



VOL. XXXIX.—NO. 29. MONTREAL, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 20, 1889. PRICE—FIVE CENTS

MALIGNED JESUITS. The Truth about the Order's Suppression. DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE.

Among the many historical falsehoods and barefaced calumnies that, thanks to honest and conscientious journalists, disclose the pages of the Encyclopædia Britannica (vol. xiii, pp. 645-636, article on the Jesuits) are to be reckoned the following, which concern the existence of the Society of Jesus in Prussia and Russia after the Papal Restoration of Pius VII. of happy memory. The first of these is a paragraph in the Encyclopædia to the effect that the Jesuits, after some ineffectual attempts at direct resistance, withdrew into the territories of the non-Roman Catholic sovereigns of Prussia and Russia, Catherine II. and Frederick II.

Like Frederick of Prussia, the Empress Catherine II. was an infidel, but like him, too, she possessed remarkable powers of government; and, apart from her appreciation of the value of the Jesuits as an Order, she was anxious to use them as a means of controlling the disaffected provinces recently annexed from Poland and Russia and part of Livonia in 1772.

How the Jesuit organization of white Russia was preserved. A few years later, when Joseph II., of Austria visited Russia, he inquired from the Bishop of Mohilev how it happened that the Society of Jesus, suppressed throughout Europe, still flourished in that Empire, and he received the following laconic but expressive reply: "Democracy, imperatrice inebriata, Romæ tacens."

Why the Empress Catherine retained the Jesuits. Later on, at the accession of Pius VI., the Empress dispatched to Rome a special messenger bearing her autograph letter to the Pope, in which she thus summed up her motives for protecting the Jesuits: "This Society of peaceful and innocent men continues to remain in my Empire because, among all Catholic orders, they are the best fitted to instruct my subjects and to inspire them with the true principles of Christianity. I am resolved to support them against any power whatsoever, and in return to do my duty; for I am their sovereign and I regard them as faithful, innocent, and useful subjects."

It is highly interesting to see how clearly Cardinal Galini pus the case in a memorial bearing his signature and seal, addressed to Pius VI. under date of the 1st of April, 1780. In this memorial, Cardinal Galini, S. J., in his Chapter, c. 4, § 38, makes the following extract very appropriate to our present purpose: "The Brief of Clement XIV. was not published in Russia because the Bishop, who, by the terms of the Brief itself, was charged to inform the members of the Society of its suppression, from motives of prudence, did not do so. The Jesuits in Russia remained accordingly in peaceful possession of what had belonged to them for two hundred and forty years under the sanction of many Bulls and Briefs of nineteen Sovereign Pontiffs; that is to say, they continued to be members of the Society in the schism? Were their disobedience? The Bishop did not communicate the Brief, because the Court of St. Petersburg forbade its publication under pain of banishment. Disciplinary enactments do not bind such grave consequences. Besides, even Catholic Sovereigns had power to refuse transmission of the Brief without incurring the charge of heresy, for the Emperor was also from the form of expression adopted by your Pope who suppressed the Society; for Clement XIV. confined himself to words of simple exhortation—*hortatur principes*. Thus, according to the intention of Pope Clement himself, the Sovereigns are not compelled to act. How, then, could the obligation be imposed upon Sovereigns not in communion with Rome?"

Like Frederick of Prussia, the Empress Catherine II. was an infidel, but like him, too, she possessed remarkable powers of government; and, apart from her appreciation of the value of the Jesuits as an Order, she was anxious to use them as a means of controlling the disaffected provinces recently annexed from Poland and Russia and part of Livonia in 1772.

deserve the reproach of disobeying him whom we revere as the Supreme Ruler of the Church."

In the face of such events, who can call the Superior of the Society in Russia rebels or schismatics, because after doing their best to procure the publication of the Brief, they waited the word of command before disobeying their troops? In connection with this subject we here transcribe from a copy of a manuscript preserved in the Stonyhurst Library, England, the following words of Father Charles Flowden (1785), which contain a forcible commentary on the strange petition quoted above, where the Jesuits were earnestly seeking their own preservation: "Two hundred condemned persons petitioned to be stripped of their property, to be driven from their houses, and to be deprived of a state of life which they preferred to every other. Two hundred edifying religious men begged to be placed in the impossibility of living within the sacred precincts of the cloister, they loved so well. For the sake of the public good, they were interdicted from many of the functions of the sacred ministry, and prohibited to exercise the duties of education and instruction of youth. They petitioned to be totally annihilated for the service of the Holy See, to which they professed the truest attachment and devotion, and they acted with the most perfect confidence with the wisdom of their enemies, who triumphed in the success of their measures, and enjoyed the pleasure of having compelled them to effect their own ruin."

Canon Littledale's dishonesty. Now we may pause for a moment to ask Dr. Littledale a few questions. What do you say, my good reason, to this? How do you manage to reconcile those historical facts with what you wrote in the Encyclopædia (p. 635)? The Jesuit direct resistance to the will of the Pope, his obstinate rebellion against the sentence of suppression? Of the forging of Briefs, of course, to deceive the Bishops and impose upon the people? Of their pleading the Pope's verbal approval, of whose existence and validity you say, no proof is forthcoming? When you penned those lies, did you have in mind the historical facts which we have just seen? If you did not know them, which seems to be very doubtful—then we ask what can justify you in fastening such calumnies on the Society of Jesus, and blackening the lives of men whose history you profess to ignore? If you did not know them—and this seems doubtful, as it appears from the long list of names, as well as the long list of references to the Society of Jesus in the Encyclopædia, that you were well acquainted with their history—then you wrote in direct opposition to the known truth, a sin which you, a Master in Israel, seem to understand both in theory and in practice. The Jesuits, animated as they are by Christian sentiments, heartily forgive you all the injuries you have heaped on their Society, and they have forgone your behalf, and by way of exoneration, the plea contained in our Saviour's words on the Cross, "they knew not what they do?"

How direct ourselves to the last point of this article, viz., the fact of the total restoration of the Society by one of Clement's successors, Pius VIII., August 17, 1814—forty one year after its total suppression.

On that eventful day, says James Clement in his "History of the Society" (p. 216), the city of Rome resounded with the joyous exultation of the entire population, who, in holiday array, were making their way to the Vatican, where they awaited the Sovereign Pontiff, when he, "Long live the Holy Father!" "Long live the Society of Jesus!" On leaving the palace, the Pope was greeted with redoubled enthusiasm and acclamation, the concourse following him to the Gem. There in that church, which was decorated as it was wont to be in the most brilliant days of the Society, were assembled all the venerable Fathers of the Order, who, in response to the Pontiff's call, had flocked thither from all parts, and now to the number of one hundred and fifty, awaited the arrival of His Holiness. The Sovereign Pontiff entered the church, escorted by the members of the Sacred College, and the leading prelates of Rome. The Bull, "Sollicitudine Omnium," re-establishing the Order of St. Ignatius throughout the world, was publicly read; and the Pope, in a simple and dignified manner, addressed the solemn assembly of all those present on that solemn and joyous occasion.

The terms of the Bull itself offer a striking proof of the general feeling of administration entertained throughout the Church for the once famous Order, the suppression of which had saddened so many hearts and left so wide a gap in the religious world.

POPE PIVS VIII. ON THE ACT OF RESTORATION. This act of justice on the part of the Holy See so nobly represented in the person of Pius VIII., was practically a denial of the charges alleged against the Jesuits at the time of their suppression. According to the Pope's own statement he acted on the demand of all Catholic Christians. The Pope expresses himself thus: "The Catholic world manifested a demand for the reestablishment of the Society of Jesus. We daily receive most earnest petitions to this effect from our venerable brethren, the Archbishops and Bishops, and from other eminent persons. . . . We should deem ourselves guilty of great negligence before God, if in the presence of the perils that threaten Christendom, we neglected the assistance given to us by God's special providence, and if placed at the helm of the bark of Peter, tossed by continual tempests, we refused to employ vigorous and experienced seamen to master the waves that threaten every instant to cause destruction and death."

The astronomer Lalande's tribute. Thus was repaired the evil to which Lalande, the distinguished astronomer, alluded when speaking of the suppression and of the chief negotiator, he said: "Oravabo (I implore) and Chosel had irretrievably destroyed the finest work of man unrivalled by any human institution. The human race has lost that wonderful and invaluable assembly of twenty thousand men, interested and unceasingly occupied with the most important and most useful to men."

A striking scene at the restoration. It is related, says a modern writer, that when the Bull of Restoration was read in the Quirinal, Pius VIII. could not control his emotion. After celebrating Mass, he lay prostrate on the altar steps, and rose at length lashed in tears. But if the Vicar of Christ was thus moved, deeper still must have been the emotion of the one hundred and fifty surviving members of the former Institute present on that occasion, who hailed with heartfelt gratitude the restoration of their mother, the Society of Jesus. Many of them had perhaps been in Rome on the 21st of July, 1773, and could compare the anguish of the past with the happiness of the present. Throughout the forty-one years that had elapsed since the suppression, they had watched with anxious hearts the progress of the fallen Institute; a secret hope that it might one day be restored; and now that Pius VIII. had cancelled the deed of Clement XIV., their wish was granted, their prayer heard, their hopes realized their patience and obedience rewarded; and the disciples of the soldier-saint stood ready to fight the battle of the Church with all the chivalry and heroism that distinguished them in the brightest days of their history.

We have purposely dwelt at some length on the details of this event, viz.: the Restoration of the Society of Jesus, first, because by so doing we thought we should effectually dispose of Littledale's malignant assertion (p. 635) that Pius VIII., in restoring the Society to its pristine vigor, annulled all vindictive measures of the Jesuits from the heavy charges in the Brief of Suppression. To use an illustration suitable to our purpose, if a public functionary, holding a highly-responsible position in the affairs of the State, is deposed from his office under the pressure of false and calumnious charges; and the charges are subsequently proved to be untrue, could the public desire than that of seeing him reinstated with all honor in his primitive rights? It is the lot of convicted felons, and lawfully tried and condemned criminals? Now this is precisely what Pius VIII. did in restoring the Society of Jesus. He publicly proclaimed their innocence, restored their honor by re-establishing them in their position in the Church, and warmly recommending them to the protection of temporal princes, as well as to the Archbishops and bishops of the Catholic world.

New York, February 15.—The Rome correspondent of the Catholic News reports that the Pope has received a letter from the bishops of the United States, signed on their behalf by Cardinal Gibbons, expressing sympathy with His Holiness because his enemies render his "daily life one of the ignominy, grief and of oppression." The letter refers to the taking of Rome by the Italian army eighteen years ago as a great sacrilege. It says that the Pope's enemies endeavored to taunt and corrupt his people by bad laws, irreligious and immoral institutions and evil examples, and declares that his intention is to deprive the Pope of all power of governing the church throughout the world. The bishop bids the Pope to be of good cheer, declares that his enemies will yet be overcome and promises to pray that the time may soon come when he can govern the church with complete liberty.

Rome, Feb. 15, 1889.—Only two cardinals received their letters yesterday, the Archbishop of Catania and Macchi, D'Annunzio, being too sick to attend the ceremony. The proclamation of the following bishops took place: John I. Foley, to Detroit; John J. Heenan, to Wichita; Thomas Helle, to St. Joseph, Mo.; Thomas G. Dowling, to Hamilton, Ont., Canada, and Dean O'Connor was named for the latter see. Bishop John J. Keen, rector of the American Catholic University, was named to the titular see of Ajaccio, and in the consistory Mgr. O'Connell, rector of the American College in Rome, asked for and received the pallium for Archbishop Janssens of New Orleans.

"ROMAN CATHOLIC AGGRESSION." The Liberals seem to have Made All the Concessions to the Church.

The Church of Rome is a religious organization, and it is a political organization as well. With the former The World has nothing to do; that concerns the theologians. Nor have we any intention of casting the least reflection on that admirable system of piety, charity and the practice of virtues taught by our Catholic education, or the noble work of the various educational and charitable institutions and the sisterhoods that control them. We are dealing with the Church as a political organization. That it is a political organization may be questioned by some, but whoever wishes European history must know that one great issue concerns the Pope's temporal power, and whoever has read his oracles from Gladstone to Goldwin Smith, or watched the course of Blomack and the champions of the Catholic position, must know that the Church claims a political as well as a spiritual dominion. The World is therefore dealing mainly with the political side of the Church, with the conduct and course of our politicians (provincial and federal) toward the Church, and the conduct of those Protestants who aid or abet, or do not oppose, what is called Catholic aggression.

Let us now come back to the Jesuit Bill. The attitude of the press of Toronto toward the various measures of the Government is very interesting. The Mail says it should have vetoed by the Dominion authority. The Globe starts out to say the same thing but ends in a haze. The Empire is notoriously weak and vacillating.

What is the common ground on which these Liberals rally? Provincial rights, Provincialism. What does Provincialism uphold? This Jesuit bill, Riellism, Nationalism, (French Canadianism) and opposition to a strong central government and the maintenance of powerful local ones. What was the beginning of this aggressive policy of Mr. Meriel? The Edgar-Levor treaty before the Champ de Mars meeting and the Interprovincial conference at Quebec when Mr. Meriel, Mr. Chouinard and all his colleagues were active spirits.

And where is this spirit of Catholic aggression showing itself besides in Quebec? In Ontario. And who are the men in Ontario who are making the concessions? The Liberal Mr. Mowat, his Minister of Education, and his followers. Who, then, does it behoove those who are opposed to Catholic aggression to watch? Primarily, our Liberals in Ontario, and the representatives of Quebec when they go to Ottawa on a marauding tour. Then is the time also to watch Sir John Macdonald and his party.

The Jesuit question formed the subject of discussion in various city churches to-day. Bishop Walsh of Toronto, at St. Mary's said that the Roman Catholic church is persecuted and misrepresented by people who know nothing of it. Father Flannery, of St. Thomas, went into a history of the Jesuit order at the Cathedral. He said the agitation is confined to Ontario, that the Protestant community of Quebec have no objection to the arrangement arrived at and that the people, when they come to understand the question, will find that they have been made the dupes of political tricksters. Dr. Wild said the law of Canada had no power to incorporate the Jesuits and certainly the Province of Quebec could not assume that power. He doubted whether if a man were shot a Jesuit on the street that the British law would punish him. It is treason against the British constitution for a Jesuit to exist in the Dominion. He forecast that the next move would be to ask the Dominion Parliament to pay the \$400,000.

away like chaff. But should the church continue only to grow greater and stronger in Quebec and should she endeavor to extend to the rest of Canada those practices which she upholds in Lower Canada, then it becomes necessary for the people of Ontario and the rest of Canada to cross to Ottawa and reconstruct so reactionary a province and so aggressive an engine as the church there will have become.

What would come of a dissolution of this Act? Is it probable that Mr. Meriel would dissolve the Legislature and come back with a stronger majority than ever? Is it probable that the Act would pass the Quebec Assembly again by an unanimous vote? Is it probable that the Ottawa Government would dissolve the Act a second time? Is it probable that the dissolution would precipitate a bitter and a bitter struggle between the French Roman Catholics? Is it probable that the result of entering upon such a struggle would be the smothering of the Confederation into its original fragments? Again we ask, should the Bill be allowed or disallowed? A Protestant of a practical turn of mind may well answer, "I can't tell," a six of one and half-a-dozen of the other." Continued on third page.

LE CARON'S ARTFUL SCHERMES.

PHILADELPHIA, Feb. 15.—General Master Workman Powderly arrived in this city last evening to attend the regular monthly meeting of the General Executive Board of the Knights of Labor. Concerning the informer and star witness for the London Times against the Irish leader, Mr. Powderly said to the World correspondent to-day that in his opinion Le Caron was a cold-blooded villain of the worst type and that no one should put the slightest reliance in whatever revelations the wretch might make, even on his oath. Nearly three years ago he made an unsuccessful attempt to entrap Mr. Powderly into a conspiracy, as the following letter sent to Mr. Powderly by Le Caron from the Southern Hotel, St. Louis, April 3, 1886, and now made public for the first time—will show.

As such a time as this a few words of advice and encouragement may be of service to you, and may possibly serve to solve the very difficult problem so suddenly thrust before you. A successful law-abiding workman will never encounter such a peril as you now have to deal with. Moral suasion, so good in trivial cases, becomes of no use when applied to such a gold-hearted fellow as J. Gould. Threat, argument and sympathy appeal to him in vain, and though they plead with him in thunder tones, the sound falls on his deaf ears. You must reach him by other means. You must win him by force. You must not be expected to publicly condemn any but peaceful measures. You will not even know that any other has been resorted to.

All that you need do will be to give me the names of a few of your lieutenants along the Missouri Pacific road and I will attend to the rest. I will be able to reach you in a very short time. I will be able to reach you in a very short time. I will be able to reach you in a very short time. I will be able to reach you in a very short time.

Toronto, February 17.—The Jesuit question formed the subject of discussion in various city churches to-day. Bishop Walsh of Toronto, at St. Mary's said that the Roman Catholic church is persecuted and misrepresented by people who know nothing of it. Father Flannery, of St. Thomas, went into a history of the Jesuit order at the Cathedral. He said the agitation is confined to Ontario, that the Protestant community of Quebec have no objection to the arrangement arrived at and that the people, when they come to understand the question, will find that they have been made the dupes of political tricksters. Dr. Wild said the law of Canada had no power to incorporate the Jesuits and certainly the Province of Quebec could not assume that power. He doubted whether if a man were shot a Jesuit on the street that the British law would punish him. It is treason against the British constitution for a Jesuit to exist in the Dominion. He forecast that the next move would be to ask the Dominion Parliament to pay the \$400,000.