

The Catholic Record.

Published Weekly at 494 and 496 Richmond Street, London, Ontario.
Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

REV. GEORGE R. NORTHGRAVE,
Author of "Mistakes of Modern Infidels,"
THOMAS COFFEY.

Publisher and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY.
Messrs. LUCK, KING, JOHN STOR, P. J. NEVILL and W. A. NEVIN, are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transact all other business for the CATHOLIC RECORD.
Rates of Advertising—Ten cents per line each insertion, agents measurement.

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

London, Saturday, Sept. 12, 1896.

INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION.

The visit of Lord Russell of Killowen to this continent has been the occasion for directing public attention more closely to a matter which has been much discussed during the last few years, and especially within the last few months, since the message of President Cleveland to Congress, on the Venezuelan trouble, threatened for a while to disturb the peaceful relations which have for a long time existed between Great Britain and the United States. This subject is International Arbitration.

This was the theme of an address delivered by Lord Russell before the American Bar Association at Saratoga on the 20th of August. It was to be expected that the views of so eminent a jurist, and one holding so high a position as the Chief Justice of England, should have great weight even with so learned a body as the Bar Association, and that such was actually the case is evinced by the resolution passed by the Association unanimously, that they "concur with the principles enunciated in the eloquent address of Lord Chief Justice Russell," and that the address be referred to the Committee on international law for such action "as may be deemed proper to forward the great cause of international arbitration."

Lord Killowen stated in his address that since 1815 there have been sixty instances of effective international arbitration, and to thirty-two of these the United States have been a party, and Great Britain to about twenty. There have also been a number of instances in which arbitration clauses have been introduced into treaties.

From the conclusions thus arrived at it may be inferred that international arbitration is a possible method of settling international disputes, though there are certainly many difficulties in the way of making arrangements to establish such arbitration, and Lord Russell is even of opinion that if it be possible at all it is so only to a limited extent. He says:

"But there are differences to which, even as between individuals, arbitration is inapplicable—subjects which find their counterpart in the affairs of nations. Men do not arbitrate where character is at stake, nor will any self-respecting nation readily arbitrate on questions touching its national independence, or affecting its honor."

As the Bar Association expressed full concurrence with the general principles enunciated in the address we must suppose that they concurred in this view, yet it would seem that at least in cases where national honor alone is concerned, there ought to be, generally speaking, no great difficulty about referring the matter to any just court of arbitration which might have been selected by both parties to the dispute, and which might therefore be assumed to possess the confidence of both parties in regard to its decisions. A high Court of arbitration which might have been appointed by two or more powers to settle their disputes may be supposed to have been selected not only because the members of the Court are acquainted with international law, but also that they know the requirements of honor when any given case arises which has to be decided solely by the code of honor, and we do not see that their decision in such a case should be rejected any more than in a case of compensation for injuries inflicted, or for the settlement of a boundary dispute where there is merely a doubt regarding the exact meaning of some former agreement on the subject of the line of separation between the nations involved.

It seems to us that the honor of a country would not be imperilled by submitting a question of honor to so fit a tribunal as the Court of arbitration, appointed by mutual agreement, should be supposed to be. There would be no dishonor in accepting such a verdict, even though it were distasteful, and it would certainly be

in every respect preferable to the sanguinary arbitrament of the sword. In fact, as a rule, it seems to be precisely on those occasions when the honor of a nation is supposed to be most wounded, and the people are in consequence greatly excited, that a cool judge is required whose decisions founded on considerations both of natural justice and national honor, may be accepted without at all demeaning the nation to which it is more or less adverse.

Of course we may expect the case when the decisions of the Court of Arbitration might be manifestly unjust or injurious. In such an event the nation wronged might feel it necessary even to reject the decision arrived at, but it would be generally advisable to accept even an unjust or injurious decision reached by a Court of Arbitration, unless the decision threatened in some way the existence or liberties of the nation. If such unjust decisions were to be several times made by a permanent Court of Arbitration, it is easy to see that there would be no confidence in its future decisions, and as a matter of course it would soon receive an intimation that no more disputes would be referred to its judgment.

There has been an agitation going on for some time in which many distinguished personages in Great Britain and America have taken part, in favor of the principle of international arbitration. The evils of war are so terrible that all humanitarians must admit that it would be advisable if the nations could agree on the establishment of some international Court whose decisions in cases of dispute should be binding, but we have already seen by the movements of the powers last year and this year in reference to suffering Armenia, that it is scarcely to be expected at all that there will be any agreement among them to establish such a court. They have too many jealousies of each other, and their interests are too various and discordant. Yet it is certain that when the people of two disputing nations reflect calmly and learn all the causes which led to the dispute, mature consideration would in most instances point out some way of settling the dispute amicably without loss of honor to either of the parties concerned. It is hopeless, however, at least at the present moment, that all the powers will agree to establish an Arbitration Court. But it is not hopeless that such a Court may be established between the two great English speaking peoples of Great Britain and the United States, and not only distinguished jurists and legislators have expressed themselves in favor of such a Court, but the clergy of all denominations are for the most part enlisted in its advocacy. Among those who have pronounced thus publicly in favor of it are the three Cardinals, the Archbishops of London, Armagh and Baltimore.

Among civilized nations, might and force are not the only powers which influence their dealings with each other. Lord Killowen remarked that public opinion is now "a force which makes itself felt in every corner and cranny of the world, and is most powerful in communities most civilized." This force has arisen out of the prevalence of Christianity, and the consequent respect shown for the principles of Christian morals as motives of action.

Lord Killowen does not appear to be very sanguine that any permanent court of arbitration can be established in the present temper of the world, and he even "gravely doubts the wisdom of giving that character of permanence to the personnel of any such tribunal." He says:

"The interests involved are commonly so enormous, and the forces of national sympathy, pride and prejudice are so searching, so great and so subtle, that I doubt whether a tribunal, the membership of which had a character of permanence, even if solely composed of men accustomed to exercise the judicial faculty, would long retain general confidence, and I fear it might gradually assume intolerable pretensions."

He does not altogether despair, however, of the exertion of some influence which may be applied in the interests of peace, and that is mediation, which he says could be successful "only where the mediator possesses great moral influence and where he is beyond the suspicion of any motive except a desire for peace and the public good."

During the Middle Ages the Pope practically occupied the position of a mediator, and to some extent of an arbitrator. He possessed to a remarkable degree the qualifications necessary for the filling of these positions, but it does not appear that there is any other authority on earth who

would obtain public confidence to an extent sufficient to justify its appointment to the responsible double office. With Europe divided into so many religions, Catholic, Protestant, Greek, and Mahometan, it seems hopeless to expect that the Pope will be generally regarded as a mediator now, yet the time may come when the nations will look to him to fill the position. The Emperor of Germany did not consider it derogatory to his Protestantism to make the present Pope, Leo XIII., a mediator to settle his dispute with Spain, and Catholic nations have several times preserved peace between themselves by doing the same thing. But we cannot expect that this will be done by nations of such various creeds as now exist. Lord Killowen's address appears to indicate the impossibility of appointing any general arbitrator at the present time, but a return of the nations to Catholic unity might effect what diplomatic negotiations will not bring about.

The case between Great Britain and the United States may not be so hopeless as that between all the nations of Europe, and it would be at all events a great boon to mankind if the negotiations now going on between Lord Salisbury and the Government of President Cleveland would result in some understanding whereby a permanent Court of Arbitration between the two countries would be established. If these negotiations prove successful, the example may finally result in the same principle being extended so that other nations will adopt a similar mode for the settlement of their disputes.

A CAMPAIGN OF SLANDER.

So numerous are the expedients whereby the enemies of the Catholic Church attempt to misrepresent and vilify Catholics that it is impossible to anticipate at any time what will be the next slander concocted for this purpose. The most recent attempt of this kind comes from A. P. A. sources and is to the effect that Jeff Davis, the President of the Southern Confederate States, was a Catholic in reality, and in proof of this a circumstance is related in connection with his imprisonment, namely, that when he was subjected to the official search after his arrest, a scapular of the Blessed Virgin was found on him, which he was allowed to retain, as he begged the officers to permit him to do so.

It would not prove much either for or against the Catholic Church if this story were perfectly true, for it must be remembered that the Southern rebellion was not by any means a Catholic rebellion. The Southern states are the least Catholic part of the United States, and in some of them Catholics are very few. The Southern rebellion was not undertaken on religious grounds, nor was it opposed by the North on any such grounds. It was a rebellion of the Southern states chiefly to maintain the permanency of their peculiar institution of slavery which was vigorously attacked by a numerous and active party in the North, but there were other reasons of trade policy which also induced the South to attempt to secede from the Union, and the North fought to maintain the Union that the growing power of the country might not be broken. There was no religious issue in the matter whatsoever, and Protestants predominated on both sides, but the Protestant predominance was more marked on the Secession side than on the side of the Union. Jeff Davis was not by any means the cause of the war, though he was President of the Southern Confederacy, and he was selected for this office, certainly not on any religious grounds, but because he was an able statesman having strong convictions of the justice of his cause. The assertion that he was a Catholic has, therefore, no bearing upon the war of secession, yet if it were believed it is calculated to create a prejudice against Catholics among those unthinking Protestants who delight in still displaying the bloody shirt in their political campaigns, and this is the reason why the calumny was at first invented, and recently resuscitated, though it was effectively refuted years ago when it was originally circulated.

The recent reproduction of this calumny has brought to light a new refutation of it. It was stated that General Miles, who conducted the search on Jeff Davis, had certified to the truth of the statement; so General Miles was asked concerning it, and he has written a letter stating that he knows nothing of the incident: moreover, Colonel Church, who personally made the search, adds his testimony to that of the general, and states that the assertion is utterly false and malicious,

having no foundation whatsoever in fact.

This lie is somewhat similar to other lies which have been circulated to prejudice those Americans who are intensely patriotic, such as that the Pope recognized the Southern Confederacy, and that he blessed it, and that Booth and Guiteau, the assassins of Presidents Lincoln and Garfield, were Catholics. There is not a word of truth in any of these statements, and so far as the story of Guiteau's Catholicity from being true, he was of French Huguenot descent, and was at one time a local preacher in one of the Protestant sects, either Methodist or Baptist.

The refutation of the Jeff Davis story will not prevent the Apapists from inventing similar stories for the future, for such things form their whole stock-in-trade.

A MUSEUM OF MARES' NESTS.

It would be merely amusing to read of the wonderful mares' nests discovered by the Toronto Mail and Empire, underlying the political acts of all the Quebec statesmen, if it were not a malicious spirit which guided the search after these marvels, and if the curious things discovered were not of a character to excite the ill-will of a large section of the readers of that journal.

The Manitoba school question is one on which this malicious spirit has been specially manifested. It has been dealt with by the Mail and Empire, not as a question which should be treated according to the principles of justice, nor with regard to what the compact of Confederation demands, but solely with a view to the effect it might have on the political party it sustains for the moment, and thus we scarcely ever find a straightforward or honest representation of the case in its columns.

For a time it sustained with apparent honesty the Remedial Bill introduced into Parliament by the late Government as a necessary measure to give justice to the Catholic minority in Manitoba. This was fair and honorable, and if it continued consistently to take this stand we could do nothing else than praise it for its honesty and fair-dealing; but it has, on the other hand, with great persistence held that it is the desire of the Catholics of Quebec to re-introduce a school system which is described as inefficient, namely, that which existed in the Province before 1890, and it still maintains that the Liberals of Quebec have given to Mr. Laurier his majority in Parliament with this purpose in view.

It is easy to see that the Mail's object in thus stating the case is to work upon the anti-Catholic prejudices existing in Ontario, and to prevent Mr. Laurier from successfully settling the school question. For the attainment of its purpose, the Mail would make the rights of the Catholics a mere toy, and the Catholics of the Dominion tools for its partisanship. We have no hesitation in saying that its statements are a gross misrepresentation of the facts of the case. Quebec has indeed given Mr. Laurier his decisive majority, and it is true to say that it has done so with the intention that the educational rights of the Catholic minority in Manitoba be fully restored. During the recent general election there was absolutely no party in Quebec which did not openly advocate the restoration of Catholic rights, and on this point the candidates on both sides endeavored to outbid each other in their professions that they would see justice done. But there was no question on either side about the restoration of an inefficient school system; and it will be found that Catholics, as such, whether in or out of Parliament, are desirous of having the school system of Manitoba, and of every Province in the Dominion, as efficient as law can make them.

It has not been shown that the Catholic school system which existed from 1870 to 1890 was inefficient. On the contrary, the weight of evidence is to the effect that considering the sparseness and means of the population, it was as efficient as could be expected, and quite equal to that of the Protestants of that Province. However, admitting that in some respects it could be improved, the Catholics of Canada are not only willing but anxious that it should be improved to the fullest extent, but always on the basis that a satisfactory religious education of Catholic children be provided for. It is because the Manitoba School Laws of 1890 are intolerant on this point that they are objectionable, but if Mr. Laurier should succeed in inducing the Manitoba Government and Legislature to modify the laws so that Catholics may have the rights they formerly enjoyed, and to which they are en-

titled under the Constitution, the Catholics of Manitoba and of the whole Dominion will be as perfectly satisfied with his arrangement as they were with the Remedial Bill submitted by the late Government.

The supposed plot of the people of Quebec to establish an inefficient school system is not the only mare's nest of the Mail and Empire's collection of curiosities. A new one has been brought to light by that journal, in its issues of the 3rd and 4th inst. This consists in a discovery to the effect that Mr. Laurier intends to appeal on the Manitoba question "from the judgment of the Privy Council of England to the judgment of His Holiness of Rome," the Pope.

This story was based on information professed to have been obtained by the Mail's Ottawa correspondent from a source which is said to be very reliable, but its name is kept carefully in the background. In fact, though there is in the Mail of the 4th inst. an editorial article commenting on the subject, it is acknowledged that there is no solid basis whatsoever for making such an assertion. Thus it is stated in the editorial article: "The intimation that the Pope is to be asked to settle the Manitoba school question . . . may or may not be well founded;" and even in the information sent by the Ottawa correspondent there is this loophole whereby the correspondent may escape the charge of giving false information. He says: "There is reason to hope that as the matter has leaked out, the administration will modify its intentions in this respect."

Mr. Laurier might do worse than to consult the Pope on this question, but we cannot for a moment believe that the matter is to be settled in this way. The Canadian hierarchy can give all the information necessary as to what will be a satisfactory settlement of the question, and there will be no satisfactory settlement which does not include the right to teach religion to the Catholic school children.

The government organs, on the 5th inst., pronounced the rumor a ridiculous canard. Evidently it was the creation of the Ottawa correspondent of the Mail and Empire.

PROTESTANT PILGRIMAGES.

It has become quite the fashion among Protestant denominations to hold pilgrimages to the various localities which have figured in their short history as the places where their heroes were born or where they dwelt for a time. These pilgrimages were begun by the Methodists in the centenary year of the establishment of Methodism by John Wesley. The Presbyterians followed the example later on, and now the Congregationalists of America have been making a pilgrimage to the "classic scenes and sites in England which are connected with the Pilgrim Fathers."

The pilgrims were entertained at Farnham castle by Dr. Davidson, the Anglican Bishop of Winchester, who made a glowing speech in eulogy of the Pilgrim Fathers, who went to America to obtain that liberty of conscience which was denied them under the regime of the Established Church in England. The speech is said to have delighted the visitors, but it made no allusion to the fact that it was the intolerant spirit of the Anglicanism of former days that obliged the ancestors of these modern Congregationalists to seek a refuge in a new and as yet a savage country.

The Belfast Witness in giving an account of this reception of the Pilgrims by Dr. Davidson reminds its readers that the movement of the Pilgrim Fathers was a just and necessary revolt against what Milton calls the Prelates' "Rage." The glorification of this movement by a Prelate of the present day is an acknowledgment of a great change in Anglicanism, which once regarded as a dangerous heresy, deserving of the severest punishment, the same doctrines which Dr. Davidson professes to regard as quite consistent with the great plan of salvation as taught by the more modern Church of England.

Among the places visited by the Congregational pilgrims besides Winchester, were Cambridge, where John Robinson, one of the ancient Pilgrim heroes, flourished, Gainsborough, which was the cradle of Puritanism, and other places held sacred in the history of Puritanism.

We have nothing to say in condemnation of the feeling which leads men to visit the localities which gave birth to the heroes they honor, or to the principles they maintain as sacred. There is no doubt that such object lessons increase respect for those principles, and

make their influence on our conduct more decisive, and thus the results are beneficial if the principles are really good. But we cannot refrain from pointing out that only a few years ago these same men held that it is a gross superstition on the part of Catholics to visit respectfully the places which were made sacred by the presence of our Lord or the saints of God in ages past. These visitations were condemned in the strongest terms by Luther and Calvin, as derogating from the honor due to God alone, because thereby that honor is transferred from the Creator to the creature. Catholics were always aware that those contentions of Protestantism were erroneous, and the new practice of these Protestants sets is a proof that the Catholics were right. When we see modern Protestants renewing the practice of making pilgrimages to the spots which they consider sacred in their history, and showing reverence to such relics of the founders of their sects which have been preserved, we may infer that they acknowledge they have been in the wrong in condemning Catholics for doing the same thing in regard to relics of the saints of God, and the martyrs who have done much more for the propagation of Christianity than any of the alleged heroes whom the sectaries regard as worthy of veneration.

Let us hope that this gradual return of Protestantism in the direction of truth may result finally in an acknowledgment that all the Catholic doctrines which were repudiated by the Reformers of the sixteenth century were wrongfully rejected, and that, after all, the Catholic Church, always the same in doctrine, has alone kept intact the "faith once delivered to the saints."

BALFOUR VISITS GLADSTONE.

Much surprise has been caused in London, England, by a visit paid by Mr. A. J. Balfour to Mr. W. E. Gladstone at Hawarden for several days. The public are asking why the Conservative leader of the House of Commons should thus seek out and be received by the Grand Old Man, who is still looked upon as the head of the Liberal party, notwithstanding his retirement from active politics. The general belief is that Mr. Balfour's purpose is to ascertain how far Mr. Gladstone's support can be obtained to a bill for increasing the efficiency of the voluntary religious schools of England by adding to the appropriation given them by Government. The School Bill introduced during the last session of Parliament for this object was withdrawn, but the Government are known still to favor religious education, and it is believed that it is their intention to introduce a new school bill which will work more effectively than the last one, which was cumbersome and experimental to such an extent that it did not meet with general approval. It is believed, however, that a bill can be framed which will better secure the objects aimed at, and which will be passed by Parliament without difficulty.

THE IRISH RACE CONVENTION.

The Irish Race Convention began its sessions, as announced, on the 1st inst. and has continued sitting; and notwithstanding the serious obstacles thrown in its way by factionists, we think we can safely prognosticate that it will carry to a successful issue the objects for which it assembled.

It is, in the strictest sense, a representative gathering of the Irish people spread throughout the world.

From the meagre reports of its proceedings sent by Atlantic cable, it is impossible to state precisely the work done by the convention; but enough has been told to enable us to see that it has succeeded in maintaining its position with due dignity.

Messrs. Timothy Healy and John Redmond and their partisans refused to co-operate in calling the convention, and there was no course open but for the party representing the great majority of the Irish people to proceed alone, and this it did; yet it issued the invitation in such a way that if the minority factions wished to be fairly represented at it they could have chosen their representatives, and these would have been welcomed to give their counsel and votes. If they did not choose to take this course, the reason is obvious. They foresaw that the rule of the majority would be insisted on; but this they did not want. They preferred to rule a faction rather than to serve the people, and so they made every effort to belittle the con-

vention, even long before delegates arrived on Irish soil.

They declared that packed with Mr. Dillon, organ of one of the factious Independent, declared of the home delegates were J. P's. In pay of the B. ment, and the foreign "vain people, strolling fools such as are to where," rushing in to "party conceived in disgrace," with more to pose.

It is needless to say that guage is dictated by the ate malice, and though professes such horror of pay of the British Government leaves us to more than rather those who have obstacles in the way of the convention are received the Salisbury Government dissension.

If there is anything human affairs, surely I give no benefit from the of senseless dissension, personal piques, and it thought to endeavor to authoritative pronouncement representatives of the race; and those who for the attempt to nullify should be brought to a believe they will be, by Ireland.

The number of delegates assembled in Leinster Hall two thousand, representing national society, and every body elected by the Irish sides every Irish society the world which found send delegates.

We can attest that delegates were chosen to who love Ireland and view to aid in reunifying which are destroying for the future; and we that the same is true of from the United States colonies on the other side. These delegates were their devotedness to the land was well known, a tified to know that the V. Harris, of St. Catharines, the Canadian delegate, the insinuation or assertion are "nobodies" who were crossing the ocean to p. lon faction. The dean dignantly the assertion dian delegates represent and he remarked that their own expense, and sonal sacrifice, because have never despaired for will never despair as long live."

The convention, and foreign delegates, made mollify the factionists, pose. These do not want and the resolution final the convention to the truly represents the Ir that the foreign delegat their influence in the countries in favor of the party in Parliament rational conclusion which arrived at.

We have not the least Irish people will ratify reached by the convention the people have already far as the opportunit afforded them. Represent throughout Ireland se delegates to the convention Town Commissioners, Guardians, the Town the National Societies, and League of Great Britain held during the session tion has already displaced of Mr. T. Healy from and appointed a sup Parliamentary National place. Thus Ireland h against faction, and this one of the results of the gathering.

The convention has dress to the Irish people them to support majority sustain the majority pment. It is to be desi will do this as it is whereby there is hope ment of Home Rule.

The Honorable John is one of the Canadian expressed to the repres Associated Press his e the convention is an success, and if the Ir follow its advice we h this will prove to be the