

# The Catholic Weekly Review.

A JOURNAL DEVOTED TO THE INTERESTS OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN CANADA

*Reddite que sunt Cesaris, Cesaris; et que sunt Dei, Deo.*—Matt 22: 21.

Vol. III

Toronto, Saturday, Mar. 2, 1889.

No. 3

## CONTENTS.

NOTES.....	33
CONTRIBUTED ARTICLES.	
A Living Jesuit Analyzed.....F. B. H.	34
From the House of Commons.....	35
By the Way.....Observer	34
THE PRIEST AND THE PUBLIC.....Rev. Edw. McSweeney	37
HIGH ANGLICAN DOINGS.....The Priq	31
EVENTS IN IRELAND.....	39
THE TEMPORAL POWER.....	43
EDITORIAL—	
“Jesuits’ Day” in the Pulpits.....	40
The Knox-Little Theology.....	40
The Absurdities of Anglo-Catholicism.....	49
The “Endowment” of the Jesuits.....	41
The Real Facts of the Question.....	41
The Act of Emancipation.....	42
Penal Proscriptions against Catholics.....	42
A Recent Decision.....	42
CORRESPONDENCE	
Prefects Apostolic.....Mgr. Howley	39
The Jesuit Question.....A. R.	38

## Notes.

*La Verite* of the 16th February translates into French in full *THE REVIEW's* article of a few weeks' ago, in reply to the New York *Freeman's Journal* on the subject of Annexation. “For several weeks,” says *La Verite*, “our valiant confrere of Toronto has sustained against the *Freeman's Journal* an animated, though very courteous, polemic against annexation” After quoting what it is good enough to term “this superb article,” our contemporary observes: “We cannot too much felicitate and thank our noble confrere of Toronto, especially for comprehending and appreciating so well the sentiments of the immense majority of French Canadians touching this question.”

We venture to think that the introduction in the House of Commons,—by one of the minor politicians—of a series of Irish resolutions, can scarcely be regarded at the present juncture of affairs, as a matter for congratulation by far-seeing and earnest well-wishers of the cause in the Dominion.

In view of the excitations to bigotry that are being so industriously addressed to the Orange and Protestant cohorts in this Province—and we are not inclined to regard them too seriously—a more inopportune moment, in our judgment, could hardly have been selected. Speaking with some knowledge of the feeling in the House, we regret to state that it is feared that the introduction of the resolutions will prove very embarrassing; and that their passage, at the present moment, appears more than problematical. It is unfortunate, we think moreover, that those who, by reason of their experience in public life and their relation to the Irish people, were most qualified to deal with so difficult and so delicate a matter, were not first consulted about it; and that the wording of the resolutions, involving a discussion of our relations with the United States, taken together with the time and the circumstances of their introduction, have given ground to an impression that they are intended as so much political bird-lime.

The *Mail* in an editorial note on Tuesday last again attributed, in order that “the people might awake and take warning!” certain language to Archbishop Ryan of Philadelphia, to the effect that the Catholic Church only tolerates heretics where she is obliged to do so; that she hates them in reality with a deadly hatred; and uses all her powers to annihilate them. “If ever the Catholics become a considerable majority,” the archbishop was represented as stating, “which in time will surely be the case, then will religious freedom in the United States come to an end.”

The first time that this slander made its appearance in the *Mail* of this city was in November, 1886. It was contradicted a few days later, in the same paper, by the late Archbishop Lynch, who enclosed a letter for publication from Archbishop Ryan himself, whose attention he had drawn to the matter. Subsequently the story was published in a book on the subject of “Christianity in the United States,” by one Rev. Dr. Dorchester. We published in an issue of this *Review* in October last the public apology made by the Rev. Mr. Dorchester through the *Christian Advocate* of New York, and also his private apology to Archbishop Ryan, for having ventured to use in his book, and ascribe to him, a story which he had learned to be utterly false, and which he had only seen going the rounds of the newspapers. He made such slight amend as was in his power by making public retraction, and by cutting out the allusion from all future copies of the book. These apologies were dated the 7th of September, 1888. It is a fine example of the vitality of a lie, and of the careful and honourable course upon which the *Mail* is conducted, to find that journal refurbishing so old a lie, and presenting it again to a fanatical public as “an evidence of the spirit which actuates Catholics.”

“Immorality is universal in South America. The priests are grossly licentious. Marriage among the lower class is the exception rather than the rule, caused partly by the exorbitant charges of the priests for performing the marriage ceremony.”—*Knox College Monthly*.

It is safe to slander people thousands of miles away. They are not likely ever to be informed of it, or if they should be, they may not consider themselves called upon to refute it for the benefit of sectarians in a distant country, whose living depends, to some extent, on destroying the fair-fame of others. It is safe, we say, and according to Presbyterian principles, perhaps very manly and courageous. The above slander is penned by a Mr. A. E. Mitchell, of Knox College, Toronto. Possibly his readers may believe he speaks the truth; Catholics, however, know that he utters a deliberate lie. It is an old yarn, made at one time or another to tell against the priesthood and the church of every country under the sun. It has done duty since the “Reformation,” and before it, and will continue to go the rounds so long as heresy and sin abound. But in Canada it is uttered against the priesthood of some distant land and *vice versa*. Why not make the charge against those at home? Then we should know how to treat it, and have no difficulty in showing the lie down the detractor's throat. But go on, ye disciples of the perfidious Knox. Keep to the “Reformer's” policy and you may slander with safety those who have no opportunity of defending themselves. That was his idea of Christianity; he made you—it would be faithless and ungrateful on your pa to disown him.