

The Catholic Record.

"CHRISTIANUS NISI NOMEN EST, CATHOLICUS VERO COGNOMEN."—"CHRISTIAN IS MY NAME, BUT CATHOLIC MY SURNAME."—St. Pacian, 4th Century.

VOLUME 9.

LONDON, ONTARIO, SATURDAY, MAY 7, 1887.

NO. 447.

Catholic Record.

LONDON, SATURDAY, MAY 7, 1887.

A MAN WHO HADN'T vs. A MAN WHO HAD THE PAPERS.

Mr. MacNeil, of North Bruce, who opposed Mr. Curran's Home Rule resolutions in the Canadian commons, moved the following amendment:

"That this House desires to repeat the expressions of its deep and abiding interest in the prosperity and happiness of the people of Ireland, and its adherence to the sentiments on the subject of Home Rule enunciated in a joint address to Her Majesty from both Houses of the Canadian Parliament, passed in the session of 1882, and in resolutions adopted by this House in 1886. This House is, however, unable to form or express an opinion as to the merits or demerits of the bill for the amendment of the criminal law with respect to Ireland, now before the Imperial Parliament, in the absence of the measure itself and of the papers and evidence upon which it is based."

The member for North Bruce was unable to express an opinion on the merits or demerits of the Coercion bill without the papers and reports. In this respect he differs from Mr. Labouchere, the eminent English M. P., who with all the papers and reports before him, declared:

"We can only accentuate our opposition by going on protesting against this bill until we have been closed upon every stage, every clause, and every amendment. There are a great many stages. For instance, we can put down instructions to the committee on the second reading; while upon the clauses we can put down a series of amendments, each of them standing on its own bottom, and raising on each a question of principle. I hold that we ought to resist coercion at every stage. It is one of those vital questions upon which, if we could muster a sufficient body of men for so hazardous an enterprise, we ought in the last resort to betake ourselves in arms to the street. But we have no right to take that step unless we have a fair prospect of success; for it is a crime to shed blood uselessly. Well, I regard our action against the Coercion Bill in the House of Commons as a kind of participation in a species of sub-revolution. On the third reading of the bill I consider that English and Scotch Liberals as well as Irish Nationalists ought to be suspended as a final protest against this iniquitous bill."

The Canadian Commons took, to its honor be it said, the same view as did Mr. Labouchere, and condemned the bill.

THE FISHERIES DISPUTE.

The Fisheries' dispute, we are happy to note, nearing settlement, and the American, who were by our handful of ultra-loyal fire-eaters to be coerced and bullied into an acceptance of terms at variance with the real meaning and intent of the treaty of 1818, about to obtain all that they asked for. Salisbury dreading the effect of American condemnation of his Irish policy, has literally humbled himself to the dust in his proposition for a *modus vivendi* to the American government. What in fact is his proposition?

"Her Majesty's government and the government of Canada in proof of their earnest desire to treat the question in a spirit of liberality and friendship, and understanding that the action of the United States is in a great measure due to oblige at being called upon to pay \$1,000,000 under the Halifax fisheries award, are now willing to revert for the coming season, and if necessary for a further term, to the condition of things existing under the treaty of Washington without any suggestion of pecuniary indemnity. This is a proposal which I trust will commend itself to your government as being based on that spirit of generosity and good will which should animate two great and kindred nations, whose common origin, language and institutions constitute so many bonds of amity and concord."

In other words, American fishermen are for the present to have all the privileges for which their government was at one time forced to pay the sum of \$1,000,000 for a brief period of years. How true the opinion expressed on the 26th of March last by the Hon. Wm. MacDoughall:

"No sane man believes that a nation of sixty millions, the most intelligent, the most wealthy, the most unassailable, the most free among the nations of the world, will submit to be told by a subordinate colony of less than five millions, 'you may continue to trade with us, but only on condition that you transport your goods in such vessels and conduct your business by such of your citizens as we approve; you may license vessels engaged in the deep sea fisheries to touch and trade in foreign ports, but if they come into ours and buy or sell anything but wood' will we seize, confiscate and sell their ships and pocket the proceeds."

Believing as we do that Canada has reached the age at which she can make her own commercial treaties, we hope that an end will be put to negotiations on our behalf through the foreign office. It is a humiliation if not a disgrace—at all events a source of constant loss to us

—that we Canadians cannot treat with a kindred people at our own very doors without first having recourse to statesmen of the Salisbury stamp, eager to sacrifice us at the shrine of Imperial exigencies. In his desire to crush out Ireland, Salisbury is ready to do anything to placate America. We loyal colonists will, he believes, bear with anything. He cannot, however, placate the 14,000,000 of Irish exiles in America.

CLAIMS OF MODERN ANGLICANISM.

V.

THE KING'S SUPREMACY IN OPERATION.

We have shown that this doctrine, founded upon circumstances which alone ought to render it suspicious, is opposed to scripture, tradition, and reason. Let us now regard it in operation. A Truth is like the faultless gem. Under whatever light it is examined, its brilliancy and symmetry proclaim its worth. A falsehood, like the gem that has a flaw, may be so set as to conceal its deformity, but there is a light under which, if it is examined, the defect will become visible. The falsehood of the divine right of kings to rule the Church of God on earth, the utter absurdity of this doctrine, is visible under many aspects. Truth can never be incompatible with truth. Hence the propositions of geometry are frequently proved by indirect as well as direct proof. That is to say, a statement is proved to have an absurd consequence, and it is thence inferred that the statement is false. We have, thus, only to look into history to see the results of the doctrine of the royal supremacy, and if any of these results are absurd or false, the principle must be equally so.

There is no doctrine more clearly set forth in Holy Scripture than that there is in Christ's Church a supreme authority existing, to which we are bound to bow in faith and obedience. That Supreme Authority is to teach true doctrine, which we are bound to accept with submission of faith: it is also to prescribe rules of conduct which we must obey with submission of will. We shall not enter here upon a lengthy proof of this, but shall only advance a few testimonies which make this clear, as a necessary preliminary to proper illustration of the first absurd consequence of the dogma of royal supremacy.

The authority of the Church precedes the authority of Christian scripture, as well in point of time as in logical sequence; for the Church was established before a single word of the New Testament was written. St. Matthew's Gospel was written about A. D. 39, and the Apocalypse (Revelation) about A. D. 97, whereas the Church was founded by our Blessed Lord in person. The New Testament, therefore, speaks of the Church as an organization already existing by virtue of the words of Christ. Thus St. Paul in Ephesians iv. tells us that Christ "gave some to be Apostles, and some prophets, and others evangelists, and others pastors and teachers, for the perfection of the saints, for the work of the ministry, unto the edification of the body of Christ, till we all meet in the unity of faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God." The object of Christ's establishment of the Church is, therefore, to preserve unity of faith and the knowledge of Christ. The authority of the Church to terminate controversies of faith could not be more positively asserted. The apostle adds further that Christ has done all this "that we may not be children tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, in the wickedness of men, in craftiness, by which they lie in wait to deceive." To this authority all matters of controversy are to be referred when private admissions do not suffice for their settlement. Therefore, in the course of one of the most solemn and instructive discourses given by our Lord to his disciples He gives this rule for their guidance: "But if thy brother shall offend thee, go and reprove him between thee and him alone. If he shall hear thee, thou shalt gain thy brother, but if he will not hear thee, take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may stand. And if he will not hear them, tell the Church. And if he will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as the heathen and the publican." (St. Matt. xviii, 15-17.)

On what ground could such authority be attributed to the Church, unless the Church should continue to teach His doctrines faithfully to the end of time? So Christ promises that she shall do this. "Teach all nations . . . to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and behold I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world." xxviii, 20. Against His Church, built upon a rock, He declares that "the gates of hell shall not prevail." xviii, 18. St.

Paul declares this Church to be the pillar and ground of truth. 1 Tim. iii, 15.

At the time, therefore, when the Parliament decreed that Henry VIII. was "Supreme Head of the Church," the Church Universal was already a self-governing body, having a supreme authority within herself. We might go further, and say that she had even a Supreme Head, for this is demonstrable, and in the line of reasoning in our Article II is sufficient demonstration of this truth. However, it is here sufficient for our purpose that a supreme authority existed. All acts, therefore, of the Church, or of any section thereof, should be done in accordance with the judgments and decrees of this Authority, otherwise they were a mere usurpation. Was this done in conferring the title of Supreme Head of the Church on Henry? Instead of this, one of the first acts of the new Pope was to appoint Thomas Cromwell his "Vicar-General," a man who, though of undoubted ability, had no theological education. To Cromwell was issued a commission to enquire into the doctrine and discipline of monasteries, universities and other spiritual corporations. Cromwell was empowered to decide upon the dogmas of religion, and to make the most sweeping changes. The king was satisfied with this was enough. The Bible was published under Cromwell's sanction, the edition known as "the Cromwell Bible" with Cromwell's arms on the title page. As the American Encyclopedia tersely puts it, "the articles (of religion) that were adopted by the convocation of 1536 were not acceptable to either Protestants or Catholics, but the government, of which Cromwell was chief minister, was strong enough to enforce them." And enforced they were with vengeance! Cardinal Fisher, Sir Thomas Moore and others were executed for their refusal to acknowledge the King's Supremacy, while Protestants also were executed for not accepting the articles of religion adopted by the new Pope and his Council. Bishops received from this lay "Vicar-General" a royal commission authorizing them to perform episcopal functions, which before could be exercised only by authority derived from the known and recognized successors of the Apostle Peter. Yet we are coolly told by Bishop Cox and other Anglican divines (!) that this English Reformation delivered England from the usurpations and tyranny of the Roman Pontiff! And wherein consists this tyranny of the Pope? Simply in this, that he has always insisted that the doctrines of Christ as delivered to the Apostles are to be preserved in the Church unchanged at the whims of men, princes or peasants; that her discipline must be observed in subjection to the Supreme Head of the church appointed by Christ himself: that the unity of the church required by our Blessed Lord consists in belief in His doctrines unchanged, and obedience to the Supreme Authority which He has constituted.

But the King's Supremacy did not end with the acts we have enumerated. By virtue of it, the members of the new Church of England must believe that two and two make three, yet five at the same time. The first act of Supremacy was to declare the king's marriage with Catharine null, and to authorize him to marry Ann Boleyn. Once the supremacy was established, it was easy to shape the moral laws of the New Testament to the king's will; and thus the Reformation, which is supposed to have delivered the kingdom from the thraldom of St. Peter's acknowledged successor, hands over the moral code of Christ to the mercies of a lascivious tyrant, the allegorical history of whom is known to every English-speaking child who has mastered the mysteries of "Bluebeard."

Catharine of Arragon died in 1536. Worthy of the noble race from which she sprang she had lived, and, though separated by Act of Parliament from her lawful husband, she remained till death a virtuous queen, maintaining her own honor and the rights of her offspring, with the unflinching dignity of a heroine. Before she died she witnessed the disgrace of her by whom she had been so grievously injured. Anne was accused of inconstancy, found guilty, and executed. That grand invention, the Royal Supremacy, was ready for any emergency, and by a solemn act of the regenerate Church of England, it was decreed that the marriage of Henry and Anne had been null from the beginning!

Such are the facts by which the doctrine of the thirty-seventh Article of the Church of England is illustrated: that to the Sovereign God Himself as given the prerogative to "rule all estates and degrees committed to their charge by God, whether they be Ecclesiastical or Temporal," and to "judge all causes ecclesiastical and civil."

Where in the history of the whole

Catholic Church, or of the Pope, can such a record be found, as the page which signalizes the substitution of Royal for Petrine Supremacy? We find throughout the history of the Church the marriage tie constantly held sacred, and no power on earth, no human influence can induce the successor of St. Peter to give consent to the most powerful monarchs to inflict irreparable injury on the innocent. In the ninth century a Lothaire in Lorraine, in the 10th the Anglo-Saxon Edwy, in the 16th the English Tudor, in the 19th the founder of the French Empire, are made to feel alike that "he that will not bear the Church, let him be to thee as the heathen and the publican," whereas the very introduction of the doctrines which are to purify Christ's Church is marked with the most flagrant violations of Christian morality by the church which has the effrontery to say so sanctimoniously in its dogmas of Faith: "The Church of Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch have erred; so also the Church of Rome hath erred, not only in their living and manner of ceremonies, but also in matters of Faith." Art. xix. Is this refreshing equality equalled by the Hottentot who called the Zulu black?

CANADIAN HOME RULERS.

The friends of Ireland's just claims to self-government are subjected to much abuse at the hands of the narrow-minded foes of Irish liberty in Canada. "A Methodist from Ireland, now of Bruce County," lately wrote the Toronto *World* of the Rev. Dr. Burns, of Hamilton:

EDITOR WORLD.—Kindly publish these remarks on the radicalism of a Methodist D. D., suggested on seeing his name and picture in a conspicuous manner in a book called "The Great Irish Struggle," published by T. P. O'Connor, M. P. for Liverpool, England. I fall our Methodist leading men in connection with power were to endorse the principles of Dr. B., very soon there would be a disintegrated church in Canada. The doctor's first latitudinarian wanderings was to endorse the heterodoxy of Dr. Thomas. But he crawled out of that by garbling scriptural inspiration and other Methodist authorities. The doctor's next step was to countenance the actions of the ribbon-men, and the marauding land leaguers and their agrarian outrages in Ireland. "Mr. Hughes of Toronto, styled him correctly, when he said he was a Fenian." Again the next broad step the doctor took was to favor the Socialistic labor movement; he became all things to all men—so as that he might gain popularity—as a Reformer. The doctor's speech in Hamilton previous to the election was on a par with the Socialist Burns of London, England. But, what I have stated is not the worst of his delinquencies. In the book above referred to, the author makes an apology for the Fenian raid on Canada. And what do you think it is? To kill the Canadian settlers and plunder them in order to bring England to time, so as to free Ireland from British rule. Did anyone ever hear of such an infamous apology, to kill and murder innocent people for revenge on England. Dr. B. endorses that murderous act of the American Fenians, when he approves of the exaggerated statements of the book in question. In the third chapter of the same book the author makes another apology for the Irish Rebellion of 1798.

We have nothing to do with the strictures here pronounced on Dr. Burns for latitudinarianism and heterodoxy. Having long since convinced ourselves that no Protestant clergyman in Canada can preach with acceptability unless his rendering of "the word" be strongly tinged with latitudinarianism, unless, in fact, he preach doctrines in accord with the popular tastes, wishes and feelings, and having, besides, very settled opinions on the heterodoxy of Methodism in its every form and color, we see nothing in the strictures of the man of Bruce that could not be applied to the great majority of the clergy of that troubled, uneasy and changing sect. What troubles the "man of Bruce" and others who hold very similar views on the Irish question is that Dr. Burns has risen above passion and prejudice to declare his sympathy with an oppressed and cruelly misrepresented people. The learned doctor has never, in any of his writings or speeches, condoned or palliated agrarian outrages in any form. That he should have deserved the distinction of personal abuse at the hands of Mr. J. L. Hughes, of Toronto, is to us no matter of surprise. Some of the very best of Canadians enjoy with Dr. Burns a like distinction: abuse from such a man is not only no dishonor but a mark of undoubted merit. The "man of Bruce" is certainly hard pressed for ground of attack on Dr. Burns when he accuses him of apologizing for the Fenian Raid of 1866. There is, we think, a slight, though very perceptible, difference between an apology and an explanation. If the spirit animating the man of Bruce had not too long guided England's government of Ireland, no such institution as Fenianism would ever have disturbed Ireland or threatened Canada.

BRIGHT ON COERCION.

John Bright has declared in favor of the Tory policy of repression—and will, it is said, lend the government the aid of his eloquence in securing a majority for their Crimes Act in the House of Commons. What a change! What a falling off in the Bright of the former times who thundered against Irish misgovernment! Lamentable is it to see a life of active and honorable service in the cause of humanity tarnished by treason so dark and so cruel to his fellow-man. We turn with relief from this saddening picture of human perversity to the many utterances of Sir George Trevelyan, a leader of the Unionist party who lately wrote of the Crimes Act, whose passage the government vehemently demands:

"No true Liberal," he says, "ought to entrust such powers to them. When Lord Spencer repeatedly refused to suppress the League no word of remonstrance emanated from the Liberals. It is inconceivable that a Liberal can now support a measure empowering the executive to treat politicians as common criminals. In 1853 3,000 Orangemen on one occasion disturbed a National League meeting, their action leading to bloodshed and necessitating the calling out of troops to preserve the peace. Col. King-Harman and Mr. Holmes actively defended these unwarrantable proceedings. There is not the slightest doubt that in the event of a recurrence of such action the Orangemen would be liable under the clauses of the present bill to punishment as criminals. But the Government has effectually provided against this contingency by proposing to enact that the House of Lords may veto a proclamation by the Lord Lieutenant. The full weight of this terrible, but one-sided measure, is intended to fall and will fall upon the politicians of one party alone. The measure will be administered by those beyond all question who are actuated by the strongest Orange sympathies, and it is calculated to exasperate the people without serving any useful purpose."

These are the expressions of opinion of a statesman who knows something of the Irish question and is ready to offer a solution thereof. But Mr. Bright's action is the outcome of intense selfishness and offended pride—a monumental evidence of vanishing good sense and self-asserting prejudice and inhumanity.

CHAMBERLAIN AND HARTINGTON.

Two men whose names will descend to posterity, with special odium thereto attaching, are the Liberal Unionist leaders Chamberlain and Hartington. Both have ruthlessly trampled under foot all past professions of friendship for Ireland and taken rank with the most extreme Tories in support of the infamous Coercion act now before Parliament. Their course on this question has aroused bitter resentment among the Liberals with whom they still affect to claim connection. In the Dublin *Free Press* of April 9th appears a paragraph specially bearing on Lord Hartington:

"A large and important meeting of the Liberal Council for the Rosendale division was held on Saturday afternoon, Mr. Frank Hodson presiding. Mr. H. Maden, of Baccup, was elected president. Mr. J. Greenwood then moved the following resolution—

That in the opinion of the Liberal Council of the Rosendale Division the Crimes Bill at present being considered by the House of Commons is repugnant to the feelings of all true Liberals, and we trust that every Liberal in the house, who values the traditions of the Liberal party will use all the legitimate forms of the house to defeat its object.

Mr. Martin Barrett, an Irishman, seconded the resolution, and said the Irishmen of Rosendale owed their thanks to the Liberal party.

Mr. Jas. Barlow, of Haslingden, suggested that there should be added to the resolution "and that Lord Hartington be asked to support its prayer."

The resolution was carried unanimously in the form proposed, and copies were ordered to be sent to Mr. Gladstone, Lord Hartington, and Lord Salisbury. Mr. Barlow moved—

That it be an instruction to the executive at its first meeting to take the preliminary steps for procuring a candidate for the Parliamentary division of Rosendale.

This was also carried.

The noble lord's constituents are evidently giving him very close attention and will not permit his sailing under false colors. No Liberal deserving the name can endorse the savage policy of repression adopted by the Salisbury government. The Liberals of the Marquis of Hartington constituency are clearly resolved to disclaim all responsibility for his extraordinary course on this question and to seek the very first opportunity to protest at the poll against his recreancy to Liberal principles. As for Mr. Chamberlain, his present political position is, we think, very accurately set forth by Mr. Labouchere, from whose interview with a representative of the *Pall Mall Gazette* we take the following extract:

"What do you think of Mr. Chamberlain's position now, Mr. Labouchere?"

"I think that unhappy man is lost. The Whigs can go over to the Conservatives and form a constitutional party with them. But his strength consisted with the Radicals at his back, and the only Radicals that are now with him are a few of his own relations; even the faithful Collings declines to follow him in his coercion career. The best thing for him to do would be to retire for a time from active political life, and devote himself to municipal affairs and the cultivation of orchids. He has entirely ceased to be a factor in politics. The Unionists trust him as little as the Gladstonian Liberals, and even if he could have managed to induce the Gladstonian Liberals to accept his nostrums on land purchase he would have offered no *quid pro quo* beyond his family vote. I regret it, for he is an able man, and it is sad to see one of such promise losing himself through vanity pushed to the point almost of lunacy."

Mr. Chamberlain has, it is well known, taken his present course on the Irish question out of personal feelings of dis-appointment. He took in the electoral campaign of 1885 a leading part in favor of Home Rule for Ireland, but because Mr. Gladstone in the formation of his Cabinet in 1886 failed to satisfy his vanity he at once rushed into the arms of Ireland's enemies and is to-day neither more nor less than an agent of the titled aristocracy that has so long lived on the repression of the masses in both Britain and Ireland.

A GOOD APPOINTMENT.

We congratulate the Government on its appointment of Mr. J. H. McGuire, Q. C., of the Kingston Bar, to the Supreme Court of the North West Territories. Mr. McGuire will do the position credit, being a clever, upright and consistent gentleman. We wish him long years to enjoy his well won promotion.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

MR. JOHN NIGH will call upon our western subscribers this season, Mr. King being engaged elsewhere in the interests of the RECORD. We will feel thankful to our friends for extending the same courtesies to Mr. Nigh that they always bestowed on Mr. King.

ON SATURDAY was held a meeting of the Liberal Unionists to consider the proposed amendment to the Irish Crimes Act Amendment Bill. The meeting, we are told, was very stormy, owing to the divergence in opinion among the attendants as to many of the details of the bill. Several of those present left the meeting before its conclusion. "When rogues fall out," etc.

WILLIAM O'BRIEN and Mr. Kibride, one of the tenants evicted from the Lansdowne estate, called for New York on the 30th. The Mayor and the Municipal Council of Queens town and various other bodies presented Mr. O'Brien with addresses. A crowd of several thousand persons gathered to bid him farewell and he was called upon for a speech. In the course of his remarks Mr. O'Brien said he carried with him the full approval of the Irish people. He felt that when the liberty-loving Canadians heard a true account of Lord Lansdowne's cruelty to his tenants they would not tolerate being governed by such a man.

GLADSTONE'S EARNESTNESS.

New York, May 1.—The *Sun* has the following from London:—The *Sun* correspondent calls on Mr. Gladstone yesterday and says he is looking well. Parliamentary papers and heavy-looking books were scattered all about, and shortly after my arrival Mr. Gladstone came in and added an armful more of books and papers to the big collection through which her husband was travelling. Mr. Gladstone was preparing for a fight against the Coercion Bill in committee, and Mrs. Gladstone was at work helping him to dig out the solid facts which give weight to his crushing speeches. It was an interesting sight to see an inspiring one. A young lawyer and his wife laboring together could not have been more utterly engrossed and enthusiastic. Mr. Gladstone remarked, with a smile, that there would be a lot of talking done yet before the Coercion Bill could possibly be passed. As one in the fight, he did not care to predict the result, but he was glad to say to Americans how much their sympathy and support had done to encourage him. "The kindness and good feeling shown to me by the American people," said Mr. Gladstone, "will always be deeply impressed upon my mind and heart. My great regret is that I shall never have the pleasure of seeing them at home and speaking to them myself." Mr. Gladstone was asked why he could not go over to see us, and whether he had any idea of the reception which awaited him in America. "Ah, that," said he, "is just what I have been afraid of. A quiet journey I might stand, but such a welcome as American kindness has led me to expect is what my physicians, who rule me, would never allow. An old man 78 years old, whose strength is more than needed for his work at home, has scarcely a right to spend it in crossing the Atlantic."