

The Catholic Record
Published every Friday morning at 42 Richmond Street.

Annual subscription \$2 00
Six months 1 00
ADVERTISING RATES.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.
All matter intended for publication must have the name of the writer attached, and must reach the office not later than Tuesday noon of each week.

THOS. COFFEY,
Publisher and Proprietor.

LETTER FROM HIS LORDSHIP BISHOP WALSHE.

London, Ont., May 23, 1879.

DEAR MR. COFFEY.—As you have become proprietor and publisher of the CATHOLIC RECORD, I deem it my duty to announce to its subscribers and patrons that the change of proprietorship will work no change in its tone and principles; that it will remain, what it has been, thoroughly Catholic, entirely independent of political parties, and exclusively devoted to the cause of the Church and the promotion of Catholic interests.

Yours very sincerely,
THOS. COFFEY,
Bishop of London.

Catholic Record.

LONDON, FRIDAY, MAY 28, 1880.

(OFFICIAL.)
DIOCESE OF LONDON.

EPISCOPAL VISITATIONS AND CONFIRMATIONS.

- May 25.....St. Francis.
" 26.....Stoney Point.
" 27.....Belle River.
" 28.....Woodside.
" 29.....Maidstone.
June 1.....St. Anne's.
" 2.....Windsor.
" 3.....Sandwich.
" 4.....Canard River.
" 5.....McGregor's Mills.
" 6.....Where a new church will be dedicated.
" 8.....Amherstburg.
" 12.....Blyth.
" 13.....Wawanosh.

By order of His Lordship the Bishop.
P. FERRON, Secretary.

INTOLERANCE REBUKED.

An institution called the British Reformation Society has recently attracted some attention by its denunciation of the appointment of Lord Ripon as Viceroy of India, and Lord Kenmare as Lord Chamberlain. These peers are devoted Catholics, but, none the less for that, ardent patriots.

The resolution adopted in reference to the appointment of the Marquis of Ripon to the Indian Viceroyalty, is a mass of ill-assorted verbiage and a tissue of inconsequential platitudes.

"This meeting views the appointment of the Marquis of Ripon to the important post of Viceroy of India, with sincere regret and apprehension; first, because, though not contrary to the letter, is contrary to the laws which preclude a Roman Catholic from occupying the throne of these realms, and from filling the position of her Majesty's representative in Ireland. Secondly, because the Queen, having been created Empress of India, it is evident by implication that the same restrictions exist with respect to the appointment of her Imperial Majesty's representative to rule over her 200,000,000 Eastern subjects.

Thirdly, because the appointment is a precedent changing those laws which preclude Roman Catholics from the throne in this country, which laws were found necessary to preserve the independence of the throne as well as our civil and religious liberties. Fourthly, because it has been so ably shown by the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone, in certain pamphlets, that more than ever since the decrees of the Vatican Council of 1870, no one can now become a convert to Romanism without renouncing his moral and civil freedom, and placing his loyalty, mental, and that of his wife, and because the spirit of a neophyte is expressed in the words, 'A Catholic first and an Englishman after,' which we take to mean that the convert intends, in the case of any conflict between the Queen and the Pope, to follow the Pope and not the Queen; and because the Marquis of Ripon being in this position, it is according to this showing unbecoming to the dignity of the Empress of India, and to the well-being of her subjects that he should fill this very important

position. Fifthly, because it is evidenced by the fact that not a single Roman Catholic representative has been returned to Parliament by constituencies of Great Britain, that this appointment is in direct opposition to their views."

The five reasons, if we can so term the absurdities put forward as reasons by the Reformation Society, evidently failed to impress the Premier in the sense of the advocates of the resolution. Mr. Gladstone's reply presents in its vigorous enunciation of fact and principle, so worthy a statesman in his position, a striking contrast to the illiberal and shortsighted emanation of the Reformation Society. Mr. Gladstone's letter is addressed to Lord Oranmore, one of the lights of those views propounded in the resolution recited above. If it do not convince that peer that the government pursued a wise and judicious course in the appointments referred to, it cannot fail to elicit the warmest approbation of the true friends of civil and religious liberty.

Mr. Gladstone's letter is couched in these terms:

"MY LORD.—In reply to your letter enclosing a memorial from the British Reformation Society, relating to the appointments held by Lord Ripon and Lord Kenmare, I am directed by Mr. Gladstone to inform you that the qualifications of Lord Ripon for the high office of Viceroy of India, had been carefully considered by her Majesty's Government; that her Majesty's Government repose particular confidence in the honor, integrity and impartiality of Lord Ripon, and are convinced from long experience of his personal qualities that he would never allow his own religious leanings or professions to interfere with the perfect equity of his conduct in any case where religious interests might be concerned. I am desired to add that the office of Viceroy is one detached in a remarkable degree from all direct contact with religious or ecclesiastical interests; and that in the case of the Lord Chamberlain's office, Lord Kenmare, as has been publicly stated, has by voluntary arrangement divested himself of all functions bearing upon ecclesiastical matters. I am to add further that the citation in your memorial from the work entitled, 'Rome and the rewest fashions in religion,' is verbally accurate, but presents when taken alone an incomplete and misleading view of Mr. Gladstone's opinions which are developed in the same book.

"Yours, etc."

(Signed) "J. A. GODLEY."
Mr. Gladstone has had a very large experience of Catholics in office. His experience proves what his statesmanship, no doubt, suggests that no body of her Majesty's subjects are more loyal to the throne, or more devoted to the best interests of the country than the Catholics of Great Britain and Ireland. They have been maligned, outraged and persecuted, but under every storm of cruel bigotry have preserved the loyalty dictated by religion and sustained by generous forbearance.

Lords Kenmare and Ripon will in office show, as they have out of office shown, that devotion to country eminently characteristic of the tried citizen and devoted Catholic."

THE SCHOOL QUESTION IN THE UNITED STATES.

We now hear little or nothing of the school question from our Catholic neighbors in the American Republic. It cannot surely be that they have abandoned the position they took with such promise of success some years ago—to rest satisfied with nothing short of liberty in the matter of education. They cannot claim to enjoy religious freedom so long as the educational system of the country remains as it is now. The present system establishes a tyranny over Catholics insupportable if properly apprehended. We greatly fear, however, that although well and ably pointed out as the injustice of that system has often been, the Catholic body in the American Republic has not as yet fully realized the danger of accepting in silence the yoke of irreligion in the matter of education. The defects of the common school system are becoming daily more apparent. But Catholics must be active if they desire to overturn that system. Their case must be kept before the public till right-minded men are forced to take a stand on its merits. This once accomplished, Catholic electors have it in their own hands to make their opinions and influence felt.

BISHOP SWEATMAN AND THE BIBLE SOCIETY.

We were unavoidably prevented from noticing in our last issue the following letter:

To the Editor of the CATHOLIC RECORD.
SIR,—As you appear to be somewhat misinformed in regard to the action of Bishop Sweatman and the Bible Society, I desire to say that the Bishop-intimated Society by this action, he has since declining to attend the anniversary meeting in a Presbyterian Church building, cordially accepted the position of Vice-President of the Society, to which he was nominated by prominent members of his diocese (not his own) on the Board of Bible Society Directors.

I answer that Evangelicals regret the action of their Bishop, but so far from Bishop Sweatman repudiating the Bible Society by this action, he has since declining to attend the anniversary meeting in a Presbyterian Church building, cordially accepted the position of Vice-President of the Society, to which he was nominated by prominent members of his diocese (not his own) on the Board of Bible Society Directors.

Bishop Fuller, of the Diocese of Niagara, has also recently done the same, as expressive of sympathy with the objects of the society to circulate the Scriptures.

Believe me,
Very sincerely yours,
J. GEORGE HODGINS,
Honorary Lay Secretary to the Bible Society.

In our observations on the action of Bishop Sweatman we stated that he had refused to attend the meeting of the Bible Society in a Presbyterian Church. Mr. Hodgins admits the correctness of this statement. We were not, then, misinformed. We knew nothing, indeed, at the time we wrote of Bishop Sweatman's election to a Vice-Presidency in the Society. His election to such a position might be considered in the light of palliation for his refusal to attend the meeting if Mr. Hodgins himself did not inform us that the Evangelicals "regretted the action of their Bishop."

Mr. Hodgins' letter, so far from rebutting any of our statements, gives them ample confirmation. Not for that reason alone, however, do we give it place in our columns, but also for the courtesy and kindness with which it is written. Bishop Sweatman may find all parties in his church united in hatred of Catholicism, but in all other things will discover, as others in his position have discovered, that there exists a spirit of discord in the church, of which he is a titular, which no ill-considered profession of bigotry can allay.

AN ECUMENICAL COUNCIL.

The world is to be favored and all nations blessed by the holding of an Ecumenical Council of Methodists in London, in August, 1881. The calling of this council has been decided on by a meeting of representatives of various branches of Methodism lately held in Cincinnati. The council is, according to the decision of the Cincinnati gathering, to consist of four hundred delegates, two hundred from the United States and two hundred from Great Britain and "other places."

We have not been informed as to the qualifications required on the part of these delegates, or whether the female element, always a potent factor in Methodist assemblies, is or is not to be represented in the council. Neither are we enlightened as to the object of the council or the extent of the authority with which it will be invested. The Pan-Anglican Synod which met some time ago, having had no definite object in view, and being invested with no definable or recognizable authority, failed to make any marked impression on this obstinate world of ours. The Methodist body should have a care that no such sad result befall their Ecumenical Council. With "free speech" and an "open Bible," much might be done to attract attention to the deliberations of this body.

But we have our reasons to think that when our Methodist neighbors settle down to the business of selecting delegates, discord of a very unscriptural character will set in. How many delegates are the different "branches" of the Church to have? This is the first rock on which we foresee a few wrecks of the proposed Ecumenical. The "branches" are numerous, and a free trip over the ocean, with change of air, etc. etc., will enkindle some rather stirring ambitions in the minds of divers preachers and adherents of these

branches. Candidates for the position of delegate may be so numerous as to create dissensions, and the balloting for delegates may result in no election. But granting that the difficulties in the way of a quiet election and an equitable distribution between the various branches of representation in the council are removed, what will the council accomplish? The Pan-Anglican Synod, ushered in with a loud flourish of trumpets, met, debated and did nothing. Its mock solemnity and bootless discussions are now almost forgotten. The sooner they are consigned to complete oblivion the better for all concerned.

Are the Methodist denominations striving for similar results? If so, they could not adopt a better mode than the calling of this council. The age we live in is too practical to respect the useless and absurd, even when disguised under the name of religion. The assemblies of religious bodies impotent for good can serve no useful purpose, but often serve to bring the true religion and holy revelation into contempt.

"HELPS BY THE WAY" AND MR. MALLOCK.

Some one anxious, doubtless, for our soul's salvation, sends us from time to time copies of various Methodist publications. This is kind, but inconsistent. If private judgment means anything at all, and is not the mere sham we take it to be, it means "every man his own theologian," "every man his own judge in matters of faith," "no man to rely upon any other man." That this is the accepted principle of private judgment, need not, we think, be proved. Were proof necessary, all those thousand and one taunts hurled against the Catholic Church for her respect for authority and tradition would abundantly suffice. Now, if it really be, as we take it, the last logical conclusion of private judgment that every man must be his own theologian—no man must rely on any other man—what necessity of sending or even publishing these books? Are they not an attempt to thrust a particular kind of theology upon the world? Are they not an attempt to lead us to rely upon some other man than ourself? And as such are they not a burlesque upon private judgment? If we are to have theological works as authorities—if, in spite of private judgment, glossaries and annotations and dissertations are to be the order of the day, we infinitely prefer the writings of the Holy Fathers of the Church to anything Methodist or Thos. J. Hamilton, 308 Yonge st., Toronto, can offer us on the subject.

That private judgment is untenable, we admit; that it is a mere mental fiction, a mere election cry invented by clever but unscrupulous clerical electioneers to hoodwink the masses, and possible of acceptance only under the heat of religious excitement, we know; but if Protestantism will profess such nonsense, let it, at least, with the courage of its convictions, stand by it. The sober world has long known that such cries as "Private Judgment," "the Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible"—those palladiums of Protestantism, as they are used to be considered—are utter impossibilities; that they exist and can exist only as abstract ideas, not as practical issues; that to know only the Bible is not to know it; that private judgment is an impossibility even in making brogues; but then the world, knowing all this, has yet a perfect right to expect those who profess such principles to practice them. Hence these books—to say it again—are a mistake, a lowering of Protestant principles; in fact, a tribute paid by error to the Catholic principles of authority and tradition.

The last contribution of our Protestant friends made in the interest of our soul's salvation, but with this disgraceful lowering of Protestant principles, is a little tract calling itself "Helps by the Way." What that "way" is, whence it comes, and whether it goes, it nowhere states. If we understand its jargon aright, it is written in the interests of "emotional religion" in some form or other. That these "Helps by the Way" are not intended as helps towards the right understanding of Catholic doctrine is very evident. In a review

of Mr. Mallock's work, and combating Mr. Mallock's defense of invocation of saints, it says:

"If Mr. Mallock really knows what the practice is, he must know that it is not at all so simple a matter (as he makes it). He must know that it is associated with a belief in the merits of the saints availing for us and in their worship and almost deification. He must know that only those who have a sufficient amount of merit to be effectual intercessors are separated from the rest by canonization, that the faithful may address their prayers aright. He must know that they are such necessary go-betweens that few venture to go to God without invoking their powerful aid. Thus the efficacy of Christ's blessed work is disparaged and the love that brought Him high to us is slighted and contemned. These are nearer, more accessible, more compliant. Mary is a woman, she will listen; rank and insulting unbelief for which the present word has long before provided the antidote; for never does Mary address the Lord in prayer but to get proof in some way."

Now here there is hardly a sentence without a false rendering of Catholic doctrine. And yet this book calls itself "Helps by the Way." Yes, "Helps by the way" of not understanding Catholic doctrine, but not helps by the way of arriving at truth on the matter.

The amusing part of the business is, that our Methodist friend, who ever he is, in answering Mr. Mallock, takes care not to answer him. Mr. Mallock, with a fairness and manliness that does him infinite credit, brings the matter down to its simple issue. He says: "Of course it may be contended that intercessory prayer, or that prayer of any kind, is an absurdity, but for those who do not think this, there can be nothing to object to in the invocation of saints. It is admitted by such men that we are not wrong in asking the living to pray for us. Surely, therefore, it is not wrong to make a like request of the dead."

This is bringing the matter down to a simple issue; an issue evidently too simple for our Methodist reviewer, since he carefully gives it the go-by, and launches out immediately into pastures that are new. And yet before any further issues are raised, we have a right to a plain, straightforward answer to Mr. Mallock's position, "we are not wrong in asking the living to pray for us; and therefore cannot be wrong in making a like request of the dead." That this is a very awkward proposition to get over, we admit; and that our Methodist friend, in the interests of throwing dust in the eyes of his readers, has shown a certain ingenuity in evading it, we will grant; but then ingenuity and evasion are not manliness and truth, and our admiration for "Helps by the Way" as an opponent of Catholic doctrine diminishes proportionately. Perhaps he thinks an honorable enemy is half a friend.

We have scripture warrant for this, asking the prayers of living saints, since the apostles did it. Our Methodist friends must show us good and sufficient reasons why we must not follow those same saints to heaven with our prayers before we can accept the prohibition. It is no answer to say that the invocation of saints "is associated with a belief in the merits of the saints availing for us." Such merits as the apostle thought the "brethren" had, when he asked their prayers on earth. "Brethren, pray for me." Such and no more, we think these same brethren in heaven have, when we say "all ye angels and saints pray for us." If the apostle thought the living "brethren" had merits before God, so do we; if the apostle did not, neither do we.

To bring in this question of the merits of the saints availing for us is to raise a false issue with Mr. Mallock, and may do well to draw off attention from the main point, but is not a very honorable proceeding. The question is not as to how the saints ask for us? or on what grounds they ask? That is thier concern, not ours. We do not suppose that anyone ever yet heard a dead saint praying to God; and we do not think that, like the Pharisee of old in the temple, such men as St. Austin or St. Peter or St. Paul will stand much on the order of their asking whilst praying for us. We suspect they will take somewhat higher grounds than their own merits, or ours either. But this is not the question raised by Mr. Mallock. The real question is (and we really wish our Protestant friends, when they undertake to teach the Catholic Church, would keep to the

question): If we may ask the prayers of the living saints—why not the prayers of the dead saints? For our own part, we do not see any difference between a living saint and a dead saint, except in that the living saint has not received his crown. When we pray to a living saint we pray to him as beloved of God, as a servant of God, as reflecting the perfections of God. When we pray to a dead saint we do so for all these motives and one more: because he has run his course and preserved the faith. Again, when we pray to a live saint to intercede for us, we do so because he has received from God the privilege of prayer. We have yet to learn that this tremendous privilege is taken away from the saints at death. Our Methodist friends make a great deal of the "merits of Christ," "efficacy of Christ's blessed work," &c., but they do not make sufficient. Through the merits of Christ, and the efficacy of His blessed work, we have each of us received the privilege of prayer, (the right and power to address our wants to God) nay, we are expressly told to ask, and reproved if we do not ask, in Scripture. This is a power given to every Christian in time and eternity. Our Methodist friends must prove a restriction to time only, before the logical world will reject the Catholic doctrine of invocation of saints.

SACERDOS.

LETTER FROM STRATFORD.

Confirmation was administered in this town by His Lordship our worthy Bishop, on Wednesday, the 19th instant, to one hundred and eighty persons. The Bishop was assisted by Right Rev. Monsignor Bruyere, V. G., who sang the Mass, and Rev. Messrs. O'Mahony, of London, and Feron, of St. Mary's. The remarkably good conduct of the children during the service reflects great credit on our worthy curate, Father Roman, who has devoted a great deal of his time during the past five weeks to the spiritual instruction of the boys and girls who were candidates for first communion and confirmation. Still we must not forget that he was most ably assisted in the good work by the Loretto Nuns, five of whom are devoting themselves exclusively to the welfare of our Separate School, and are doing all in their power to second the efforts of our Separate School Board. The Episcopal corporation recently decided the Jarvis property to the Loretto Nuns for the nominal sum of one dollar. The beautiful property was purchased about two years and a half ago, by our pastor, Rev. Doctor Kilroy, for the sum of eleven thousand dollars. The only debt on it now is four thousand dollars, which the Ladies of Loretto assume. During the last four months one thousand dollars has been paid on our church debt, thus reducing it to six thousand dollars, which will be wiped away by the surplus pew rent inside of four years.

We now have the largest and finest church in the diocese, a beautiful convent, and two elegant separate schools, with a constantly increasing congregation, and fast diminishing debt, which speaks well of the charity of the faithful.

Yours, J. L.

Stratford, May 21, 1880.

LETTER OF THANKS FROM IRELAND.

To the Editor of the CATHOLIC RECORD.
Brewer's Mills, May 17th, 1880.
DEAR SIR.—Will you kindly give place in the columns of your worthy journal to the following reply of the Most Rev. Dr. Gilooly, Bishop of Elphin, in regard to contribution sent by the Catholics of Brewer's Mills to his Lordship.

P. DE SAUNHA, P. P.

Sligo, April 27th, 1880.

MY DEAR REV. FATHER.—I am deeply grateful to you and to your warm-hearted Irish flock for your remittance of 251 5s. 6d. for the relief of my poor diocese. The kind contributors shall be remembered fervently and frequently in the prayers of our clergy and flocks. Rev. P. de Saunha, the destitution is still undiminished in the diocese and other parts of the country, and will continue so until the next crops come in, in August. So far the all-bountiful Providence of God has enabled us to supply the necessary food to our poor, famishing people, and we have every hope that the relief funds will be sustained for a few months longer. Begging the help of your good prayers and those of your flock, and again assuring you of my profound gratitude.

I remain, my dear Rev. father,
Yours sincerely in Christ,
+ LAWRENCE GILLOOLY.

ANOTHER LETTER OF THANKS.

The following is another letter received by His Lordship Bishop Walsh, in acknowledgment of the sum of £100 sent to relieve the distress in Ireland:—
St. Jarlath's College, Tuam, May 1, 1880.
MY DEAR LORD.—Owing to absence from attending on two missions and continual occupation there, I was unable to acknowledge your Lordship's kind letter and generous remittance of £100 towards the relief of the prevailing distress. I pray God to bless your Lordship and your generous flock. The prayers of the poor whom you shall have relieved will be offered up without ceasing for you. In this they shall be cordially, however unworthily, joined by
Your Lordship's
Very devoted,
JOHN J. McEVILLY,
Right Rev. Dr. Walsh, Bishop of London.