic Record

Published every Friday morning at 428 Richmond Street.

Annual subscription, \$2.00
Six months, \$1.00
Single copies, 10 cents.

ADVERTISING RATES.
Ten cents per line for first, and five cents per line for each subsequent insertion. Advertisements measured in nonpareil type, 12 lines to an inch.

Contract advertisements for three, six or twelve months, special terms. All advertisements should be handed in not later than Tuesday morning.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.
All matter intended for publication must have the name of the writer attached, and must reach the office not later than Tuesday noon of each week.

THOS. COFFEY,
Publisher and Proprietor.

LETTER FROM HIS LORDSHIP BISHOP WALSH.

LONDON, Oct. 23, 1879.
DEAR MR. COFFEY:—As you have become proprietor and publisher of the CATHOLIC RECORD, I deem it my duty to announce to its subscribers and patrons that the change of proprietorship will work no change in its one and principal object, which is, and it has been, thoroughly Catholic, entirely independent of political parties, and exclusively devoted to the cause of the Church and to the promotion of Catholic interests. I am confident that under your experienced management the RECORD will improve in usefulness and efficiency; and I therefore earnestly commend it to the patronage and encouragement of the clergy and laity of the diocese.

Believe me, yours very sincerely,
+ JOHN WALSH,
Bishop of London.

MR. THOMAS COFFEY,
Office of the "Catholic Record."

Catholic Record.

LONDON, FRIDAY, NOV. 26, 1880.

THE MASSACRE OF ST. BARTHOLOMEW.

That a great number of Huguenots were fully and treacherously put to death in the French capital and other cities on the eve of St. Bartholomew's feast day, 1572, is a fact that no one acquainted with history can possibly deny. But on whose guilty shoulders does the blame then rest? Who is responsible before the world and before God for such monstrous deeds of blood? Certainly not Papal Rome, or the Catholic Church—as many Protestants, ignorant of history, maintain—notably amongst whom the name of Rev. S. M. Baldwin, rector, Montreal, stands out conspicuous. Nothing could be further from the mind and heart of the saintly Pontiff then reigning in Rome, Pius V., than ordaining or sanctioning deeds of violence or bloodshed. Besides, it is laid down in canon law, as it stood in ancient times, and as it stands to-day, that "any person who concurs actively, either directly or indirectly, in the death or mutilation of any human being, be he Catholic or heretic, Jew or pagan, becomes irregular, that is to say, such person cannot be promoted to Holy Orders or exercise Holy Orders, if he have actually received them." Notwithstanding this emphatic and well-known law of the Church, ministers of the Gospel, who ought to know better, will stand up in their pulpits and asseverate that it has been always taught in the Catholic Church "that to destroy heretics is pleasing to Almighty God—and that if Papal Rome does not persecute and crush out heresy by fire and sword—it is solely because she has not the power." We learn from history that never was the power of Papal Rome so great or so irresistible as during the nine centuries that elapsed between the reign of Constantine, or Pope Sylvester (315), and the Council of Lateran (1213). Yet, during that long period of Rome's undisturbed and undisputed supremacy and power, there is no mention made of heretics being chastised corporally, or put to death, or tortured, on account of their opinions, however distasteful and abhorrent. The Manichæans, the Arians, the Monothelites, the Gnostics, the Pelagians, &c., &c., were allowed to preach their absurd doctrines unmolested by the secular power. The Church condemned their errors, as in duty bound, but never had recourse to the civil power to aid in their suppression. Pope Leo the Great, writing concerning the Manichæan heretics, who, as he asserted, "laid aside all modesty, prohibiting matrimony and subverting all laws, human and divine," says: "The ecclesiastical lenity was content, even in this case, with the sacerdotal judgment, and avoided all sanguinary punishment (Epist. ad Tarib.). In the same century two Spanish bishops, having interfered in the capital punishment of certain Priscillian heretics, the other bishops of the Church refused to communicate with them. St. Ambrose, of Milan, reprobated their conduct—as did also St. Martin of Tours, who

wrote saying, "it was sufficient that they had been declared heretics, and that there was no precedent of an ecclesiastical cause being brought before a secular judge." The first heretics mentioned in history as having been chastised by the State are the Albigenses, whose errors were condemned in the Council of Lateran (1215) exactly three hundred years before the Reformation. And these latter were punished, not indeed because of their doctrines, however infamous and anti-social, but on account of the excesses they committed in the name of religion.

Fancied they were authorized by their religious principles to rise in open rebellion and slay and destroy all around them who did not join in their belief, they played themselves under the leadership of the powerful counts of Toulouse, Foix and Comminges, and carried fire and sword through the neighboring Provinces, burning churches, pillaging monasteries, waging war upon Christianity, morality and nature itself. However, the council merely condemned their doctrines; the king of France undertook to repress rebellion and punish violations of the civil law. But why were the Huguenots persecuted?—or were they really persecuted?—we appeal to a Protestant historian, Dr. Heylin, who says: "It was agreed upon by the Huguenot chiefs, 'that a certain number of men should repair to the king at Blois, and tender a petition for the free exercise of their religion. But these petitions were backed by multitudes of armed men, who, on the king's denial of so just a suit, should violently break into the court, seize on the person of the king, surprise the queen and put the guises to the sword (the guises were the heads of the Catholic party), and that being done, free exercise of religion should be proclaimed—the affairs of the Realm committed to Prince Conde and all the rest of the confederates gratified with rewards and honors." This scheme, styled the conspiracy of Amboise, was, however, frustrated and the armed bands completely routed, while such was the moderation of the king, that a free pardon was granted to all the conspirators, provided they laid down their arms and retired to their homes. This lenient disposition of the monarch had no effect on the chiefs of the Huguenots, for they caused great tumults to be raised in Poitiers, Languelec and Provence. "In Dauphiny they seized upon siders of the Catholic Churches, for the exercise of their religion, drove out the Catholic priests and acted as though all matters in the conspiracy had succeeded."

A short time previous to the massacre of St. Bartholomew, the Huguenots assembled in armed bands and laid siege to the city of Lyons. Then they practiced on Narbonne, the chief city of Languelec, after which they attempted to carry and plunder the Pope's city of Avignon. At Pomiers, in the Earl of Foix, says Dr. Heylin, they (the Huguenots) taking offence at a solemn procession on Corpus Christi Day, took up arms, and falling upon those whom they found unarmed, not only made a great slaughter among the churchmen, but in the heat of their fury burnt down their houses—which outrage being suffered to pass unpunished, (as it occurred in the Province of Navarre, whose queen was a fierce Huguenot) gave both encouragement and example to some furious zealots to commit the like in other places, as namely: at Montauban, Cefion, Lodez, Valence, &c., being all situate in provinces where the Huguenots were predominant in power and numbers.

These outrages, and many others, too numerous to mention in a newspaper article, were the chief causes of the massacre of St. Bartholomew. Queen Catherine of Medicis, then regent of France, who, to further her own ambitious aims, ordered the massacre, would not have been aided and abetted in her murderous designs were not the French people already goaded to madness beyond endurance by the lawlessness and the sanguinary excesses of the Huguenots in every Province where they gained a foothold. But to maintain that the Catholic Church is in any manner responsible for such a foul and un-

pardonable crime, is an outrage upon history. Great stress is laid upon the fact that a *Te Deum* was chanted in St. Peter's, at Rome, to celebrate the event. But this is explained easily enough by recollecting that telephones or carograms did not exist in those days. The Pope had to rely for news on the Queen's envoy, who brought despatches to the effect that "a murderous plot against the royal family had been discovered, and the ringleaders put to death." The secret despatches transmitted to Rome by Salviati, the Pope's Nuncio at Paris, and published in Mackintosh's history (vol. 3rd) as quoted by Lingard (ch. iv. page 143) prove beyond any possibility of dispute, 1st, That the massacre was rather an accidental occurrence than the result of a premeditated plot, and secondly, that the Pope was not made acquainted with the real facts for fully two months after the horrible transaction. It is certain also that no priest or bishop's name is mentioned in connection with the massacre, except in so far as affording shelter and protection to the Huguenot refugees who fled to them in the moment of danger. An old history, printed in Paris, 1752, now lying before us, states: "that the clergy who had most to suffer from the Huguenots were the first to interfere in their behalf. The Bishop of Lisieux, John Henninger, protected and saved all the Calvinists in his diocese, so much so that great numbers of them returned in time of peace to express their deep gratitude, and several of them embraced the Catholic faith." [Abbregé de l'Histoire Eccl.]

THE SOLID SOUTH.

Any important and vital factor in American politics must always prove of interest to the people of Canada. The American Republic was fifteen years ago the theatre of the greatest social and political revolution ever witnessed on this continent. Several of the commonwealths then forming part of the Republic seceded from the union of States and formed themselves into an independent confederacy. The agitation in favor of the abolition of slavery within the territory of the United States had culminated in 1860 in the election on the 6th of November of that year of Abraham Lincoln, of Illinois, and Hannibal Hamlin, of Maine, the candidates of the anti-slavery party, as President and Vice-President respectively of the American Republic. Though one hundred and eighty of the three hundred and three members of the electoral colleges were selected to support these candidates the record of the popular vote throughout the union showed that one-third of the ballots cast at the election were in favor of Lincoln and Hamlin. On the 7th of November, 1860, the very day after that of the polling for the Presidency, the State legislature of South Carolina issued a call for a State convention to consider the position of that State towards the other commonwealths in regard of the question of slavery upon which the Presidential election had been contested. The convention met on the December following, and passed unanimously an ordinance of secession from the union, in accordance with which the State Governor at once published a proclamation declaring the State of South Carolina to be "a separate, sovereign, free and independent State." This sharp and decisive action on the part of South Carolina brought matters at once to a crisis. The slave States, dreading the inauguration of President-elect Lincoln, were almost immediately led into following the bold example of South Carolina. On the 9th of January, 1861, Mississippi seceded from the union, on the 10th of the same month, Florida; on the 11th, Alabama; on the 19th, Georgia; on the 26th, Florida; on the 18th of February, Texas; Virginia followed on the 17th of April; Arkansas and Tennessee on the 6th of May; North Carolina on the 20th of the same month. All efforts to induce Kentucky, Missouri, Delaware and Maryland, strong pro-slavery States, to withdraw from the union, failed, but the sympathy of large bodies of the people in all the border States was certainly with the secessionist States throughout the war. Of the result of the struggle we need but say that

it terminated in the complete discomfiture of the Southern confederacy. Slavery was abolished, and the blacks immediately enfranchised. By the intervention of Congress, State governments were set up throughout the South in the interest of the freed men, in many cases to the exclusion of the whites. The sudden, and, in our estimation, unjustifiable elevation of the colored population from a position of servitude to one of domination, served to engender a feeling of rancor and bitterness between both races, certain to have but one termination, the speedy restoration of the superior race to supremacy. What added to the bitterness of the white population was the importation of political adventurers from the North, who, by means of the votes of the ignorant, and through no fault of these easily deceived colored people, rode into office and emolument. The feeling of revulsion against such rule made itself manifest very soon after the war in many of the Southern States, as well those that had seceded as those pro-slavery States which had not seceded, but found themselves now obliged to recognize negro suffrage. In the short space of ten years, in every State from Texas to Delaware, the white man has again become the ruler, and the South more solid than at any former period in her history. If we go back to the records of the Presidential contests since 1832 we find no such display of unanimity on the part of the South as that witnessed on the 2nd of November, 1880, when its sixteen States cast their one hundred and thirty-eight votes for Gen. Hancock. The electoral vote of the South in 1832 was divided by General Jackson, who received 89, and his various competitors, who received 34. In 1836, Martin Vanburen was the Democratic candidate. The South gave him 71 votes and 55 to his opponent. But in 1840 the South abandoned him, casting 78 of its electoral votes for his Whig opponent, Gen. Harrison, five Southern States only, with an electoral vote of 48, supporting the Democratic nominee. In 1844 the slave States gave their adherence to the Democracy by a vote of 67 to 47, but in 1848 again abandoned that party, 66 Southern electors supporting Gen. Taylor and 55 Lewis Cass, the Democratic candidate. In 1852 the pro-slavery States rallied almost unanimously, for the first time in many years, around one candidate, Franklin Pierce, of New Hampshire, thirteen States giving him 96 electoral votes against 24 cast by two States on narrow popular majorities against him. In the triangular contest of 1856 between Messrs. Buchanan, Fremont and Fillmore, the first named candidate received 112 out of the 120 Southern votes cast—the heaviest pro-slavery vote ever cast for one candidate. In 1860 the Southern vote lost its solidity, there being 72 for Breckenridge, 39 for Bell and 9 for Douglas, candidates all friendly to Southern institutions. At the election of 1864, eleven of the Southern States did not vote, but in 1868 all but three had been reconstructed and voted, but the recently enfranchised colored element enabled the Republican party to secure 57 out of the 110 electoral votes of the South in that election. The election of 1872 witnessed an equal division of Southern States between the candidates for the Presidency, but of the total vote of 138 cast by those States, Gen. Grant obtained but 58, while in 1876 but 19 votes from the South were counted for the Republican candidate. We say counted, for we do not believe that these votes were legally cast in his favor. At all events, the last two elections, particularly the last, shows a "solid South" more pronounced in its determination to uphold the right of each State, as against federal encroachment, than at any previous election. It is not indeed a matter of wonder that Republican politicians look upon the attitude of the South with dismay. To a very large extent the "solid South" of to-day is of their own creation. A Republican journalist thus defines the situation:

"The solid South presents the greatest problem to the new administration. It is a danger to our whole future, not because the people of that section are agreed to vote the Democratic ticket, but because the party there in power have agreed to eliminate from their politics the American methods of free discussion and a fair vote."

It is the entail of 138 votes to a single party, secured to them beyond the reach of popular persuasion and agitation of any sort, and with the need of but 47 Northern votes to secure them the Presidency. It is the ruin of political methods within these States, through the agreement to substitute fraud, if not violence, for the honest ascertainment of the popular will. It is the moral injury done to the young men of these States, in bringing them up amid political associations which cannot but lower their respect for law and order. Against such a solid South no similar solid North either is or can be arrayed. If the North is found solid, or nearly so, it is the result of the free judgment of the majority upon national issues."

We subscribe to the statement that the solid South presents the greatest problem to the new administration, but cannot endorse this writer's subsequent statements of the position and feeling of the South, but are more inclined to view with favor his definition of the duties of the Republican party towards that section of the country:

"If the Republican party is to retain its hold on the popular confidence, it must approach the Southern question in an earnest and even judicial spirit. It must show that it has no by-ends in view in attempting a solution, and especially that it does not aim at the restoration of the carpet-bag governments, and the permanence of the Republican rule in the Southern States. It must welcome any and every sort of co-operation on the part of the Southern people of the better sort, who are groaning under Bourbonism and its violence. It must show a disposition to deal generously with the South, as for instance in the matter of national appropriations for internal improvements. And it must do all this with no hope of a partisan advantage, casting its bread upon the waters in the expectation of finding it after many days and in other quarters."

If the incoming Republican administration have anything of patriotic devotion to the country, it will pursue a course of justice and conciliation towards the South, seeking in every attainable manner to remove every cause for complaint on the part of Southern commonwealths and making the Southern people feel that in all respects they form part and parcel of a really free nation. By no other cause can the results of the civil war be brought to happy fruition.

THE CHINESE QUESTION.

We hear frequent mention, especially in times of election on the other side of the line, of the Chinese question. The question seems to have no very great interest for any of the commonwealths but those on the Pacific coast, but we venture to state that there is no more important question now before the American people than this Chinese question. What is the origin of the Chinese question? It is simply this: Since the early days of California's gold fever, to the present time, large bodies of working people from the Eastern States and from Europe have found homes on the Pacific slope, principally in the large towns. Accustomed to a mode of living involving considerable expenditure in the support and education of their families, they very naturally, and, we must say, very justly felt themselves aggrieved when the labor of Chinamen, with no families to support and none of the proprieties of life as recognized by the Caucasian race to maintain, was introduced by speculators into California and the contiguous States with the view of diminishing their own just claims to equitable remuneration for their work. No white laborer could or would object to Chinamen getting work at such a figure as they might demand if it did not lead to serious loss and injustice to himself. But the white laborer, having a family to support and having taxes to pay in support of State, Municipal and National Governments, considers it a wrong and a crying grievance that the Chinaman, who maintains no family relations, pays no taxes, sends all his savings abroad and defies all efforts at absorbing him into American society, should be protected in the injustice he inflicts on the white working classes in reducing the price of labor to a figure menacing these latter and their families with starvation. No one but one who understands the position of the white working population on the Pacific coast can fully appreciate the magnitude of this question. The Chinese Empire, having a population of nearly five hundred millions, could at any time flood the whole of America with millions of its people to the social and moral detriment of the nation. The Chinaman in America is, we admit, without directly intending it, an enemy to the white

race. He comes as an alien and remains an alien. He gives indeed outward obedience to the American civil law, but is as much bound by the secret edicts set in force by his own countrymen in America as if that law had really no existence. There is certainly no excuse for the murder and outrage committed by the lower classes of the Pacific coast on the Chinese inhabitants. But the government, while protecting the lives and rights of the Chinamen, should recognize the impossibility of two races living in peace together. The growth of the Chinese population in America means the decadence of the white laboring classes. These latter, constituting the very bone and sinew of the nation, should be fostered and protected, even, in our opinion, to the complete removal, if necessary, of the Chinese element. The whole question is one that must need soon receive attention from the Washington Government, and, perhaps at no distant day require prompt and energetic action.

BISHOP CLEARY.

On Sunday, the 21st, His Lordship Bishop Cleary was consecrated Bishop of Kingston. The Right Rev. prelate was consecrated by His Eminence Cardinal Simeoni, assisted by His Grace the Most Rev. Dr. Croke, Archbishop of Cashel and His Lordship the Bishop of Waterford. We understand that the new bishop will visit Dungarvan, his native parish, immediately after his consecration, and will embark at an early date for his Canadian home.

TO THE CHARITABLE.

We hope to see the City Hall crowded on Thursday evening of this week, on the occasion of the lecture to be delivered by Rev. Father O'Mahony. The subject of the lecture is an interesting one. We feel certain it will be done full justice to. As the proceeds are to be devoted to the poor who receive assistance from the London Conference of the St. Vincent de Paul Society, we are confident that the charitably-disposed will come forward in large numbers to assist these gentlemen in their noble mission of charity.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

THE Catholics are the largest denomination in the United States; but never yet has a Catholic sat in the White House, and from the birth of the nation till now only three Catholics have occupied seats in the President's Cabinet.

THE memorial presented to the German Emperor by the Ultramontane party on the occasion of the inauguration of the Cologne Cathedral, and praying for the reinstatement of the deposed Archbishop, has obtained no less than 40,000 signatures.

THE Queen of Greece has sent to the Pope an autograph letter from her father, the Emperor of Russia. It is said to be a reply to the Pope's appeal, made some time ago, about the Catholic Church in Poland. Since the death of the Empress the Czar has been less rigorous to the Polish Catholics; but no great concessions have been granted so far.

THE London, Ontario, Canada, Free Press Printing Company appears to have a special cable correspondent. We have often thought it most likely, judging from the tenor of this person's dispatches, that the company must be the owners of a small patch of bog in Ireland from which they have of late been unable to receive "gales" of rent. The lugubrious agent of the company is in all likelihood their cable correspondent. If not, it must surely be Mr. Bycott.

THE Pope, in receiving the Irish Bishops on the 11th inst., said he sympathized with and praised Ireland's fidelity to the Roman Catholic Church, and asked that the priests and people act concertedly to avoid revolution. One of the bishops told the Pope that the present movement was not revolutionary; that the Irishmen were loyal, and were merely fighting out the great question constitutionally.

THE infidel Government of France has adopted the means suggested by John Calvin of dealing with the Jesuits. He wrote of these men whom he regarded as his most formidable opponents: "They must be destroyed, and if it cannot be done quietly, they must be chased away

or crushed
hoods and
to chase t
The more
more nu
cause of
whom they

The Adver
following f
perturbed
many griev
system of la
the Govern
remedy this
"So far,"
thinks that
not wish to
It claims th
they keep up
purpose of g
This we thin
of the matt
ance is adu
made for red
stitutional u
a blank refu
whelming m
ored to make
lon. But my
even to b
circumstan
prised at th
agitation, a
case the lea
sincerely.

The ave
man not n
Let him b
letter and i
trunk, pock
with his ag
grinding—e
ever-watch
possessed o
ately trans
and commo
the Atlant
occurrences
are lightl
receipt of
of an Irish
amusing ac
papers, w
away; He
winter in l
ment did m
maid, who
morning i
threaten
ordered hi
station and
made the j
a revolver
his side; i
rifles in t
colored, an
perched be
threatening
French man
to Ireland,

HAR
CHRISTMAS
"LET US
OF JUST
MATTERS
NEUROS.

The Siste
preparation
Entertainm
House of P
the aid of
good work
proportion
Institution
It takes in
and provide
of a well-b
beneficial t
municipalit
from the f
and relieve
and expens
to be born
purely in t
ducted in a
strict econo
sary expens
other mean
tions of a b
circumstan
assist in th
tion. The
which will
son is inter
it is hoped
are so gen
will be so
complete st

The Spec
coming to
have suffer
tions that
to suffer.
true. The
Irishmen a
unfortunat
world "ne
wrongs, wh
relieve the
now that t
people hav
will not be
longer.
A journa
needed in
dailies hav
other with
pion boat
the other
yond law a
the latter
induced th
in a mor
sounded its
in charit
in the oth
if viewed t
glass. The
mingled f
guat, wond
"teachers"
quer. No
ability of
of much d