

The Catholic Record
Published every Friday morning at 422 Richmond Street.
Annual subscription..... \$2 00
Six months..... 1 00

ADVERTISING RATES.
Ten cents per line for first, and five cents per line for each subsequent insertion. Advertisements measured in nonpareil type, 12 lines to an inch.
Contract advertisements for three, six or twelve months, special terms. All advertisements should be handed in not later than Tuesday morning.

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 WALSH.

London, Ont., May 22, 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 one and principal object, which is to give to the Catholic people of this country, and to the promotion of Catholic interests, a paper which is devoted to the cause of the Church and to the promotion of Catholic interests. I am confident that under your experienced management the *Record* will improve in usefulness and efficiency; and I therefore earnestly commend it to the patronage and encouragement of the clergy and laity of the diocese.

Believe me,
Yours very sincerely,
+ JOHN WALSH,
Bishop of London.

MR. THOMAS COFFEY,
Office of the "Catholic Record."

Catholic Record.

LONDON, FRIDAY, SEPT. 24, 1880.

THAT SYNOD AGAIN.

The Anglican Provincial Synod, opened on the 8th inst. with so much empty pomp and sound, went on from bad to worse. The proceedings on the day of opening were indeed farcical enough. The sermon preached by Bishop Binney was, as shown in our last, illogical in its argumentation and absurd in its conclusions. Then the ill-timed and ferocious attack on the British Parliament and Government by the Rev. Mr. Bell, a delegate from the Irish Protestant Episcopal Church, added to the really ridiculous aspect of the synod in the first days of its existence. But the climax of absurdity was not reached till the discussion took place on a proposed "canon" concerning marriage within the prohibited degrees. For the information of our readers we may say that there is, in connection with these synods, a "House of Bishops" sitting apart from the lay and clerical parochial delegates. It was in this "house"—we mean the "house of bishops"—that the canon on marriages within the prohibited degrees originated. The canon, as adopted by the bishops, forbids clergymen from solemnizing and the people from contracting marriages within the prohibited degrees, of which a table is to be printed and placed at the entrance of every church in the country. The motion for the adoption of the canon by the parochial delegates, lay and clerical, drew from several speakers expressions of intense hostility and ignorant bigotry towards the Catholic Church. A Rev. Mr. Kelly declared, in reference to the proposed legislation on the subject of marriage with a deceased wife's sister, that "the great Romish organization which they had to face in Montreal was at the bottom of all this. The Pope sold the power of dispensation to the bishops, which was one great source of his power and of his bad influence, and the bishops sold him to the laity."

We never before heard of this clerical firebrand till the meeting of the synod, and we hope for the good of the people at large we shall never again hear of him. He is evidently a man of such narrow intellectual capacity, warped by bitter prejudices, as to be incapable of recognizing his own turgid and uncontrollable fanaticism. Such men are a pest in a new and rising country—a plague on religion and a dishonor to society. Mr. Kelly did not, however, stand alone in fanatical outpouring. Rev. Dr. Sullivan declared that if the legislature passed "ten thousand bills" to legalize marriage with a deceased wife's sister, he should refuse to celebrate them, for "the law of the Church was superior to the law of the State." This is very sound doctrine indeed, but a church which has ever been the creature of the State—which owes its origin to Statecraft of the most questionable nature, is not the body to maintain so sound a principle? Dr. Sullivan's empty threat of defying even ten thousand bills must and will be taken at his word and consigned to the doom and oblivion of other sweeping post-prandial declarations. Were

this bill legalizing marriage with a deceased wife's sister to become law, no one will be readier to assist in carrying out its provisions than the hungry rural rector, who thinks as much of the "house of bishops" as that "house" thinks of him, and whose household necessities are too pressing to permit him to sacrifice a fee to obey a "canon."

The canon was approved by the synod, and a petition ordered to be prepared against legislative sanction of marriage with a deceased wife's sister. The latter proposal drew from Mr. Thomas White, M. P., a vigorous protest. His protest was, however, of no avail. The delegates were determined on showing hostility to Rome by taking the course proposed, and did so. They forgot that the Catholic Church is as consistently opposed to these marriages as the needs of religion and society require, and that fewer marriages within the prohibited degrees occur between Catholics than in any other religious body. If the synod imagines that the ridiculously untenable position it has taken up on this question will influence public opinion, it will find itself sadly mistaken. Neither Parliament nor the people can afford to give heed to a body so wholly irresponsible and deplorably illogical.

NAUGHTY BUT NICE.

We have in this city a ministerial association. This body is not political, but religious. We are not, we must confess, aware of the special objects for the promotion of which this society was formed. All we know is that it meets from time to time, and that its members at their meetings enter upon discussions affecting the interests of the sects to which they respectively belong. At a recent meeting held here we learn that the Rev. Mr. Grant read a short but suggestive paper on Church sociables. The leading points were that they came not from apostolic days, but were a pitiable innovation from less orthodox times. That in principle they were absolutely wrong and indefensible. That they opened the door to most objectionable features, such as lotteries, raffles and kindred abuses. That it smacked of the world to be announcing 'pan-cake' socials, 'maple-sugar' socials, 'calico-apron' socials and such like. Such means of raising money as by a lady granting kisses for twenty-five cents apiece, and others as ludicrous as these, were a crying shame when sanctioned by the Church of Jesus Christ.

This paper must indeed have proved very suggestive, so much so that it led to a lengthy discussion. The condemnation of 'pan-cake' socials, 'maple-sugar' socials, and 'calico-apron' socials, so popular and so agreeable as they have evidently proved to be with all classes of sectaries, was too sweeping to meet with approval from the ministerial association, of whose godliness no man should doubt.

Rev. Mr. Wallace thought that socials were "necessary nuisances." They were popular, as proved by the large number who attended them. Many believed them necessary because of the heavy debts which hung over most congregations. While he deplored as much as any one the miserable features which characterized them in many instances, yet he thought that the only thing practicable now was to control them.

Rev. Mr. Herridge considered that "such things were, in many instances, needful, or else some churches would go to the wall. . . . He thought some who could not give money could give labor, which could be transformed into money. He thought a keen watch should be kept over all church entertainments."

With Rev. Mr. Herridge's observations the discussion closed. Mr. Grant thus found himself almost alone in his denunciations of 'pan-cake,' 'maple-sugar,' and 'calico-apron' socials. The sweetness of the 'pan-cake,' the lusciousness of the 'maple-sugar,' and the tender loveliness of the 'calico-apron' socials have too long held sway amongst our sectarian brethren to be wiped away by the denunciations of one member of the ministerial association. Devoted members of the various churches

represented in the ministerial association may have frequent occasions to find fault with abuses in connection with their various sociables. But we will venture to remark that ninety-nine out of every hundred church-going members are heartily and sincerely in favor of the continuance of these festive gatherings. What would become of religion amongst the sectaries in the rural districts but for these sociables? Mr. Grant complained of ladies granting kisses at twenty-five cents apiece at sociables. Would he be horrified to learn that at camp meetings and sometimes at ordinary church meetings they grant them for nothing, thus securing a large attendance of youthful male sinners? Very few if any of the latter, in declaring their experiences, admit the weaknesses of their lady associates. But the evil complained of at the meeting of the ministerial association, nevertheless, exists. Will the ministerial body suppress it? We think not. It may be very bad to indulge in the levities of these sociables, but the ladies find it "awfully nice," and the ladies will triumph.

THE PRESIDENTIAL CONTEST.

The result of the Maine election is yet in doubt. A few hundred votes either way will give the gubernatorial seat to one or other of the leading candidates. The time was when the Republican nomination for the governorship decided the contest. In 1856 the Republican majority in Maine was 27,974; in 1860 it was 27,704; in 1864, 17,592; in 1868, 28,038; in 1872, 32,335; in 1876, 14,960. Today the Republican candidate for the governorship, if elected, can claim a majority of but a few hundred votes. Maine, which was the banner State of the Republican party in the days of old, is no longer to be relied upon by that party. Gov. Davis may indeed be re-elected, but his re-election in the face of such a decisive expression of popular opinion as that manifested in the popular election for State offices shows the decadence of the Republican party in the opinions of the masses. That party has held sway for twenty years. Its avowed policy has been one of union and reconciliation, but its real course has been antagonistic to union and in every sense opposed to reconciliation. The canvass in Maine, on the Republican side, was conducted by Senator Blaine and his followers on the "bloody shirt" and "solid South" cries. The time has passed when these cries can excite the masses in the north. The union is no longer in danger. The war has effectually decided the great questions arising out of the contest of 1860. Neither the people of the South nor those of the North are anxious to see reopened the questions set at rest by the great civil contest which divided the strength and distracted the forces of the American union for five long years. The party which appears to the people on the strength of the old war cries is doomed to defeat and lasting humiliation at the coming elections. The Republican party, led by Blaine, Sherman and others, seems to have staked all hopes of success on the issues forever set at rest by the war. Maine has shown, in the recent State elections, the slenderness of the hope of success based on such cries. To secure the Presidential seat in 1876, the Republican managers committed themselves to a practical acknowledgment of the old secessionist doctrine of States rights by agreeing to a recognition of the Democratic State Government in Louisiana and South Carolina. It is, therefore, with very bad grace that the same party in 1880 raises the issue of centralization. The events of four years ago prove the utter insincerity of the Republican leaders in the maintenance of this supposed cardinal doctrine of their party. The elections to take place in Ohio and Indiana on the 12th of October will, we make no doubt whatever, show the determination of the American people to secure a fair and honest return of a President in November next. From present indications we are led to believe that the contest will not be as close as anticipated. We are now under the impression that the election of Gen. Hancock by a very decisive majority

is a matter of certainty. We feel confident that his election will give strength to the union at home, secure prestige abroad and promote the growth of free government throughout the world.

THE STATE OF IRELAND.

The prorogation of Parliament without the passage of any effective measure of reform for Ireland, places the Irish people in a position of the most awkward embarrassment towards the present liberal administration. The Irish people were to expect a great deal from the Gladstone Government. Their position had excited the attention of the whole civilized world. The sufferings of the tenantry drew forth expressions of sympathy from every civilized people, and one nation may be said to have vied with another in its efforts to alleviate the distress of the afflicted children of Erin. No one failed to see the cause of the distress. The leading statesmen of Great Britain admitted that the land laws demanded thorough reform. The condition of the Irish tenantry was on all hands admitted to be unendurable. Yet when the sufferings of the people of Ireland had been relieved by foreign contributions, the landowners refused to admit that which the whole world besides clearly saw, that the Irish people were the victims of a system of landownership oppressive in every sense and disgraceful to the age we live in. The Irish landlords and their English allies never had so favorable an opportunity in their hands to conciliate the good feeling of the tenantry. They allowed that opportunity to pass by them. In their selfishness they refused to do justice to them from whom they receive their enormous revenues. The people have now nothing to look for from the landowners, they have everything to look for from themselves. Animated with the determination to put an end to injustice and oppression, the Irish people must of a certainty meet with success in their struggle with the selfish and unscrupulous landowners. Well will it be for the latter if the success of the people mark not the utter downfall of landlordism, and the termination of the present system of land tenure in Great Britain.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

The *Catholic Times* has changed its place of publication from Waterloo to Rochester. The transfer has made no alteration in its bright and cheerful appearance. We wish our Rochester friend a long career of usefulness.

On the 15th a contract was made by the Dominion Government with capitalists in London, Paris and America for the construction and working of the Pacific Railway. It will be subject to the approval of the Canadian Parliament.

We are pleased to welcome again *McGee's Weekly*, of New York, with all its old-time freshness and vigor apparent in every page. It will prove most interesting and instructive to every Catholic family, and we trust many thousands of our people will come forward and extend it a generous support.

SOME time since the Toronto corporation visited Rochester, and were entertained in the most hospitable manner. The latter returned the visit during the week of the fair, but were so disgusted with the reception they received that they left for home without even paying a visit to "Canada's Great Fair." Insinuations are thrown out regarding the manner in which the Toronto men behaved in Rochester, which would lead to the supposition that they are not all high-minded Christian gentlemen.

ACCORDING to the *Saturday Review* it is easier for a Jew to get into Parliament as the representative of an English constituency than for a Roman Catholic. Ontario people boast of a large liberality in most matters, but the history of its elections will amply bear us out in the assertion that in many constituencies will be found a goodly number of persons who refuse to vote for a Catholic simply because of his faith. And these men dub themselves Christians. By voting for Catholics their consciences would be sorely troubled—that is, in cases where they

will not eventually receive a pecuniary poultice to relieve that elastic portion of their being. Ireland and Lower Canada are very good examples of doing at Parliamentary elections. In these places many Protestant gentlemen have been elected, while Catholics have been defeated, and in sections, too, where the voters were nearly all Catholic.

SOME torpedoes are to be sent out to Canada for coast and harbor defence. What is the use of preparing for defence when there is not the slightest possibility of attack? Gentlemen, we do not want your latest devices for destroying human life. Keep them at home. On this side of the ocean we are contented and peaceful and prosperous. Could not our government utilize these torpedoes in some manner for blasting purposes? It would be much more in accordance with the fitness of things to use them for flying rocks rather than human beings in the air.

The magnificent new organ for St. Michael's Cathedral, Toronto, was the centre of attraction for lovers of music at the Toronto fair. It was built by the celebrated firm of S. R. Warren & Son, of that city. The front is 16 feet in width, and the depth is 25 feet. The case is of ash, trimmed with walnut. The large pipes are in drab and gold, and the smaller ones are light and dark blue and gold. There are three rows of keys, and the organ is blown by one of Berry's hydraulic 4-inch engines. The tone of the organ is of unusual sweetness, the Vox Humana, the Glockenspiel, Clarinet, and the Oboe stops being extremely natural. The organ was to have been placed in the Cathedral by the 1st of September, but His Grace Archbishop Lynch allowed it to remain in the Exhibition till its close. Mr. Clark, the organist of the Jarvis street Church, gave recitals daily from 11 to 12 and 3 to 4.

A NEWSPAPER correspondent tells of a Boston school girl of thirteen years of age, who, with her strap and school books on her arm, sat reading in the horse-car a book called "The Demon Bride, or Wedded to her Doom." It had this touching motto: "Hast thou suffered? If not, this book is not for thee." A girl in that tender age could not be supposed to have suffered very greatly on the love question. Such reading at such an age is worse than useless, but for a girl of thirteen, it is a sin and a shame. We hear much said about what our boys are reading. Mothers should turn their attention as well to what their girls are reading. America needs good mothers as well as ever France did in Napoleon's time, and unnatural hot bed novels are a sorry foundation for womanly character. Mothers who have come to know in their own experience how home is what a woman makes it, have a duty and a privilege in the development of their girls superior to all other works or "spheres."

THE London correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian* makes a strange statement with reference to Dean Stanley's coming visit to America. He says the Dean is going to investigate the "Church question," and adds that it is said the growth of Roman Catholicism in the United States is creating a current of feeling there in favor of a State and Church union as a safeguard against it. It is asserted by another writer that the Dean can scarcely be coming to America with any such idea in his head. It is to be hoped this latter statement will prove correct. The gentleman would lose a good deal of valuable time, and also succeed in making himself appear ridiculous before the American people. The Catholic Church is making rapid progress in the United States, and any attempt to stop that progress, no matter from what quarter, will be utterly futile.

WILLIAM JONES, Baptist minister, South Australia, writes a long letter to the *Christian World*, explaining a terrible misfortune which recently befell him. His wife and children have turned over to Rome, and all his efforts to bring them back to the Baptist persuasion have been unavailing. The Jesui come in for all the blame, and the newspaper quoted above bewails the fate of Protestantism in England if the Sons of Loyola are permitted to obtain a foothold in the country. One of our Canadian religious contemporaries sympathizes deeply with the bereaved minister, and most sorrowfully ejaculates: "Poor Mr. Jones." What makes the matter appear worse, is the supposition in the minds of our friends that the good lady was induced to give up her former creed by reason of the lying and plotting of the Jesuits. The truths of the

Catholic Church have become so distasteful to some men that they have worked themselves into the belief that they are falsehoods. The Jesuits will go on in their work as long as souls are to be saved, and many who now vilify them will doubtless, ere long, be faithful children of that Church for which the Jesuit has given up his all on earth.

A SON of Gen. Grant was engaged to be married to a wealthy young Catholic lady, Miss Flood, of San Francisco. On a visit there recently young Mr. Grant was seen to keep company with females of questionable reputation. Miss Flood at once sent him about his business when he called to see her. Brave girl! Would that all young ladies would go and do likewise when such a cause presents itself! Most likely young Mr. Grant became impressed with the idea that because his father happened to be Gen. Grant, Miss Flood would overlook his want of self-respect. We are proud to see that he was mistaken. Miss Flood has thus set a noble example to the young ladies of the present day. No matter what may be the social position of a young man—no matter how wealthy or how well-educated or how nobly born—unless he bears the stamp of moral worth, he ought to be shunned by every high-minded girl. Miss Flood has escaped being wedded to a bad husband. Mr. Grant has lost the chance of being married to a woman who would prove to be a model wife.

VICTOR HUGO is a man of much renown among our Protestant friends. They accept his statements whenever he takes a fling at the Catholic Church. This is his opinion of the Jesuits and the anti-Jesuit decrees: "Men unite and live together; by what right? By right of free association. They do not go abroad; by what right? By the right possessed by every man to close his door or keep it open. They do not go and come, which includes the right to stay at home. At home what do they do? They speak low; they keep their eyes on the ground, they work. They shun the world, the cities, the gratification of the senses, the pleasures of folly, pride and ambition. They clothe themselves in coarse linen or coarse cloth. None among them call the least thing his own. Once entered he who was called great or noble becomes the equal of him who was a peasant. The cell is for all the same. They have left their own families; they form a family among themselves. They have given up their natural parents, that they might have parents, of mankind. They elect one of themselves superior and they obey him, that each may be able to call the other brother."

SO MANY preposterous statements have of late appeared in our Protestant contemporaries regarding Catholicity, that it would be absolutely impossible to take notice of one-half of them. These assertions we will not designate by any harsh name. Charity demands that we should not say unkind things of our neighbors. Many Protestants believe every word of the ridiculous nonsense laid at the doors of Catholics—while others have common sense and liberality sufficient to lead them away from giving credence to such groundless assertions. Many a hearty laugh is enjoyed by Catholics at the expense of those simple people who learn all they know of the Catholic Church from their Protestant family paper, or the anti-Catholic tracts issued by the Bible society. The stories related of Catholic practices are so exceedingly amusing to the Catholic mind because of the grave way in which they are related that we have often seriously thought of making a selection of them weekly from our Protestant exchanges, and putting them under the head of "Humorous." The last number of the *Christian Advocate* boldly says, and altogether on its own authority, that "The use that the late Pope made of a large portion of the 'Peter's pence,' which for years flowed so freely to Rome, appropriating them to swell his private fortune, has so discredited the charity that the Vatican is seeking new devices to provide for its expenses." And who, pray, did the Pope leave his private fortune to when he died? Popes have no need of a private fortune. Their ambition is to save souls—to carry out the commands of their Divine Master, and extend the sway of His Church among all nations. The money they have to spare is devoted to this object. All Catholics know this to be the fact, and hence there will be no falling off in the Peter's Pence.

THERE is a remarkable difference exhibited in the manner of treating Irish affairs by the *Advertiser* and *Free Press* of London. The former, a few days since, took a view of the matter which will entitle it to some