



EDITORIAL NOTES.

WE FIND in last week's New York Union and Catholic Times an editorial under the heading "Transfer of Archbishops—Eh!" As to the merits or demerits of the very debatable subject to which that article refers we have nothing to say. The question, at best, is a delicate one for even those who are most intimate with its every detail, on one side or the other; therefore, we, who know but very little about the subject, dare not hazard any opinion. But we can give an opinion as to the tone of the editorial in question. We scarcely like to call it vulgar, but decidedly the man who wrote it forgot for the moment whatever literary refinement he ever possessed. We cannot help characterizing it as very disrespectful, above all coming from a Catholic journal and referring to the heads of the American hierarchy. The very second sentence is anything but polite, and we use a mild term. It runs thus: "If there were anything serious in the matter 'the long head' of Gibbons, Ireland and Keane would keep it as quiet as was kept the coming of Satolli on his mission of general amnesty to priests afflicted with the displeasure of their bishops." We will not quote any more; the same disrespect is repeated throughout the article. If the New York Catholic Times considers it smart to refuse their titles to Cardinal, Archbishops and Bishops, we consider it exceedingly impolite and a mark of bad breeding. If that organ has not lost all respect for the leading members of the hierarchy, it must consider itself their equal and entitled to call them by their first names. That kind of Catholic journalism is always a source of harm, and it should be frowned down. The article in question even goes so far as to refer to persons in Washington, as well as in New York, "noted more for braying than brains." That tone is unhealthy; it is not truly Catholic; it weakens rather than assists the cause.

THE session of the Imperial House is not far off, and signs of its approach are to be noticed upon the political horizon. On last Friday, Hon. Mr. Gladstone, John Morley and Justin McCarthy held a long conference at the Prime Minister's residence. The matter under discussion was the financial proposals to be embodied in the Home Rule bill. Evidently the G. O. M. means what he says, and says what he means, when he tells us that the Home Rule question is the one of the coming session.

QUITE an amount of talk has been caused by the letter from Father Martin, the apostate priest, announcing his repudiation of Protestantism and his return to the bosom of the Church. Once already did he return and a grain went back to his family. It appears that the poor man is in a real dilemma; his family on the one hand, his Church on the other; what he supposes to be his duty towards his wife and children and what he feels to be his duty towards the sanc-

tuary that he abandoned. Two conflicting influences apparently held his poor, wavering heart in a constant state of uncertainty. Whether he has actually returned or not, we cannot say; but we think that it would be better for all parties, the public and himself, were he to be left to his own actions and his Creator. If he remains out side, the Church there is no cause for wonder nor is it a subject worthy much attention; if he has returned to the Church, the more quietly and humbly he performs his penance and makes his reparation the better.

Mrs. M. L. Shepherd told the people of Kingston (a small attendance however) that she would like to be a man that she might stump the country (a la Tarte) for a seat in the House, and once there she would show the Roman Catholics who would rule. As it is she intends to use her influence at the opening of Parliament, to settle the Manitoba School Act. This is all exceedingly lady-like, tolerant, and humble. It is a pity she were not a man, she would then be handled in a different manner by the press and the public. She accuses Catholics of intolerance and she impotently threatens all that she would do had she power. Her influence in Ottawa will not go beyond a very narrow circle, if she attempts to carry it any farther she will likely find the sergeant-at-arms upon her heels. Such people are to be pitied; but their dupes are to be despised.

SOME time ago there was great jubilation in the sectarian camp over the "astounding and most significant news," that Bishop Keane's secretary had left, turned Protestant, married a minister's daughter and started out upon a crusade against Rome. It would be very natural for a person to jump to the conclusion that the Bishop's secretary was a priest, of course that would mean another ranting anti-sacerdotal, anti-Catholic preacher. The press of the country—we mean the non-Catholic press—had a regular bonanza. It was rumored that the ex-priest was a Doctor of Divinity, and he was announced as "Rev. Dr. Snell." It appears, on the authority of Bishop Keane, that Mr. Snell, was his paid secretary, paid out of his own pocket, that he never was a priest, much less a "DD," or a Lecturer in the Washington Catholic University. He was discharged by the Bishop some three months before these matters were noised abroad. The lie has been circulated; how many of the daily newspapers—that helped to circulate it—will be honest enough to tell the true version of the story?

WE FIND the Roman correspondents are speculating upon the probable successor to Leo XIII. In fact, one despatch-sender has gone so far as to say that the Pope predicted Cardinal Serafino Vannutelli, Archbishop of Bologna, as his successor. Is it not a pity that the world cannot wait until there is at least some sign of the approaching

death of Leo XIII. before choosing the next Pope? We may say openly that neither Leo XIII. nor any other human being can regulate the question of the next incumbent of the Holy See. God Almighty, and He alone, settles that matter. Christ promised to be with His Church until the end of time, and in accordance with that promise He it is who will see to the succession of Sovereign Pontiffs. All human speculation is vain.

SOME PEOPLE cannot—or will not—grasp the difference between the civil and the canon laws, the civil tribunal and the ecclesiastical one. Yet they very readily comprehend the whole question of the harmony rather than conflict of the two laws—the human and the Divine—when it becomes a question of any other church outside the Catholic Church. In the case of the condemned publication that wants to take out a writ of mandamus against the Archbishop, the very fact of making such a threat, and of attempting seriously putting it into execution, is the very best evidence that the ban of the Church was imposed at the right time and under the proper circumstances.

THE *Witness* of the tenth has a very unhappy article under the heading, "Precedence." It pretends to ridicule the idea of any importance being attached to the act of politeness performed by Lieutenant-Governor Chapleau on New Year's Day. Then it threatens Hon. Mr. Chapleau with hints from Westminster, for having dared to place the Queen's crown at the feet of the Pope, a foreign potentate. It is too bad that there is not something done by some Catholic minister or high state official of sufficient perverseness to furnish the *Witness* with material for editorials against the Pope, the Church and the faithful. We feel for that "only religious daily," but our sentiments refuse to liquify into tears.

THE OTHER day we met with a very interesting Christmas and New Year's greeting. It comes from J. Francis Brophy, a student at the College of the Propaganda, Rome, to his friends in America. It is dated "Propaganda College, Rome, Dec. 10, 1892," and reads, "A Merry, Merry Christmas and Happy New Year, 1893." It is conveyed in nine different languages, apart from the English. It is in Syrac, Arabic, Armenian, Greek, Zulu, Chinese, Molabane, Danish and Chaldean. We might say that it is from the Propaganda that missionaries are sent all over the world.

A ROMAN despatch tells us that the Pope opened his episcopal jubilee by giving a reception to children in the Consistorial hall. There were present 500 children belonging to noble Catholic families, with their parents. A choir of children sang a hymn dedicated to Christopher Columbus, after which the Pope distributed medals among the

children and dismissed them with a blessing. What a grand old man the Pope is! How faithfully he follows the desire of his Master, who ordained that little children should be allowed to come unto Him. The venerable Head of the Church, with the vast burden of the Catholic world upon his shoulders, commences his jubilee with the "little children." This incident requires no comment. Let our readers reflect seriously upon it.

WE feel great pleasure in bidding welcome to a new daily which came into existence last Thursday. It is an eight-page paper, and bears the very attractive name of THE RAINBOW. We have not been able to find out who the editor or editress is (as the case may be); but we have gleaned from its columns the fact that it has been started in the interest of a Bazaar now going on in St. Mary's Parish. A short time ago the Rev. Father O'Donnell, one of Montreal's best and most zealous priests, became pastor of that parish. In the duties of his responsible station he has had the good fortune of having the Rev. Father Shea as assistant. He took charge of the parish when a considerable debt was upon the Church, and it is for the purpose of effacing that debt that the Bazaar in question was started. Perhaps one of the most attractive features of the whole enterprise is the daily appearance of THE RAINBOW. We do not think that anyone who has seen the make-up of this charming journal and has read its columns will deny that it is second to no paper of its kind on the continent. We wish every success to Rev. Fathers O'Donnell and Shea, to the Bazaar and to the RAINBOW.

DR. CARMAN has been trying to ape Dr. Douglas, but he can only play second fiddle in this dance. Dr. Douglas got into the arena long before Dr. Carman had any idea of coming out as he did. Here in Montreal Dr. Douglas has the satisfaction of dictating his tirades, having them published in the *Witness*, then having them read for him, while he is not obliged to hear any of the criticisms that his abuse awakens. But Dr. Carman was not so very fortunate. It happened, unhappily for him, that Dr. Allison was present. He was received with great applause and heartily cheered when he sat down, after demolishing Dr. Carman's poor little attempt at Douglasism. Thus runs the report:

"He was intimately acquainted with both men, and he felt persuaded that if Dr. Carman knew Sir John Thompson as well as he did some of his remarks would not have been made. He deprecated, in discussing public men, the introduction of matters relating to their religious belief and faith, and, in closing, assured the meeting that the Premier entertained the most kindly feeling to the Methodist Church, to which his mother and sister now belonged. He had never heard a more fervent tribute to any educational institution than that paid by Sir John Thompson in the Nova Scotia Legislature to Mount Allison. This statement of Dr. Allison was greeted with hearty applause."