

The Catholic Record
Published every Friday morning at 428 Richmond Street.

Annual subscription \$2.00
Six months 1.00

ADVERTISING RATES.
Ten cents per line for first, and five cents per line for each subsequent insertion.

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

London, Ont., May 23, 1878.
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 principles; that it will remain what 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.

Yours very sincerely,
WALSH WALSH,
Bishop of London.

Catholic Record.

LONDON, FRIDAY, FEB. 11, 1881.

RANK OPPRESSION.

The British Parliament was once considered a free legislative body. It cannot now be so considered. Freedom of speech, without which there can be no full discussion and consideration of legislative matter, was once the attribute of the English House of Commons. It is so no longer. The presiding officer of that body has, under the inspiration of a so-called Liberal Government, declared that for the Irish members in the House there cannot be freedom of speech. The advocates of Irish oppression may qualify the action of the speaker as they please. His action is any of such unparalleled and indelible narrowness and treachery that no man, be he English or Irish, calling himself a lover of freedom, can look upon it in any other light than an outrage on Ireland and the Irish people.

THE FENIAN CRY.

We have in Canada, we must, humiliating as is the avowal, declare it, a number of journalists ever eager to excite ill-feeling and animosity amongst the people by raising from time to time the stupid cry of a Fenian invasion of Canada. In the eyes of some very narrow-minded and ill-bred people, not only every Irishman and descendant of an Irishman, but every Catholic is a "Fenian." We have never yet heard from our scribes who deal so largely in the Fenian cry, a definition of "Fenianism." If they mean by "Fenianism" deep and heartfelt sympathy for Ireland in her wrongs and sufferings, they may class not only Irish Catholics, but a very large body of Irish

and other Protestants as Fenians. We greatly fear, however, that these men attribute no such meaning to their term "Fenianism." It has with them a vague and indefinite signification, elastic enough in character to permit of its application to the most loyal of our people whenever party purpose or prejudice is to be served. We know, for instance, of postmasters who give serious annoyance to Catholics by refusing or delaying the delivery of Catholic journals for which they subscribe. On what ground? That these journals are dangerous and disloyal! Forbearance on the part of Catholics seems to have encouraged them and others into the belief that they might thus continue to act with impunity. Forbearance, however, ceases to be a virtue when it encourages crime and injustice. Our people have suffered so much from the annoyances and petty persecutions to which they have been for years subjected, particularly in this Province, that thousands of them have left to seek homes in the American republic. The new cry of Fenianism may be used for the purpose of driving away numbers of those remaining. It will not, however, serve that purpose as a similar cry did in former times. The Catholics of Ontario have proved to the satisfaction of all classes of their fellow-citizens that they are fully qualified to discharge the duties of good citizenship and good neighborhood, and will not permit themselves to be made the victims of a senseless persecution. We are firmly convinced that there is no foundation whatever for the rumor recently published that a Fenian invasion of Canada is intended. Whenever Canada is invaded it will not be saved the dishonor of subjugation by the blatant disseminators of falsehood and hatred.

THE BIDDULPH TRIALS.

It was not our purpose to say anything concerning the Biddulph trials recently held in this city. We have always believed that beyond giving a faithful and impartial report of the testimony adduced in a case before the courts the press should not go. If the opinion of the press on any case is to be preferred, as some writers on the daily press seem to think it should be preferred, to the decision of the jury, the sooner the expense and delay of trial by jury are abolished the better for the country. Our system, as we understand it, leaves every matter before court to the interpretation of the law hearing on the case by the judge, and then to the intelligent and conscientious decision of the jury. We do not propose today to say one word either in praise or blame of the verdict rendered by the jury in the case just terminated. Our sole reason in referring to the matter at all is to reprobate the cowardly attempt made by certain newspaper correspondents to impart into the feeling held on the subject the bitterness and rancor of religious bigotry. As far as the question of religion is concerned, there are only two facts worth noticing in the matter. The accused man Carroll was a Catholic, the judges and jurymen were Protestants. The fact that Carroll is a Catholic should not prevent his receiving justice at the hands of Protestant judges and jurymen. The fact that he was acquitted to the satisfaction of his neighbors, who apparently hold him innocent of the crime laid to his charge, should not prevent them manifesting their satisfaction as the issue of the trial. The ignorance, cowardice, and malice of the individual who invented the story of the "high mass" and "Te Deum," are positively beneath contempt. Journals presuming to lead the Canadian press, which could keep men of that vulgar stamp on their staff, can no longer set themselves up as models of veracity, not to say public decency. It is not the first time we have had reason to complain of the ignorant display of bitterness made by these correspondents. To say that they were misled by report is no excuse. Any man capable of being misled by such an absurd report is not deserving of a place on Canadian journalism. Our newspaper press should be speedily purged of its execrable bigotry and mendacity.

RITUALISM AND RITUALISTS.

The English state church is now sorely beset with internal troubles. These troubles are not of recent date. Their origin can be traced to days long since passed. The existence of High and Low church parties dates from the gloomy days of Puritanism and even farther back, if the Anglican establishment can be said to have had being at an earlier period. The Ritualist party is of more recent date, but is descended in line direct from the old high church party. The first tendency of Protestantism on the continent was to destroy every vestige of the old worship. Under the glowing accents of Luther's vituperation, the people in many places attributed the wrongs and persecutions suffered from their princelings to the church whose sees and benefices were filled by these petty potentates. They thus conceived a dislike for Catholic worship amounting to absolute hatred. The abolition of the most essential rites of Catholic worship was, therefore, in many districts of Germany, rapid and complete. In England, on the contrary, the people were sincerely attached to the Catholic faith, its solemn rites, and soul-inspiring worship. King Henry and his instruments did not on this account proceed any further with innovation than denying the supremacy of the Pope. Even this innovation could not have been successfully accomplished but for the support the monarch procured for it through the distribution amongst the nobles of the riches of monasteries robbed and suppressed. Contact with foreigners, however, brought about, at an early period, the establishment in the sea-taring towns of small but aggressive sects of Protestants, professing principles of a character as leveling as any held by their German co-sectaries. The influence of these sects was at first very limited. Open profession of their doctrines in the reign of Henry led to instant and severe punishment. This wicked monarch was, however, doing himself the work of the sectaries better than they could themselves do it. His suppression of the monasteries, his filling of the episcopal sees with mere creatures of his own—the vacancy for many years of several parochial benefices in each diocese—the contentions, disorders and license of this unfortunate period, all combined to produce general demoralization amongst the people. The last years of King Henry's reign saw a new generation of Englishmen entering manhood. This generation, bred in the utter absence of that religious restraint which for ages gave their fathers peace and happiness, fell an easy prey to the designs of Cranmer and the host of minor apostates who wielded power and influence under the short but disastrous reign of the boy-king, Edward VI. The religion established in the reign of this young prince was essentially Protestant. Its tenets were embraced by the timid amongst the bishops, the dissolute amongst the inferior clergy, by the nobles who had in the previous reign shared in the plunder of the monasteries, and by the change-loving amongst the inhabitants of the towns and cities. It was essentially a new church, quite distinct from, and hostile to, the old form of religion for centuries before prevailing in England. No one of its originators claimed for it any connection with the old church. Such a claim were too absurd to be made by men who professed to destroy that very religious system from which certain of the modern members of the church of Edward VI. claim unbroken historical, hierarchical, and doctrinal lineage. The infant Protestant creation brought into being under Edward VI., received a rather rule awakening, and was almost frightened to death by the accession of Queen Mary, a Catholic, in 1553. It contrived, however, to survive her brief reign, to be nursed into new life, vigor, and activity by her sister Elizabeth, who filled the throne of England for nearly half a century. Her whole reign was devoted to the establishment of the reformed religion, and the destruction of the Catholic faith as understood and practiced for centuries throughout England and Christendom. There was no mention in those days by the clergy of the established Church of

apostolical succession or the like. Fierce denunciations of popery and piteous lamentations over the sad misuse of Christian nations under the popish system for so many ages made us at that time, as it does with many, even now, the stock in trade of the clerical upholders of the reformed system. It was only when Catholicism had disappeared from the kingdom that the prelates and clergy of the state church began to lay claim to continuous succession from the church of pre-reformation times. The claim at once gave rise to the fiercest contention, and pre-eminence soon fell into disrepute. The people fell away day by day from the state church—till in the reign of Charles I. the vast majority of Englishmen had abandoned the system set up under the Tudors at the cost of so much blood and happiness. The despotic measures resorted to by the Stuarts could not save the church as by law established, nor did the support of the Church avail the monarchy anything. Both fell—the latter deeply regretted by many—the church by none. Under Elizabeth the people had heard nothing of the pretensions afterwards vaunted with such a total disregard for the really Protestant character of the English reformation. No wonder then that they were amazed by the self-asserted Catholicity of the church under the Stuarts. From the very earliest times many of the adherents of the state church held indeed that the retention of pre-eminence savored too much of popery. The open avowal of direct succession from the former Catholic hierarchy of the country was more than this party, which from the death of Elizabeth daily grew in numbers and strength, could stand. Archbishop Laud was as cordially hated as ever Pope of Rome could be by the mass of the English nation. The restoration of 1660 brought the church, which the commonwealth had destroyed, once more into being. The controversies as to the divine right of kings which disturbed the reigns of the second Charles and of his brother James, divided the clergy into two parties. The High Church party, embracing many of the bishops and nine-tenths of the clergy, nobly maintained the doctrine of passive obedience, and the Low Church the right of the deposition of sovereigns under certain circumstances by the people. The revolution of 1688 terminated for a time these controversies in the church, but they were afterwards raised with some advantage to the Low Church party—during the reign of the first and second George. The long ascendancy of the Tory party, dating from the accession of George III. till the passage of the Reform bill more than seventy years afterwards, gave the High Church party that complete control of the opinions, thought and action of the state establishment, which led in the second quarter of this century to such surprising results. One of these results was the foundation of the Ritualist party. It was difficult to give an exact definition of Ritualism. It can be much more easily described than defined. We should term it a revival in a church out of the pale of Catholic unity, of the rites of a church in communion with the Roman See, the mother and mistress of all other churches. Ritualists may not indeed accept this definition of their system. The acceptance of Catholic unity by a large body of advanced High Churchmen at the time of the Tractarian movement was the only legitimate outcome of the strong feeling in favor of unity, apostolicity, and Catholicity developed steadily but surely during the previous fifty years and more. The mere adoption of the rites and ceremonies, the open profession itself of many of the doctrines of the Church Catholic—cannot entitle the Ritualist party within the Anglican body to any share in the oneness of the faith. There can be no such oneness without one infallible teaching authority representing Jesus Christ on earth. The Ritualists ascribe authority and prerogatives to their bishops, which the latter dare not assume. They observe certain rites and ceremonies wholly meaningless to their people, and antagonistic in their significance to the doctrines and principles of the Protestant system. They uphold doc-

trines of themselves subversive of the practice and belief not only of the national church, but of the very position they themselves hold in it. The fundamental error of the Ritualists is that they proclaim themselves Catholics when they are really heretics. Catholicity, without the acceptance of an infallible teaching authority representing Christ Jesus on earth, is a contradiction and an impossibility. The position occupied by the Protestant or Low Church section of the Anglican body is one, if we may so speak, more rational—however pitiable—than that assumed and held by the so-called Ritualists. The latter base their position on antiquity and on authority. But we have shown that the church of Edward VI., the church of the book of Common Prayer, the Church suppressed under Mary, but revived by Elizabeth, the Church of the thirty-nine articles, of which these men are members, has no connection whatever with old Church Catholic as a whole, or with the English Catholic Church previous to the reformation in particular. As to authority, they have none. Their bishops are not bishops—and if they were bishops as far as order is concerned, they could not be looked upon as such in point of jurisdiction and authority, since they are cut off from the source of infallible teaching, without which there is no Catholicity, no Christianity, and consequently no revelation or salvation. The present difficulties in the English state establishment should set thinking men to reflect on the abnormal character of that church and its utter helplessness to serve the ends for which many of its members, no doubt, believe it was intended to accomplish. Its record is before the people—and a sadder record of contradiction, uselessness and demoralization it were difficult to find.

THE CANADIAN WINTER PORT.

The ice blockade on the St. Lawrence renders it necessary for the people of the Western Province of Canada to seek for several months in the year an ocean outlet for trade in Portland or Boston. The winter trade of our Western country is something of which the figures in trade and railway returns convey but an inadequate idea. It is during winter that the immense harvests of grain are conveyed by rail from the well-stored granaries in our lake and prairie regions to the seaboard. The Grand Trunk, Great Western and Canada Southern railways are largely engaged in this work of transhipment. These lines carry not only Canadian products, but a very large quantity of American products to the eastern seaports. The Grand Trunk has now an independent line under its own exclusive control from Port Huron to Chicago. At the latter place it claims and receives a due share of attention from American grain shippers. The Eastern termini of the Grand Trunk are Boston and Portland, both large and thriving cities of the neighboring republic. The first named city derives very great benefit from its close connection with Canadian trade during the winter months, while Portland has, without exaggeration, grown into the fine, progressive town it has become by its being for a considerable portion of the year, the ocean port of Montreal. Previous to Confederation, these Maritime colonies were so wholly separated from the Upper Provinces that Canadians felt but little interest in the establishment of a Canadian winter port. Various places along the gulf did, indeed, and some do still, (especially Tadoussac) claim immunity from ice which blockades the upper ports, but none are so advantageously situated, even if we do grant this claim—as to ever become the winter terminus of our carrying trade to the ocean. Since Confederation, however, a notable change has taken place. The building of the Intercolonial Railway has bound the eastern to the Western Provinces in a manner which has led, especially within the last two years, to the revival of this question. The people of Halifax—with their magnificent harbor and port, have brought the matter into frequent discussion by their urgent but moderate claim to recognition as the winter port of Canada. We can see but one difficulty in the way of the gratifica-

tion of the just desires of the good people of Halifax, and that a serious but not insuperable one—the immense length of the Intercolonial railway system. A glance at the map must convince any one that the trade of Western Canada will never go over the present line of the Intercolonial to the Sea. If Halifax and St. John desire, as we know both desire to become important ocean ports in connection with our whole railway system, some shorter line of railway must be found from these cities to Montreal. Can such a line be found? We believe it can. We go further, we hold that if our Confederation is to last, and we earnestly and sincerely desire it ever may—such a line must be found. We commend the matter to the careful consideration of the people in the Maritime Provinces. Resolutions and manifestoes cannot solve the difficulty. Its solution lies in the co-operation of the people of the Provinces in forcing the attention of the Parliaments of Canada and of the Provinces on the important national bearing of the question. The present Intercolonial railway must, as far as certain sections of it are concerned, become more and more localized when brought into competition with a shorter line to Quebec and Montreal from the east. But it were better to abandon such portions of the road—if necessity should demand their abandonment—than fail to secure a winter outlet on Canadian soil for Canadian products. We trust that the people of the Maritime Provinces will keep the question alive till it must be dealt with in a manner to secure for their just desires a complete fruition.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

We were glad to notice the familiar face of Father Northgraves in the pulpit of St. Peter's Cathedral on last Sunday. He preached such a sermon as we might expect from him—full of deep thought and couched in the choicest language. We hope we will have the privilege of hearing him often again. Father Northgraves has many warm friends in London who will always listen to his preaching with pleasure, and profit by his admonitions.

The Paris Union says it is not sorry to see Mr. Gladstone struggling with the revolution which he has crossed; calls on him, in the event of Fenian incendiarism, to acknowledge that he and many English statesmen are largely responsible for such disasters, and declares that he who sows the wind reaps the whirlwind. "Where you have everywhere subsidized the revolution you have lost all right to repress or condemn it, and justly undergo the consequences of the doctrines you have preached."

A city contemporary says that a clergyman of its acquaintance advocates the introduction of lady ushers in church to make the young men attend. What next? Would it not be well to introduce the chromo in some shape? It has already been tried with very good results among the savages. They take to the pictures at once. Common school graduates, as a rule, require something interesting to keep alive the small spark of Christianity dealt out to them in their boyhood.

A MOVEMENT is on foot to increase the facilities for acquiring a more thorough knowledge of music in our public schools. We earnestly hope the suggestions of some of our most prominent citizens contained in the Advertiser of a recent date will be carried out. Many studies to which a great deal of time and attention is now devoted, might with profit be placed on the shelf to make room for this really useful and beautiful accomplishment. We may expect some opposition from men on the school board who have no ear for music. Some of them have too great an ear for dollars and cents.

Two hundred and fifty-four years ago, says the Boston Post, Charles I. of England wrote to the Duke of Buckingham as follows: "I can say but little yet. Yreland (Ireland) being the onlie egg we have yet sitten upon, and having a thicke shell, we have not yet hatched it." This prompts the Toronto Globe to remark that ever since the king wrote that letter "England has been sitting upon that egg and has not yet hatched it." Mr. Gladstone is now in charge of the hen, and from present indications he will be no more