

The Catholic Record.

Published Weekly at 181 and 183 Richmond Street, London, Ontario.

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

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

REV. WILLIAM FLANNERY, THOMAS COFFEY, Publisher and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY.

Messrs. LORI, KING, JOHN NICH, P. J. NEVEN and M. C. O'DONNELL are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transact all other business for the CATHOLIC RECORD.

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

Approved and recommended by the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa, and St. Boniface, and the Bishops of London, 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.

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

Persons writing for a change of address should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

London, Saturday, September 5, 1891

THE HOUSE OF LORDS AND HOME RULE.

It is now so certain that Home Rule for Ireland will come in the not distant future that it seems an utter absurdity for the Tory Government to attempt to stem the current of popular opinion.

The constituency of Lewisham, in which the most recent election took place, went Tory, as its antecedents led every one to expect would be the case; but the reduction of the Tory majority by eight hundred in such a Tory stronghold is a sign of the tendency of popular opinion to which the most ultra among the Tories cannot close their eyes.

There was never anything more certain in political prognostication than that the cause of Home Rule is progressing surely in England, equally with Ireland, Scotland and Wales, in spite of all the drawbacks which have stood in the way, including the dissensions among Irish Nationalists.

Lord Salisbury still professes to believe that the cause of Home Rule will not gain the day. His nephew, Mr. Balfour, has put forward his half-measure of government by County Councils, such as obtains in England and Scotland, but this will not satisfy the aspirations of the Irish people, who desire real self-government, such as is enjoyed in Australia and Canada.

The half measures of Lord Salisbury and Mr. Balfour will not meet the demand; and the verdict of the constituencies must have convinced the most ultra Tories by this time that such is the case; and the lesson might be learned even from the result in Lewisham.

But Lord Salisbury in a recent speech stated that the popular verdict will be frustrated "by the play of other parts of the Constitution."

The plain meaning of this is that the House of Lords will set itself as a barrier against the tide of popular opinion: that the Lords will presume to reject what the House of Commons, backed by the people, will peremptorily demand.

Mr. Gladstone has taken up in its proper sense this bombast of the British Premier, and in a letter to the Liberal candidate, who was defeated at Lewisham, he boldly meets the issue as presented by Lord Salisbury. During the by elections the will of the people of the three kingdoms has been unequivocally expressed, and to their will Mr. Gladstone appeals with confidence, demanding whether their judgment is to be lightly overborne. He says:

"It is for the constituencies to decide how to receive this threat to overbear the judgment which has during the last four years been so unequivocally declared. I trust you will be enabled to show that the sense of the people, so evident elsewhere, is shared by the metropolis, and that the electors of Lewisham will perform their share in closing a controversy injurious to every interest of the Empire."

It is not the first time that the Lords have thought it fitting to oppose the expressed will of the people, but they were forced to yield, and they will equally be forced to yield now. They attempted to oppose the disestablishment of the Irish Church, and a deadlock was the consequence, but their opposition was fruitless, and it will be equally so in the present crisis. The question of Home Rule for Ireland is too serious a one that the Lords should attempt to thwart the wish of the nation, and if they make the effort, the ugly question may and will arise, "of what use is the House of Lords itself?" And by the time this question is answered the popular voice may sweep it out of existence.

Nothing is more certain in the world of politics than that the unmistakable verdict of the people at the coming general election will be in favor of Home Rule, and the Lords cannot be allowed to stand in the way of its passage. Tory papers are condemning

Mr. Gladstone for daring to insinuate that the voice of the people must prevail over that of the Lords; but the London Daily News, which is the mouthpiece of the Liberals, does not shirk the issue, and in its issue of the 23rd inst. expresses its joy that Mr. Gladstone has promptly taken up the issue which Lord Salisbury has raised. It says:

"We shall be surprised if even Home Rule does not recede to the background before this impudent attempt at dictation, and if the country does not send such an overwhelming majority to Parliament as will effectually frighten the House of Lords into submission and curb Lord Salisbury's tongue."

It was to such plain-speaking as this that the House of Lords succumbed before now, and it cannot be doubted that it will have to succumb once more.

THE REVISION QUESTION.

The revision of the Presbyterian Confession recommended by the committee to whom the matter was referred, does not appear to have given satisfaction to either party. Professor Warfield, who represents the stand-still party, and who occupies the chair of Dogmatic Theology in Princeton, protests in the July number of the Presbyterian and Reformed Review against the proposed "radical revision of the third chapter," which, he says, lowers and lessens the expressions of one of the essentially involved doctrines of Calvinism until it is all but expunged."

The Professor objects also to a reconstruction of the section on infant salvation. He says we may have a personal belief in the salvation of infants; yet that there is no such clear and direct scriptural warrant for it as will justify the assertion of it dogmatically. The New York Independent, on the other hand, points out that the very chapter which has been so revised as to bring out Dr. Warfield's protest "is the very chapter which 106 out of 134 presbyteries desiring revision pointed out as the chapter which ought especially to be revised. A protest against the proposition to revise this chapter is a protest against all revision."

The difficulty under which the Church seems to be laboring now is that those who desire to have the Confession revised expressly indicate that it is the strong Calvinism which ought to be modified, as this is the feature which creates so much discontent at the present day, and which the majority of the clergy now have tacitly agreed to ignore in their pulpit teachings. It is this extreme Calvinism which the people just now are not willing to believe, and which has been the real cause why thousands have left the Presbyterian Church, many giving, as a reason for so doing, the absurd consequences to which the Calvinistic theories tend. Some of those who have in consequence left the Church have gone into the ranks of other Churches, but more, like Bob Ingersoll, have gone into open infidelity, and have vindicated their course by declaring that they will not accept a doctrine which makes God a tyrant.

These people forget that Presbyterianism is not Christianity; but they seem to be unable to separate genuine Christianity from the burlesque which John Calvin invented and called by this name.

The Revision Committee might have entirely eliminated Calvinism from their creed; and probably they would have done so were it not that while they were aware that it was to its Calvinism that the advocates of Revision objected, nevertheless even those who were the loudest in calling for the Revision united with their opponents in passing a resolution that no change of doctrine should be made. Such a resolution hampered the Revising Committee, for it was incompatible with the changes which it was expected should be made.

The strangest thing in the whole transaction is that it did not strike the members of the General Assembly as an inconsistency to demand doctrinal changes, yet in the same breath to insist that the doctrines should remain unaltered. The committee took a course of its own under the circumstances, and recommended, indeed, some doctrinal changes, but not such as would satisfy either party. One party believes that they exceeded the instructions given them, while the other is of opinion that they have only succeeded in making matters more obscure than ever.

It is a curious fact that in the discussions which have taken place on this question, and on the case of Dr. Briggs, which is another of the questions which are at present troubling the United States Presbyterians, those who insist

most strongly on the necessity of preserving a standard of faith, to which all clergymen shall be bound to adhere, do not take this stand on the ground that the Church should teach unalterably the truth of God, but that the individual preacher should not claim the "patronage and privileges of the Church" while he is teaching a doctrine which differs from the Church standards.

Thus Dr. Halstead, in the Western Christian Advocate, laid down recently the following principle as being that on which the Protestant Churches are now instituting heresy trials, and insisting upon the submission of their preachers to their creeds. The Doctor says:

"No preacher has any right to invade his Church with 'strange doctrines,' and still claim the patronage and privileges of that Church. There are rights and just means by which the errors of creeds may be eliminated and the truth substituted. No member of any leading Protestant Church is deprived of an equal opportunity with all the others to make all wise and necessary fundamental changes in the body; but this opportunity must be used in the way by which all changes are safely made."

It will be seen that it is not proposed to make changes in accordance with any teaching of Christ, but according to the whims and fancies of those individuals who can succeed by caucusing to control a chance vote in the governing body of each Church.

This doctor, indeed, insinuates that thus truth will be substituted for error; but it is much more likely that error will be substituted for truth, or one error for another. But what are we now to think of the cry which has been hitherto raised against the Catholic Church for laying down her doctrines clearly and authoritatively instead of giving full play to the fancies of every private individual with his doctrinal hobbies?

Protestantism is itself now obliged to abrogate its own theories, and to acknowledge that there can be no Church without exercising real authority over its members, and especially over its clergy. Thus the necessity of an infallible guide is conceded, as otherwise the members of the Church must be "carried about by every wind of doctrine," a state of affairs which, according to St. Paul, the Church of Christ was especially instituted to prevent.

CONVENTION OF NATIONALISTS.

Among the American despatches of Friday last we read that "John Fitzgerald, of the Irish National League of America, has issued an address calling for a meeting at Chicago on October 1 and 2 next. The address calls for the co-operation of all friends of the Irish cause, and says one object of the convention is to examine into the present and past relations between the League in America and the leaders of the National movement in Ireland, with a view to placing them on a better and more satisfactory basis."

In the beginning of April, 1890, a meeting of delegates of the Irish National League was held in St. Louis, Mo., under the presidency of the Hon. John Fitzgerald. At that meeting it was resolved to hold a convention in the month of September or October. The city of Baltimore, Md., was chosen as the place best suited for the assembling of delegates and members from the United States and Canada.

On the second day of the meeting a despatch was cabled to Mr. Parnell advising him of the action taken by the delegates and requesting the Irish leader to cable a reply fixing the date for the holding of a general convention at Baltimore. The delegates waited and waited—day after day they waited; still no reply came from the sphinx, the mysterious guide and leader of the Irish people at home and abroad. What was the matter? What reasons had the wily chief for not sending an immediate fiat, and appointing the day and date and naming the members of Parliament—whether Dillon or Sexton or O'Brien, or his own gracious majesty the uncrowned king, who would grace with their presence the grand convention and with their studied and practiced eloquence electrify it? What were the reasons which determined Parnell and his associates, if he consulted them (which is doubtful), not to have a convention in Baltimore or any other place? The natural dread, we fancy, of an explosion at such convention—the fear of wild exclamations of threats of war and of wilder and more fierce denunciations of the assassins of Dr. Cronyn, who was so brutally murdered in Chicago. The prospect of the convention breaking up in confusion and violence, if not worse, determined

Parnell to have no convention in Baltimore. Therefore the delegates returned from St. Louis to their homes, without any information as to whether a convention should be held that fall or should be held at any time, under orders from Mr. Parnell and his party.

About six weeks after the meeting in St. Louis Hon. John Fitzgerald received a letter from Mr. Parnell stating that owing to divisions in the organization in America it was more advisable to hold no convention, but that henceforth all contributions, instead of being sent to the Rev. Treasurer, Dr. O'Reilly, of Detroit, should be forwarded immediately and directly to Dr. Kenny or Mr. Webb, secretaries, in Dublin, Ireland.

The fact of Mr. Parnell displacing Father O'Reilly by his own authority, without consulting Hon. John Fitzgerald, or anybody else, showed exactly where Mr. Parnell stood and where the whole organization of the Irish National League of America stood. Mr. Parnell was all: the National League of America and branches that sent to him their hundreds of thousands annually were nobodies. He could treat them all with the contempt of his silence, or he could displace and degrade their most trusted officers and staunchest members at his own sweet will.

Dr. C. O'Reilly sent home to Dublin the remaining \$9,000 he held in the treasury; and there was an end to the Irish National League in America. The League had no motive or reason of existence other than to collect funds and assist the Irish tenant farmers in their struggle with landlordism, while also, by means of the same funds, talented and patriotic members of Parliament would have the necessary supplies for all expenses incidental to their presence in the House of Commons and prolonged stay in London.

When Mr. Parnell dismissed the Rev. Treasurer of the League it was a virtual acknowledgment that he had no further confidence in the League. This was very evident also from his ignoring their demand for a convention to be held in Baltimore. When Messrs. John Dillon and Wm. O'Brien came to Philadelphia and New York last September they took no cognizance of the Irish National League, but went on lecturing and raising funds independently, as though it had never existed.

Now a federation is established in New York, with Thomas Addis Emmet as President and the famous Catholic banker, Eugene Kelly, acting as Treasurer.

Is it not possible for all well-disposed Irishmen to send their contributions to Mr. Eugene Kelly, or for all branches of the late League to request their Secretaries to open communication with Mr. Thos. Addis Emmett, and obtain all necessary information?

We have reasons to be apprehensive that if a convention is held in Chicago, as Mr. Fitzgerald suggests, that trouble will ensue. The factions in Chicago are more bitterly opposed to each other than they are in Ireland. No doubt a majority in that city, as in all others on this continent, are in favor of the new federation, and will be found on the side of Dillon and O'Brien, of Thos. Sexton and Justin McCarthy and of all the priests and Bishops in Ireland and America; but there is also in Chicago a formidable body in favor of Parnell, having for leader and chief instigator the editor of the Citizen, with all his bold and fiery eloquence.

We are of opinion that a convention such as proposed by Hon. John Fitzgerald would lead to scandal and riot. We are of opinion, too, that emissaries from Balfour and Salisbury would be there in the guise of patriots, fanning the embers of discord and helping to lead to some catastrophe that would shock the English people and do infinite injury to the cause of Home Rule in the approaching general election. We are strongly of opinion that no such convention should be held in Chicago.

If the National League still exists, as stated by Mr. Secretary Sutton and others, then let its provisions made in St. Louis be carried out, and let the convention of Irish Nationalists be held in Baltimore. If the League does not exist, then John Fitzgerald has no more right or authority to issue an address calling for a convention than any other man living.

But Chicago with its physical force promoters, its fiery orators, its paid emissaries and spies of Downing street is the very last city in America where such a convention should be held.

A cable despatch states that the Pope is preparing an encyclical on the different forms of Government, his object being to show how much the nations are indebted to the Church for conciliatory settlements of differences.

THE TYRANT BALMACEDA DEFEATED.

The despatches up to Friday last described the situation in Chili as gloomy in the extreme for the Catholic party. It was stated that reinforcements had been constantly arriving at Valparaiso to strengthen Balmaceda's forces, which already numbered 20,000. He had established a line of defence, which it would be impossible for General Canto to break through. Again, it was reported that Canto's army, which landed near Valparaiso for the purpose of storming, was attacked by the enemy, its retreat to the ships cut off, and that all the insurgent forces had surrendered.

This was sad news for all men who took an interest in the fate of a Christian people struggling for liberty against a usurper whose chief occupation while in power was insulting the Church and imprisoning priests.

Last Saturday's despatches gave the lie direct to these gloomy statements. It now appears that General Pinto appealed once more to the country, and, having landed any amount of rifles and ammunition, he found willing hands among the indignant peasantry to use both.

Balmaceda's troops were fiercely attacked all along the line, and after a stubborn resistance his line of defence was broken through. General Canto's volunteers pursued the fugitive army of the tyrant, who himself escaped, but five thousand of his subsidized mercenaries were slain on the battlefield and the city of Valparaiso surrendered to the victors.

The despatches conclude with the comforting assurance that the people of Chili have triumphed over the oppressors of their liberties and their religion and that there is an end to the reign of tyranny and infidelity in the Catholic republic of Chili.

THE HOLY COAT OF TREVES.

Our Toronto contemporary, the Christian Guardian, begins an editorial article on the Holy Coat of Treves with the statement that baseless legends "are used in Roman Catholic countries to interest and please the credulous," and the tradition that the sacred relic which is preserved at Treves as the seamless garment worn by our Blessed Lord, is placed among these baseless stories. In the same article we are told that "there is not a fragment of trustworthy evidence that this Holy Coat is the coat worn by our Saviour," and that nevertheless "thousand are ready to accept the silly legend as true and to believe there is religious merit in going to see this Holy Coat."

In last week's CATHOLIC RECORD we stated that there is no dogma of the Catholic Church in reference to the authenticity of this or of any other relic of our Lord or of any of the saints; yet we have no hesitation in declaring that there is the strongest possible reason for believing that the tradition of the Church of Treves in regard to this holy relic is well founded.

It has always been the practice of the Catholic Church to venerate relics of the saints, and this practice is founded upon the nature of our humanity. It is natural for us to cherish that which has belonged to those whom we love and venerate, and though Protestants have maintained that the practice is superstitious and idolatrous, they have themselves over and over again fallen into it. Thus it is officially announced that at the coming Methodist Ecumenical Council, which is to be held in Washington next month, there will be on exhibition papers "which were written by some of the early Methodist ministers," who are styled "the Fathers of Methodism." There will also be locks of their hair, spectacles which have been worn by them, and even a tea-canister which was once the property of Bishop Asbury.

There will be also the razor cases of Rev. Dr. G. C. Roberts and Rev. Jacob Gruber, and a clothes-brush of Bishop McKendree, and a lock of hair of Bishop Asbury's mother.

We do not pretend that it is superstitious to preserve these mementoes, but we maintain that it is the height of inconsistency to charge Catholics with idolatry or superstition for preserving with similar care the mementoes of Christ and His saints.

A decree of the Council of Trent forbids Bishops to offer relics of doubtful character for the veneration of the public, and as early as the twelfth century a similar decree was issued by Pope Innocent the Third. Surely the learned and pious line of Bishops who lived in Treves would have obeyed this decree if there had been any doubt of the authenticity of the holy coat preserved in their cathedral.

The tradition in Treves has been so constant and unvarying that there can be no reasonable doubt of the authenticity of this relic. It is a fact attested by history that when the Empress St. Helena visited Palestine in the beginning of the fourth century, she obtained many relics of the Passion of our Lord, including His Cross, the crown of thorns, the lance with which His side was pierced, the winding-sheet in which His body was wrapped, the nails which fastened Him to the cross, and His seamless garment.

Treves was at this time the western capital of the Roman Empire, and on her return to the city she presented to the cathedral the coat, one of the nails, and a portion of the crown of thorns, in the year of our Lord 324, and they have been preserved ever since with the greatest care.

In 1196 after the decree of Pope Innocent the Third, which forbade the public exposition of any uncertain relics, a careful examination was made into the evidence which attested the identity of these relics with those which had been presented by the Empress, and a legal document was drawn up and signed by a number of Bishops and clergy, and by the magistrates of the city attesting the fact, and this document is still in existence. There is no dogma of faith to oblige us to believe in the identity, yet as a historical fact there is no doubt about it, and it is most unfair for the Christian Guardian to pretend that there is no foundation for the tradition.

THE DOMINION CENSUS.

The census returns of the Dominion were laid on the table of the House of Commons on the 26th inst. They are very disappointing, as they do not show nearly so large an increase of population as was expected. The population in 1881 was 4,324,810. In 1891 the population is reported at 4,823,344, the increase in ten years being 498,534, or 11 1/2 per cent. The following are the figures for each Province:

Table with 5 columns: Province, 1881, 1891, Inc., P. C. Nova Scotia, 440,572, 450,523, 9,951, 2.25. New Brunswick, 321,253, 321,254, 1, 0.32. P. E. Island, 198,831, 204,788, 5,957, 3.00. Quebec, 1,359,027, 1,488,586, 129,559, 9.53. Ontario, 1,126,922, 1,212,989, 86,067, 7.63. Manitoba, 62,299, 131,412, 69,113, 111.00. Assiniboia, 25,515, 61,487, 35,972, 140.98. Alberta & Saskatchewan, 49,459, 92,757, 43,298, 87.56. Unorganized Territory, 39,131, 32,168, 1,237, 4.90. Totals, 4,324,810, 4,823,344, 498,534, 11.52.

The increase for the decade falls far short of that of the preceding decade, which amounted to 638,214, or nearly 17 1/2 per cent. It is noteworthy, however, that great precautions were taken, in making the present census, to exclude non-residents, which was not the case in 1881. There is no doubt that this fact will account for a considerable part of the apparent difference between the two decades.

By the British North America Act, the redistribution of the representation of the various provinces in Parliament is made to depend on the decennial census. The number of members for Quebec is fixed at 65, and by dividing the population of that Province by 65 we obtain 22,901 as the population which in each province is entitled to be represented by one member in the House of Commons. As the population of Ontario when divided by this number gives 92 for quotient, which is the number of members to which Ontario is now entitled, the total representation of Ontario will be unchanged, though it is probable that when a new redistribution bill will be brought before Parliament the boundaries of many of the constituencies will be changed. Manitoba will be entitled to an additional member, but the maritime provinces will have their representation diminished. New Brunswick will lose two members, and Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island one each.

When compared with the increase of population in the United States, our increase is very disappointing, and it has already caused much comment which is not calculated to impress us with the idea that the Dominion is as prosperous as it ought to be with the advantages it possesses.

The growth of Toronto has been phenomenal. In 1881 its population was 77,034, but it is now 181,220. This is an increase of 135 1/2 per cent. But when it is noted that this increase of population by 104,186 in ten years constitutes the largest part of the increase in the Province, the fact is not at all encouraging. The total increase of Ontario is placed at 186,067, which leaves for that of the Province, outside of Toronto, only 81,861, which is exceedingly small. Part of the population is due to the extension of the city limits, so that the actual increase is to

be reckoned as

According to the Department of Agriculture settled decade. Yet Dominion has more than had total increase. There has certainly been an increase to the children of young men and women? These are to be judged elsewhere, to be one and a half and in ten years population of 5 ing immigrants, without increase, would Where has the There is but of tion. It has the population public. Canada to induce immigrants and it seems that with the intention found it more make their first States, and the have also from there than in the

We have here years of a great population of it into the United into New England has taken place when the figures weighed carefully the exodus from much short of immigration is much larger than the increase of that of Quebec. Nevertheless the Canadians into decidedly made Canada is to be which we have have boasted, so be taken to mal at least, who ar

During the the progress of greater than d reaching 17 1/2 per cent as the new census therefore, that ward, unless which the cen responsible for any. At all ob portant problem to solve, and n undoubtedly, as their help toward tory result, as t ment is to be population to p ing to other lar earning a respec itself ought this to its own still to have luc those strangers daily to take up mist.

It is to be inc ress of the inc provinces is The increase is 9,961, while in Prince Edward ridiculously low spectively.

TEACHER

Separate sch believe in the "Make hay w The religious greater or less tions holding m engage in vari cises calculated always fresh an their own efficien and to secure th of the schools Recently the R plete report of convention held ters of the Han we learn that d closed the Bro schools condu Teachers' Insti bers on a most scale. Details this pedagogic apply called, ar have sufficient that it was en may be necess assemblies held annual affairs, characteristic seek rather to