

The Catholic Record.

Published Weekly at 484 and 486 Richmond street, London, Ontario.
Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

EDITORS:

REV. GEORGE R. NORTHGRAVES,
Author of "Mistakes of Modern Infidels."
THOMAS COFFEY.

Publisher and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY,
MESSRS. LUKE, KING, JOHN NICH., P.
J. NEVEN and M. J. O'NEILL, full
agents for receiving subscriptions and transact
all other business for the CATHOLIC RECORD.

RATES OF ADVERTISEMENT.—Ten cents per line each

Advertisement, and recommended by the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa, and St. Boniface, and the Bishops of London, Hamilton, and Peterborough, and the clergy throughout the Dominion.

Correspondence intended for publication, as well as that concerning advertising, should be addressed to the proprietor, and must reach London not later than Tuesday morning.

Arrears must be paid in full before the paper can be stopped.

London, Saturday, May 20, 1893.

THE A. P. A. CONSPIRACY.

The A. P. A. is confident of retarding the progress of Catholicity in America. This is a society of a recent date—a loathsome excrecence on the tree of liberty, given an ephemeral vitality through the efforts of a clique of ranting, roaring noisy demagogues. No principle sanctions its institution, and no object save opposition to Catholics, at all times, and in every manner, guides its plans. Its stock-in-trade is falsehood: its credentials are hypocrisy and unblushing effrontery. Its methods are those of the assassin—to steal upon its victim and to stab from behind. Free and open warfare is a thing unlawful to those who compose it—to the thousands who allow themselves to be driven by a few shuffling politicians, who will not admit that ere long they will be repudiated by a nation whose cherished principle is, and has been, freedom for all. They are preparing to resist the encroachments of Papal tyranny! How the old words flow easily off their lips! But, gentlemen of the A. P. A., use them only in your lodges rooms when you are enrolling members to take part in the mighty struggle.

We are not surprised that the Catholic Church is the object of their derision and hatred. It seems that one of the most striking marks of her truth, in the presence of a noisy and frivolous generation, is the fact that she is the inheritor of the reproaches heaped on her by her Divine founder. "You shall be hated by all men for My name's sake," said our Saviour to the chosen few who followed Him; and many times have the words been fulfilled in the history of the Church. "If the world hate you, know ye that it hated Me before you. If you had been of the world, the world would love its own; but because you are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world, therefore the world hateth you." She is of the kingdom of God—stern and unbending custodian of the deposit of Revelation, entrusted by her Divine Founder, but, with full love, taking compassion on the multitude, redressing its wrongs, alleviating its woes, and answering the question wrung in our time from many an anguished soul, "What is truth?" She alone may answer it; for she alone possesses absolute infallibility. "Any supernatural religion," says a writer, "that renounces its claim to absolute infallibility, it is clear, can profess to be a semi-revelation only."

The old charges that she is opposed to progress are uttered only by men whose mental food is the sophistry and calumny of an age gone by. She is identified with modern progress—and we use the word not to indicate the progress of men who are wrapped up in the pride of life and devoting every energy to the cause of Demos, but the progress that enlists the strength of the higher faculties and that makes the world fairer and better. Even as she moulded the fierce and stubborn barbarians into useful and peaceful citizens, so at the present is she guiding the earnest, restless spirit of the age into free spheres of thought and action.

Anyone who considers her present policy must admit that she is not overburdened with traditions or excessive conservatism, but that she is full of vitality, conforming herself with a Divine adaptability to all conditions and to all men. She is every day increasing her strength. Time was when it was poor and few in numbers, but to-day it is rich in even material resources, and its children (by the millions we count them) are citizens famed for their loyalty and ability.

No wonder, then, that it excites animosity from certain quarters! No wonder, also, that groundless charges move men to investigate her doctrines and to acknowledge their truth! In the meantime, the Church is a little disturbed by calumnious denunciations as the lion is frightened by the howling of the unclean and skulking jackal.

A CLERICAL MISFIT.

At a meeting of the Ministerial Association of this city, held on Monday, Rev. Mr. Rigsby, Methodist, once more demonstrated the fact that he had mistaken his vocation. After a variety of subjects were discussed the rev. gentleman gave vent to the anti-christian hatred of Catholics with which he seems to be filled and flowing over.

He wants the Government to take away the grants to Catholic hospitals, and says that it should discourage their establishment. The dear man seems to think that because Victoria, a Methodist college, does not get Government assistance, Catholic hospitals should be treated likewise. People whose common sense is not inextricably knotted need not be told that there is a vast difference between a college and an hospital. If Catholic colleges were bonused and Methodist colleges ignored by the Government there would, of course, be just grounds for complaint. If Mr. Rigsby were honest he would tell us at once that what he really thinks is that Catholics have in this country no rights which he is bound to respect, and that fair play and equal rights have reference only to those who are non-Catholic.

Rev. W. J. Clark, after Mr. Rigsby had unburthened himself of his animosity towards Catholics, said he thought nothing could be done in the matter at the present session; which, we take it, was a very refined way of telling Mr. Rigsby that he was out of order and making a fool of himself.

Evidently this ranting preacher has become a disagreeable quantity in the Ministerial Association: and doubtless a great deal of ungodly work would be left undone were he to take off his white tie and seek some other occupation.

The preacher who endeavors to stir up ill-will in a community is a social pest.

THE PRESBYTERIANS AND THE REV. DR LANGTRY.

The lecture of the Rev. Dr. Langtry, on which we made some comment last week, has greatly stirred the Presbyterians of the Province, but as yet only a few desultory replies have been made to his very scathing attack on the Presbyterian system. No one has

up to the time of our writing this attempted a complete defence of the system against the doctor's arraignment, probably for the reason that his arguments are in the main unanswerable. Yet the *tu quoque* argument has been used, for the reason that pretty much the same may be said of Anglicanism as of its Presbyterian rival, that it is as much a "man-made religion" as the latter; which, as we already remarked, is perfectly true.

In fact, Dr. Langtry's reasoning is a boomerang, which, after striking his adversary fatally, returns to give an equally severe blow to the doctor himself who launched it.

The Rev. G. M. Milligan is one of those who have made some attempt at answering the doctor. He took the occasion of an ordination in St. Andrew's Church on the 11th inst. to criticise and say "some strong things of the prelatic system which, instead of being of divine origin and consonant with the teachings of Scripture, he declared to have been based upon the pagan notion of the priestly caste. The idea of caste, he characterized as being contrary to the whole spirit of Biblical truth, born of paganism and the child of hell. There is no warrant in the Old or New Testament for sacramentalism."

This extract from the Rev. Mr. Milligan's sermon we take from the report given in the *Globe* of the 12th inst., and we are led to ask: What could have ailed the reverend gentleman when he talked in this style?

His language, indeed, has the savor of fire and brimstone, and in this respect it was certainly "strong," but it was exceedingly feeble if we view it in the light of a logical or truthful standard, or if we test it by the rigid rules of reasoning laid down by Dr. Whately and others who have treated of the logical art.

Mr. Milligan himself tells us what he means by the "prelatic" and other "systems." He says "there are four leading views regarding Church government—the Papal, the Prelatical, the Independent and the Presbyterian. The Papal system places the people under the infallible rule of the Pope as the Vicar of Christ and the perpetual colleague of the Apostles. According to prelacy the governing power of the Church is secured by the perpetuity of the Apostleship. The Independents affirm that the government and executive power of the Church lay in

brotherhood, and that every Church organization is complete in itself"; but "the three great principles of Presbyterianism have always been recognized in the word of God . . . government by elders, the parity of the ministry, and courts of appeal."

It looks very much as if the Rev. Mr. Milligan were purposely obscure as to the absolute necessity of a ministry properly ordained and receiving its succession from the Apostles, yet there is enough in his sermon to show that he would wish it to be believed that Scotch Presbyterianism has such a succession. Thus he tells us:

"The ancient British Churches claimed to have received their form of Government from the Apostles' teaching and practice. Calvin and other Reformers derived their principles of polity and discipline from the creeds of these ancient Churches. The Protestant Reformation (of course he here means especially the 'thorough and Godly' Presbyterian form of the Reformation: Ed. C. R.) was not something new introduced into the world for the first time. It was simply the restoration of Apostolic teaching to matters maintaining to the polity and government of the Church. Presbyterianism and not Prelacy was the form of government set before us in the New Testament."

It will be observed that all this is mere assertion without a particle of proof—and the pretended facts are contrary to the whole testimony of history. It is well known to all conversant with the actual state of the case that Gildas, Bede, the book of Llandaff, and all other authorities of any value, state that Pope Eleutherius sent two Bishops to Britain at the request of King Lucius to establish the faith, near the end of the second century, that their successors attended the Councils of Arles and Sardice in the fourth, and signed the Acts of these Councils, acknowledging thus the universal authority of the Pope in common with the Bishops of all the countries represented at these Councils; and it is known, besides, from numerous other sources that the nations represented at these Councils were in unison in recognizing the Pope. Hence the early British Churches were both prelatic and Papal. They had Bishops, and they recognized the one Supreme Bishop who was head over the entire Church.

It is true, therefore, that the British Church claimed to derive their form of Church government from the Apostles, but they derived it through the Pope: so that it is absurd to say that Calvin derived his Presbyterian form of Church government from them.

But there is some light thrown upon the character of the Presbyterian ministry from the authorized form of Church Government which accompanies the Westminster Confession. We are there told that "Christ instituted a government and governors ecclesiastical in the Church;" and that it is the "doctrine of ordination" that "No man ought to take upon him the office of a minister of the word without a lawful calling;" and that "every minister of the word is to be ordained by imposition of hands and prayer with fasting by those preaching presbyters to whom it doth belong."

Now it is certainly also the Scriptural teaching that "No man taketh this honor unto himself but he that is called of God as was Aaron." (P. Bible Heb. v. 4.) Yet it has been pointed out by Rev. Mr. Langtry that the first Scotch Presbyterian ministers had no such ordination, and this fact is even hinted in the Westminster Ordinal itself. From this it follows that the so-called Presbyterian ministry have no orders, even according to their own theory of Presbyterian ordination.

But we may here quote a couple of the ancient Fathers as to the usage of the Apostolic Church on this point.

St. Clement of Rome, of whom St. Paul says that "his name is in the book of life," (Phil. iv. 3,) says "the Apostles appointed the aforesaid, (Bishops and deacons) and then gave direction in what manner, when they should die, other approved men should succeed them in their ministry." (1 Cor. Clement's Epistle).

St. Ignatius, the disciple of St. John the Evangelist, names "the Bishop holding Presidency, the presbyters and the deacons." Again: "Your famous presbytery, worthy of God, is knit as closely to the Bishop, as strings to a harp." (ad Ephes.)

We need not quote further. These quotations show how the New Testament is to be understood, and completely refute the Presbyterian pretension that Episcopacy was not introduced into the Church till a late date.

In reference to Mr. Milligan's assertion that a gradation of sacerdotal orders is a pagan invention, we shall only say here that Josephus as well as the

holy Scripture show that such a gradation similar to that of the Catholic Church existed even under the Old Law, which had its high-priest and subordinate priests and levites. The elegant language in which Mr. Milligan denounces this gradation as "the child of hell," would be much more appropriate if it were applied to his own "man-made religion."

ARCHBISHOP IRELAND.

It may not be generally known that Archbishop Ireland was a military chaplain during the civil war. Nothing gives him greater pleasure than to talk of the days when he ministered to the spiritual wants of the "boys in blue" or to meet old soldiers who greet him with the words: "I saw you in the army."

It has been said that his experience of camp life developed the courage and determination that have made him so conspicuous a figure of our century. He has not, however, left the battle-field, for he is a chaplain to a cause that enlists all the strength and energy of his nature—the cause of humanity and of God. He loves his age and his country, and in them he has implicit faith. He is convinced of their capabilities, for up the long vista of the future he sees a new world, peopled by men swayed indeed by their passions, but animated with a strong and abiding love for mercy and justice and righteousness. He sees them, with hearts that beat in union with their brothers, and with intellects that crave only for the best and highest, marching onwards to higher realms of thought and action. All this will not come to pass without delays and backward movements—without reactions and repressions—but the victory will be for truth and justice.

PROTESTANTISM AND HOME RULE.

As an offset to the manifesto of the forty Catholics in Ireland who have made themselves conspicuous by issuing a protest against Home Rule, it is interesting to remark that a large number of Ulster Presbyterians and Unitarians have sent to Mr. Gladstone a communication expressing their desire for Home Rule, and declaring their unbounded confidence in his Irish policy as the only one which can bring peace and prosperity to Ireland. They likewise protest against the anti-Home Rule resolution which was sent to Lord Salisbury in the name of the Protestants of Ulster. Mr. Gladstone in reply says that he is comforted to find that amid the sea of violence and intolerance at Belfast, there exists such an enlightened opinion as that entertained by his correspondents.

In the face of the frequently reiterated assertion that Home Rule is advocated by Irish Catholics with the design to impose upon the Protestant population of the country a hateful and oppressive Catholic ascendancy and domination, a fact like this is highly instructive, as it shows that liberal-minded and patriotic Protestants have not been influenced by the cry of alarm which has been raised especially by the Methodist Conference and the Presbyterian Assembly on the same pretence.

This religious cry is recognized by all true lovers of their country as a false issue. It is the teaching of experience that the Imperial Parliament has never had and never will have either the time or the inclination to deal with Irish questions in a manner satisfactory to the people of Ireland, or with any regard to their interests, whatever may be their religious belief; and all the efforts of these ministerial assemblies will not

give a religious aspect to a question which affects the material and social interests of the people, and honest Protestants of England and Scotland, as well as Ireland, fully understand this.

In connection with this subject of Protestant opinion, on the Home Rule question Mr. S. Williamson, Liberal M. P. for Kilmarnock Burghs, has addressed an open letter to Rev. Robert McChesney Edgar, the Moderator of the Irish Presbyterian General Assembly, in reply to the resolutions adopted by the last meeting of the Assembly, against Home Rule. He tells the Moderator that he has carefully considered the arguments used in the printed statement sent to him, but he finds that instead of being based on solid facts, they are founded on vague apprehensions of future evil. He says:

"As a matter of fact the liberty of an individual is circumscribed by the State. It takes charge of personal conduct, defines crime, and raises or lowers the standard of morality."

This view of the matter is undoubtedly correct; and as it is impossible and undesirable that in this very mixed community any particular form of religion should be established, it follows that the only reasonable solution of the vexed question of giving a moral and religious training to the children, is that the greatest freedom possible should be allowed to parents to educate their children in

party, and condemnation of what are called the arrogant claims of the Roman Catholic hierarchy."

Mr. Williamson reminds the moderator that it is not the business of legislators to trouble themselves about vague fears and apprehensions, and that it is not surprising that the "party which has always sought to maintain Protestant ascendancy in Ireland should have at present some qualms of conscience, and be filled with some fear of retaliation by the Roman Catholic majority because of the persecutions they endured in days not long gone; but I am, however, convinced that these fears are utterly baseless.

In the main the Irish Roman Catholics have returned good for evil, although it is not astonishing that they should entertain but little respect for the religion of their persecutors."

He therefore reminds the Assembly that they should have moderated their hatred of Roman Catholicism in Ireland, and distrust of Roman Catholics might have been with advantage tempered by large admissions of the fact that for centuries the Irish Roman Catholics endured much persecution at the hands of the party which claimed, and still appears to claim for itself, that ascendancy which has wrought so much mischief and injustice in Ireland and engendered so much religious strife.

The truth is that the Catholics of Ireland have shown remarkable forbearance towards their Protestant neighbors, considering what they have endured from them, and, as Mr. Williamson says, they have returned good for evil.

He advises the Irish Presbyterians to encourage its loyal and patriotic sons to join with all sections of their Irish fellow-citizens in an Irish Legislature in seeking to devise wise and just measures which will be beneficial to the country as a whole.

The Assembly resolutions speak most disparagingly of the Irish Nationalist members of Parliament, as endeavoring to establish "the baneful influence of Rome." To this Mr. Williamson answers that he would rather confide in the wisdom and justice of such Roman Catholic statesmen as Sir Charles Russell, Lord Ripon, and Lord Acton than the most distinguished statesman which Ulster can produce. He would rather trust Mr. Timothy Healy, rough and rude-tongued though he be, than the partizan of Mr. Carson, on whose very countenance the attributes 'implacable, and unmerciful' are legibly written."

Mr. Williamson is a Presbyterian, and it was with the hope of influencing him against Home Rule that the manifesto of the Irish Presbyterian Assembly was sent to him as to other Presbyterian members; but it is needless to say that the labor was lost. It was not difficult in the past to arouse Scotch Presbyterians by an appeal to their anti-Catholic prejudices, but Mr. Williamson has shown that they are to day more amenable to reason. His reminder to the Moderator that the securilous reference to the Irish Nationalist party is unbecoming a grave and venerable ecclesiastical assembly was much needed, and it is to be hoped that the next Assembly will take the lesson so much to heart as not to intermeddle again on a subject which calls for more patriotism than the great majority of Irish Presbyterians seem to possess. The Methodist ministers need to be taught a similar lesson.

THE SCHOOL QUESTION IN A PRESBYTERIAN SYNOD.

We notice by a paragraph in one of the daily papers that "Mrs. McPherson, of Boston, a prominent lecturer on Romanism, is expected to speak here about the end of the month, under the patronage of the Loyal Women of Canadian Liberty," whoever they are.

It would appear as though there were a regular bureau for ex's in Boston. From there, it will be remembered, came ex-Leyden, the most vulgar scamp of the lot. This is the first time we have heard of Mrs. McPherson, of Boston. She is evidently a novice in the business, otherwise she would not omit the ex. This has a wonderful influence in filling Opera Houses, at 15 cents a head—barefooted boys and members of the P. P. A. half price. She has undoubtedly been induced to come to London from the fact that Shepherd was wonderfully successful owing largely to the circumstance that Mayor Essery became her little Lord Fauntleroy. Mrs. McPherson, of Boston, we have not doubt, will draw large houses, and she may have an entirely new programme to submit to the simpletons who go to hear her; but she must not forget to do the ex.

ANOTHER ONE.

We notice by a paragraph in one of the daily papers that "Mrs. McPherson, of Boston, a prominent lecturer on Romanism, is expected to speak here about the end of the month, under the patronage of the Loyal Women of Canadian Liberty," whoever they are.

Catholics are not too numerous in Ohio than in Ontario, and the thought it a suitable power and influence pose they directed days ago towards the public candidate for the State. The facts she mentioned action, the clique that operates be frustrated even very Protestant com-

Catholics are not too numerous in Ontario than in Ontario, and the thought it a suitable power and influence pose they directed days ago towards the public candidate for the State. The facts she mentioned action, the clique that operates be frustrated even very Protestant com-

It would appear as though there were a regular bureau for ex's in Boston. From there, it will be remembered, came ex-Leyden, the most vulgar scamp of the lot. This is the first time we have heard of Mrs. McPherson, of Boston. She is evidently a novice in the business, otherwise she would not omit the ex. This has a wonderful influence in filling Opera Houses, at 15 cents a head—barefooted boys and members of the P. P. A. half price. She has undoubtedly been induced to come to London from the fact that Shepherd was wonderfully successful owing largely to the circumstance that Mayor Essery became her little Lord Fauntleroy. Mrs. McPherson, of Boston, we have not doubt, will draw large houses, and she may have an entirely new programme to submit to the simpletons who go to hear her; but she must not forget to do the ex.

POETS AND POETRY OF YOUNG IRELAND.

Mr. Rossiter gave, in a recent meeting of the Literary and Scientific Society of London, an interesting lecture on the Poets and Poetry of Young Ireland. Literary genius was, as it were, banished from