

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 Infallible."

THOMAS COFFEY,
Publisher and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY,
Messrs. LORR, KING, JOHN NICHOL, and
P. J. KEENE, are fully authorized to receive
subscriptions and transact all other business
for the CATHOLIC RECORD.

Rates of Advertising—Ten cents per line each
insertion, space measurement.

Approved and recommended by the Arch-
bishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa, and St.
Boniface, and the Bishops of Hamilton and
Peterboro, and the clergy throughout the
Dominion.

Correspondence intended for publication, as
well as that having reference to business, should
be directed 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, August 4, 1894.

ANGLICANISM AND UNITY.

What a miserable sham and mockery is the discussion about the unity of Christendom. It is verily "a cistern without water." When men undertake to debate a question of such momentous interest they should put off their prejudices and antipathies, and, with calm and dispassionate mind, endeavor to find a fitting answer to the cry that comes from the hearts of thousands: What is truth? Perchance their very inability to answer prompts them to let loose the flood of verbiage and invective.

The Anglicans are now seeking the union of Christians. They speak of the one faith when they know that if they are true to their traditions and principles they cannot elicit an act of faith, and if they do, they must move on to a higher level—on to Catholic ground.

They wish Rome to pronounce authoritatively on the validity of their orders. Why? Do they still cherish the delusion that their ministers have any more authority than laymen?

This opinion had formerly a certain vogue; but there is not one of their representative theologians who would, before any intelligent audience, presume to defend it. An Anglican clergyman is, as De Maistre said, a gentleman habited in black, who says every Sunday, for a certain sum of money, nice, respectable things to a well-fed, well-groomed congregation. He is generally well educated and no stranger to the usages of polite society, but he can show no credentials giving him power to teach his fellows. He is painfully aware of his situation, for who does not view with mingled feelings of pity and contempt their ludicrous attempts to forge a link that may bind them to the apostolic chain. They speak of the primitive Church, as if it could have connection with the sordid, time-serving clericals who pandered to every whim of the libidinous king who upreared the fabric of Anglicanism.

We have no quarrel with Anglicans, but why do they not be logical? Why have a masquerade of Catholic services in their churches? If they follow the Thirty-nine Articles how is it that they countenance things that are stigmatized as false and blasphemous. They affect an admiration for things Catholic, but better far a strong hater than the man with the smile from the teeth outwards. When we contemplate their servile imitation, their paste-colored vesture of belief that may be put off and on according to circumstances, we cannot refrain from saying that Anglicanism is the most disintegrated organization in Christendom. When we view their fraternizing with Dissenters, chiefly because they are armed against the common foe—the Church of Rome—we cannot but remember the times when Anglicans gave high scaffolds and short shrifts to all who differed from them in belief.

But enough. Anglicanism is powerless to satisfy the wants of the human heart. The breath of the State gives it the semblance of life and sends it tripping through the world, in gaudy clothes, uttering ever the same worn commonplaces. True, they preach according to their fancy the Gospel of Christ, but the Gospel of Christ, if taught by weak and faltering lips, is as powerless to touch the minds of men as is the doctrine of Buddha.

Well does Cardinal Newman say that its essence lies in its recognition by the State. Strip it of this world, and you have performed a mortal operation upon it, for it has ceased to be. Take its Bishops out of the Legislature, tear its formularies from the statute book, allow its clergy to become laymen again—and what would be its definition? Methodism represents some sort of an idea; Congregationalism an idea; the Established religion has in it no idea beyond Establishment.

It has been cradled in kingly adultery and rapine; it has never withstood its masters when they would minimize or annul the gospel which it

is pledged to preach and defend, and history has no sadder page than that which records the craven cowardice of its Apostles. The "Mass priest" was hunted like a wild beast; and now in these later days we have Anglican clergymen performing a blasphemous travesty upon the sacrifice so dear to Catholic hearts.

A man who is true to his principles will always obtain the respect of his opponents, but a man who is recreant to his principles, who goes mumming in stolen vesture, will always receive—and deservedly—unmitigated contempt.

They meet in conventions and synods and consume the precious time in rescussing old calumnies or drawing up innocuous resolutions. They talk much of pure gospel, and as we see them wending their way through the streets, accompanied oftentimes by their wives and children, we cannot refrain from admiring their faithful and true exemplification of its tenets. If some of the Fathers who were at the Council of Nice could attend their deliberations, they would surely be invited by the Bishop to say a few words. They would tell doubtless that they distributed thousands of Bibles, that they were driving backwards the forces of Rome and each delegate could grow eloquent, at the supper with Julia or Martha, upon the progress of Anglicanism.

What a farce it is! Men are crying in the dark, and they give them no light: men's souls are starving and they can do nothing.

Heartless herself—her rule control
Eats out the very feeling soul.

MR. DALTON MCCARTHY AGAIN.

Mr. Dalton McCarthy has had another meeting in his own constituency at which he explained and vindicated his present policy.

The gathering took place at Creemore, where both Orangeism and P. P. Aism flourish as indigenous plants, and it might have been expected that there would have been a large and enthusiastic attendance; for Creemore is supposed to be peculiarly one of Mr. McCarthy's strongholds. The expectation, however, was not realized, and the picnic was anything but a success in respect to numbers. Indeed it might be described as a complete failure, for only a few hundred persons were present, when as many thousands were looked for. The McCarthy organs claim that the attendance amounted to about seven hundred, but in reality not more than about half this number were present, notwithstanding that a large contingent of Mr. McCarthy's supporters came from Collingwood under the leadership of Mr. Henry Forman, President of the McCarthy club.

Mr. John McKay opened the proceedings by giving some reasons for the slowness of the attendance. He explained that the farmers were very busy with the harvest; but the chief cause of the trouble was acknowledged to be that the Patrons of Industry had refused to allow themselves to be made a catspaw by the McCarthy committee.

For the purpose of securing a good attendance, it had been proposed to hold a union picnic of Patrons of Industry and McCartheyites; but when Mr. McKay as chairman of the Committee of Arrangements insisted that it should be called "a McCarthy Picnic," the negotiations were broken off. Notwithstanding this disagreement, Mr. McKay was able to announce that Mr. Archibald Currie, the Patron member of the Provincial Legislature, would be on hand to deliver an address before the close of the meeting. Mr. Currie did appear, as promised; but it is worthy of note that though he expressed his pleasure that Mr. McCarthy had promised to support the Patron programme, he did not bind himself to Mr. McCarthy's.

It is possible that Mr. McCarthy will still win Simcoe at the next election, and that the smallness of the attendance at his picnic does not indicate that he has lost popularity with his constituents; but taken in connection with the fact that at the Provincial election the P. P. A. candidate for West Simcoe, who also supported Mr. Meredith, was defeated by a Liberal Patron, we may reasonably conclude that the constituency is not irretrievably given over to fanaticism, though the boundaries of North Simcoe, Mr. McCarthy's riding, are not identical with those of West Simcoe, wherein Mr. Jas. S. Duff was defeated by Mr. Currie.

We may reasonably suppose that the people of North Simcoe can see through the causes of Mr. McCarthy's present disgust with the party with which he acted until recently. We are accus-

tomed to see letters in the daily papers from disgusted Conservatives or Liberals who state that they will never again give a party vote; and it is generally well understood that the cause of the disgust is disappointment that the merits of these politicians were not estimated so highly by the Government as by themselves, rather than unalloyed patriotism, and Mr. McCarthy himself let the cat out of the bag in one of his speeches at Stayner, by stating that the cause of his disgust was that "he was not consulted when certain changes were effected in the personnel of the Government of the Dominion"—that is to say, he was not invited to become a member of the Government at a time when he was manifesting hostility towards it. The people of North Simcoe have shown no little good sense, if their failure in assisting at the Creemore meeting arose from their taking but little stock in Mr. McCarthy and his disgust with the Dominion Government.

The speeches delivered at the meeting consisted of the usual denunciations of French Canadians and Separate schools, which form the staple matter at all P. P. A. gatherings. Thus Mr. J. M. Godfrey abused the French-Canadians in Parliament for having voted solidly in favor of the treaty securing a certain amount of trade reciprocity with France. The trouble is that Mr. McCarthy's amendment, which would have destroyed the treaty, was voted down by a majority much larger than that by which the Government is usually sustained.

Mr. Godfrey attributes the vote of the Quebec members to love for "la Belle France." Possibly this may have been one of the causes which operated in securing the unanimity of the Quebec members, but the fact must not be overlooked that there was also a majority of English-speaking members in favor of the treaty, which was Government measure. It is reasonable to suppose, therefore, that it was sustained because the members believe that it would be beneficial to the Dominion; and the French-Canadian members had the undeniable right to vote in favor of it. They would have had this right, even if the Ontario members had been a unit against it; but as the case stands Ontario has all the less right to complain of the French-Canadian vote, since an Ontario majority voted in the same way as did Quebec.

We do not need to express an opinion on the expediency of the treaty. There is room for honest differences of opinion on the question; but the complaints against French-Canadian domination must rest on a very frivolous foundation when there exists no better reason than this for denouncing it.

The fact that the amendment was moved by Mr. McCarthy, and supported by the whole strength of the McCartheyite party in Parliament—which by the way consists of only one member beside the leader himself—may be deemed by Mr. McCarthy's supporters a sufficient reason why Mr. Laurier should have supported the amendment; but Mr. McCarthy has never manifested such strong liking for Mr. Laurier himself, or for his nationality, that the Quebec Opposition should feel itself bound to assist the member for North Simcoe to put himself before the public as a successful legislator.

On the question of Separate schools, Mr. McCarthy took an extraordinary attitude at the Creemore meeting, showing clearly that his opposition to the system of Separate schools in Ontario and the North-West does not arise from any conviction on his part that Separate schools are really an evil, but solely from his hostility, and that of his followers, to Catholic education.

If the Public schools could only be Protestantized, Mr. McCarthy would be quite content. He would then wish the Separate school system to be abolished, and, of course, as Catholics could not endure to send their children to Public schools to be Protestantized, they would be obliged to establish a system of private Catholic schools without State aid; and thus be doubly taxed—taxed by themselves, voluntarily, to educate their own children, and by the State to educate the children of their Protestant neighbors. Such is the Utopia which he would establish in all the Protestant Provinces of the Dominion if it were in his power! and Catholics should quietly submit to such a condition of things.

All this is concealed under an ingenious form of words which Mr. McCarthy is so well able to construct; but this is certainly his meaning.

In the debate on the North-West bill

in the House of Commons he declared that he preferred Separate to secular schools; and in explaining his views at Creemore he stated that "a secular system of education is one from which the word of God is excluded. This is a Christian country, and it would be a scandal if there were no opportunity given to have the religion common to the whole people taught in the schools. Although there are some people in this country who do not believe in any religion, their number is small, and it would be a terrible hardship to the people generally if the word of God were the only book excluded from the schools."

It is, therefore, evident that he wants religious teaching in the schools. He adds, indeed, that the religious teaching he desires should be such as all could agree upon, specifying that "surely there are in the Bible chapters on which all could agree and which would not promote sectarianism." But it is evident to all that such a mangled course of religion would never be satisfactory, and that if a religious teaching were introduced into the schools, it would assume whatever coloring the teacher might think proper to give it, and thus it would be really Protestant teaching, while professedly non-sectarian. Besides, we all recollect what an agitation was created throughout Ontario four or five years ago, on the mere suspicion that the so-called "Ross Bible" had been submitted to Archbishop Lynch for approval before being adopted as a school text book. It is clear, therefore, that no religious text-book, and no Bible, or book of Bible selections acceptable to Catholics would be tolerated in the Public schools of Ontario, nor, as we presume from analogy, in any other Protestant Province.

The evils we speak of are not merely imaginary. Many teachers have been in the past very aggressive upon their Catholic pupils in the matter of religion, and it was on this account that in many instances Catholic Separate schools were established; because when such aggressions took place the teachers were nearly in every instance sustained by the trustees. Thus Catholics had no resource but to establish Separate schools. Such aggressions often occur even as matters stand now, and they would certainly occur still more frequently if trustees and teachers were not restrained by the knowledge that Catholics might be driven by them to protect themselves in the way we have indicated. If Mr. McCarthy were able to carry out his plans, it is easy to foresee that the cases of such aggression would be multiplied greatly. We are aware that this is just the state of affairs which would be agreeable to Mr. McCarthy and his followers, but all true lovers of equal rights and liberty of conscience will see that it would be the cause of dissensions which would be a serious obstacle to the prosperity of the country.

In addition to all this we must remark that such an imperfect religious teaching as Mr. McCarthy would favor would be of little use. There can be no solid religious or moral training without the foundation on which religion rests, and that foundation is doctrinal. It is a myth, therefore, to suppose that a satisfactory teaching can result by such a partial method as that suggested by Mr. McCarthy.

COLLAPSING.

The influence of the A. P. A. is declining as rapidly in the neighboring Republic as is that of the sister society, the P. P. A., in Ontario. The utter defeat of the Ontario society at the late elections seems to have caused a responsive pulsation in the United States, and Michigan, which has been the centre of A. P. Aism, seems to be about to repudiate entirely the dark-lantern influence. The important political question of the moment is the election of a governor, and the whole influence of the A. P. A. was thrown into the scale to secure the Republican nomination for Mayor H. S. Pingree of Detroit. So far does the association go in its impudence that it has threatened that if the Republicans do not accept their candidate, they will run him as an Independent, and of course elect him.

It is a good sign that common-sense is returning once more to the Michigan people that they are not to be bullied by such threats. The choice of the Republican candidate for the governorship is not decided as we go to press, but the election of delegates to the State Republican convention makes it absolutely certain that the A. P. A. candidate will be repudiated by the party, and that means the collapse of A. P. Aism in Michigan, the very hotbed of the organization.

It would by no means follow that Mayor Pingree would be the next Governor of Michigan, even if he obtained the Republican nomination. There are Democrats enough in the State to make it hard work for the Republicans to win, and four years ago the Democrats actually gained a majority in the Legislature sufficient to make their influence felt in the election of President in 1892, to the extent that the State which would have given a solid vote of 14 to Mr. Harrison, was so manipulated by the Democratic Legislature as to give Mr. Cleveland 6 out of 14 votes, and thus to diminish the electoral college vote of Mr. Harrison by 12. If Mr. Pingree as an Apsaist secured the Republican nomination for the Governorship, he would still have to face the opposition which such a nomination would raise up against him. But to the credit of the Republicans of the State, it is now to be said that they have not yet yielded to the attempted domination of the A. P. A. As we go to press the exact number of adherents of the candidates for nomination is not known, but it is certain that the supporters of Governor Rich for re-nomination will outnumber those of Mayor Pingree 4 to 1. There are certainly over 600 adherents of Governor Rich in the convention.

It is an additional proof of the consciousness of weakness on the part of the A. P. A. that they chose Mr. Pingree as their candidate, simply with the hope that they would secure an apparent victory through his personal popularity, for as far as can be ascertained the popular Mayor has given no pledges that he will carry out an A. P. A. policy; and from his antecedents it is very sure that he would scorn to do so; though he may not till the election is over declare very positively against the dark association which has undertaken to elect him in the face of all opposition.

Their patronizing of Mayor Pingree, and his supposed coquetting with them, seems to have sealed his fate.

The collapse of A. P. Aism in Michigan will be the signal for its collapse throughout the United States; for nowhere else had it attained, in proportion to the population of the State, so firm a foothold.

A. P. A. PROSPECTS.

The decisive victory gained over the P. P. A. in Ontario on the memorable 20th of June appears to have had an effect on the other side of our border, more salutary than the most sanguine could have expected; and now that both parties are preparing for a desperate struggle in many States of the Union, it seems that one of the chief issues on which the battle will be fought will be as it was in Ontario, the platform of Apsaism.

The A. P. A. have not the courage to present their own platform directly before the public, any more than the P. P. A. did in Ontario, but they are following similar tactics in endeavoring to capture the Republican party; and in many States they have succeeded in so doing, just as the sister association in Canada succeeded in capturing the Conservatives, at least for the time being.

The result is that while the Republicans as a body are not willing to identify themselves with the A. P. A., in many States the Republican tickets for officials have been constructed at A. P. A. dictation, Catholics having been rigidly excluded from them for the sake of catching A. P. A. votes. On the other hand, the Democrats have in nearly every instance made a just ticket on which Catholics are named in fair proportion, according to their numbers, in the general population of the country.

It was the first declaration of the A. P. A. that their wish was to defeat Catholic candidates for office in every instance; but local successes have made them bolder, and they now announce themselves, not only as being determined to defeat all Catholics, but likewise all Protestants who are not members of their order.

The Democrats appear to be determined to crush this tyranny, and already in several State resolutions have been passed by the Democratic State Conventions denouncing the A. P. A., and all organizations animated by a spirit of religious intolerance.

The Illinois State Democratic resolution was as follows:

"Hostility to secret political societies is a tenet of the Democratic political faith which is fundamental, and standing by this doctrine now, as in the days when their party presented an unbroken front to the cohorts of Know-Nothingism, and finally crushed that detestable organiza-

tion, the Democracy of Illinois denounces as cowardly, unpatriotic, and dangerous to the peace and happiness of this country, the American Protective Association, which seeks to proscribe men on account of their religion or birth-place."

The resolution of the Pennsylvania State Convention was equally strong, except that it does not actually name the A. P. A. It is as follows:

"We reassert the old Democratic doctrine of equal rights and religious liberty. We are opposed to all organizations which strike at freedom of conscience; and we declare that no party can justly be deemed national, constitutional, or in accordance with American principles, which is animated by a spirit of political proscription or religious intolerance."

In Maine a similar resolution was passed, and it is the general opinion that at the National Democratic Convention which will soon be held, the principle contained in these resolutions will be asserted in unmistakable language. Democratic newspapers do not hesitate to say that such action is necessary; and the success of Mr. Mowat's administration in Ontario has led them to the belief that their doing this will have the same effect throughout the union, which the bold assertion of equal rights to all citizens and the open denunciation of P. P. A. bigotry by Mr. Mowat himself as well as his followers had in Ontario.

We never wavered in the belief that P. P. Aism would be condemned by the people of Ontario the moment it would be fairly placed before them as an issue; and the result of the recent elections proved that our presentiments were correct. We are just as strongly convinced that if the issue be placed squarely before the people of the United States the result will be similar.

The situation of the two countries in regard to religion is very much alike, the differences which exist being rather in favor of the cause of toleration in the United States. Here we have always had a powerful organization stirring up religious dissensions. That organization could never secure a foothold among our neighbors. Here the appeal of the fanatics is to all Protestants, or rather to all non-Catholics; but in the United States the movement is nativist as well as politico-religious, and thus the German-Lutherans and Jews are antagonized, so that they, as well as all Catholics and liberal Protestants, are naturally opposed to it.

The governors of many States, as well as senators and other prominent men, leaders of public opinion, and clergymen of many denominations, have been outspoken in their condemnation of the society; and though it may be expected that the A. P. A. will have some local victories where bigotry is rampant, there is little doubt that as a general political issue it will be stamped out by a most decisive vote of the people, as soon as they have an opportunity to express their opinion on the subject, as will be the case when the State elections come on.

The number of A. P. Aists is greatly exaggerated by the organs of the society, in order to paralyze opposition to their designs; but shrewd Americans are not to be deceived by such tactics; and though they call their movement "an American movement," it is regarded as being what it really is—an attempt to introduce Canadian Orangeism into the country under an assumed name. Thus the Scranton, Penn., *Truth* says in a recent article: "The President of the A. P. A. is a Canadian and an Orangeman. This explains his burning anxiety to save the United States from Pope and Popery, brass money and wooden shoes."

An American gentleman of Detroit, Mr. J. Wesley Smith, a Methodist, as his name indicates, after having investigated the character of the society declares:

"I have come to the conclusion that the movement is not American, but anti-American, unconstitutional, and treasonable, and that the A. P. A. society is not only an unlawful organization, subversive of American institutions, but is, in addition, a fraud of the most barefaced description."

Speaking of the A. P. A. claim that it controls two million votes, Mr. Smith says: "I do not believe the society could muster two hundred thousand adherents in the Union; and as for votes, by far the major portion of its adherents are not citizens, while they all appear to be accomplished and splendid liars."

He judges the number of adherents by comparing the alleged with the real membership of lodges which he knows: thus a Cincinnati lodge whose actual membership is only 39, is publicly declared by its officers to have 1000 members; and in most instances the membership is chiefly made up of