

The Catholic Record.

Published weekly at 454 and 456 Richmond street, London, Ontario.

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

REV. GEORGE R. NORTON, Editor.

REV. WILLIAM FLANNERY, Editor.

THOMAS COFFEY, Editor.

Publisher and Proprietor—THOMAS COFFEY.

Messrs. King, John Nigh, P. J. Neven and M. L. O'Donnell are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transmit all other business for THE CATHOLIC RECORD.

Rates of Advertising—ten cents per line each insertion.

Approved by the Archbishop of Toronto, and recommended by the Archbishops of St. Boniface, Ottawa, Kingston, and the Bishops of Hamilton and Peterborough, and leading Catholic Clergymen throughout the Dominion.

Correspondence intended for publication, as well as that having reference to business, should be directed to the proprietor, and must reach London not later than Tuesday morning.

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

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

Catholic Record.

London, Sat., Jan. 3rd, 1891.

NEW YEAR'S DAY.

For the many graces and blessings vouchsafed to us by a merciful Providence during the year that is now reckoned with the past most sincere and heartfelt thanks are due. The public in general has been benefitted in many ways visible and by thousands of providential mercies, disregarded because of their continuity, nor felt or appreciated on account of their iteration and frequency. We in this country and climate were very much favored during the past year with delightful weather. The mildness of the spring season was very remarkable. It allowed ample opportunity to the farming community to make every necessary preparation for the approaching heats and rains, which came in due succession. Abundant crops of unusual richness were stored away in the granaries, and the prophecies of evil who foretold scarcity of the country's provision supply were all silenced. The autumn season has been mild and moist and of sufficient duration to permit of most extensive fall ploughing and preparations for an early and busy spring. The great desideratum of all Canadians to the manor born—plenty of snow and good sleighing—gladdened the hearts of all. The young and the old enjoy the tingle of the merry sleigh-bell. A right good fall of snow that comes to stay is the delight, as it is the profit, of both town and country. It opens up the mines of untold wealth that lie buried away in the depths of our vast forests. It levels the hills and fills the valleys; it makes the "crooked ways straight and the rough ways smooth." An even road bed and glassy avenues exist where tangled roots and frozen clods impeded the way and locked out the farmer's hidden treasures from the public mart. What serves the country work and brings money to the farmer's pockets must necessarily enrich the merchant and the small trader, whose fortune is made by the rapid exchange of commodities and the ever-increasing calls for demand and supply. The epidemic which broke out in Russia last year and reached us in the month of February did not produce the fatal results that were predicted of it, although every city and town had some deaths to deplore that were commonly ascribed to its pernicious influence. Yet, thanks to a merciful Providence, the percentage of fatalities did not reach one in ten of the stricken population. Its effects were felt in every district of both continents, and were of so general a character that the year of 1890 will be long remembered as the year of the Russian influenza, or, as it was named in France, *la grippe*.

Another source of gratitude is found on the signal defeat sustained at the polls by the party of bigotry and fanaticism. During the early months of the year we were threatened with a godless school system, in the legal annihilation of all our educational privileges. An appeal was made to the country by men hungry for power and office. It consisted of a rallying cry to all Protestants to unite against the common foe. It invited all sections and denominations to make war on the constitutionally existing Separate school system, by depriving Catholics of all our rightful and legal privileges as such and by ignoring us and our children as part of the body politic of this country. Our Catholic faith and principles were to be treated with contempt and our Catholic conscience both disregarded and outlawed. The general good sense and sober judgment of Canadians, although for a while disturbed, was not imposed on or led astray to any appreciable extent. A few who did allow their reason to be overborne by the appeals of fanaticism went over to the side of bigotry, but their less was more than amply compensated for by the firm and constant closing up in the ranks of Catholic voters hitherto careless or indifferent. The Reform party was sustained and kept alive by the solid Catholic vote. It was about time the opposite party would open its eyes to the futility of such old-time appeals. It certainly

ought to remember that we are a nineteenth century people; that we do not live in the days of Titus Oates, and that, perhaps except in St. John's Ward, Toronto, Gordon riots are no longer possible in any part of Canada. The Reform party should also learn a lesson and take it to heart and carry it out in practice. It should learn to be no longer afraid of bigotry. It should be convinced of the advisability and the necessity of doing justice to the weaker side, in spite of the howlings and protestations of fanatics. Nor should Mr. Mowat and his cabinet fancy that all is accomplished in the way of good and liberal government. They certainly should find a way of compelling the assessors, who are paid by the taxes of all, to make out a complete list of supporters of Separate as of Common schools. The Separate School Board is obliged to hire men to attend to this difficult operation or do it themselves, while officials are paid large salaries out of their (Catholic) taxes for doing it for the Common School Board. The public assessors did this successfully, and to the general satisfaction, during a number of years; but Mr. W. Meredith raised his voice against it during last May's electioneering campaign, and the Mowat Government was frightened into compliance. They can see now how groundless were their fears. It is to be hoped that at the next election in Toronto they will have the courage of their convictions and of their former legislation. It is about full time our present able and liberal legislators would take into consideration the question of chartered companies' school taxes. Is it fair that all school taxes raised from railway companies, banking and manufacturing institutions, chartered by government and incorporated, should be handed over to the Common schools. In the Province of Quebec one-third of these school taxes are paid in to the Protestant Separate school boards. Will the Government ever conceive the necessity or advisability of similar liberality in this Province? We will probably hear something about it very soon. The party which opposes the liberal administration in Toronto is forever crying out that Catholics obtain a solid *quid pro quo* for their solid vote. It is provoking that we should have the name without the gains. We certainly will look for some recognition at the next parliamentary sittings of our local government. We must admit that the sessions held last February and March were of a stormy nature, but we are at a loss for reason to explain the supineness of the government in yielding to the clamor raised about the assessors' work when the assessor was paid for his work by Catholic and Protestant alike. But the clamors have all ceased; the cry of fanaticism is no longer heard in our halls; the whole country has settled down to live in peace, and acknowledge each other's right to fair play and common justice. We feel assured that there is no educational privilege granted to Protestant Separate schools in Quebec which may not be freely and willingly accorded by liberal-minded Protestants to the Catholic Separate schools of Ontario. The educational interests of the Province are so closely connected with the spiritual that they can never be considered apart. What affects the one of necessity affects the other.

While we have no reason for self congratulation in any advance towards perfection as provided by law in the former, we can without reserve give expression to feelings of thankfulness and rejoicing in the wise provisions made by the Holy See for our consolation in the latter. The opening of the year 1889 found us orphans—a flock without a shepherd. A good, faithful and prudent prelate was taken from us for Toronto's benefit and his own advancement; and we were all in doubt and in a state of apprehension as to the character and standing of his successor. The New Year finds the whole Dominion in a state of exultation and satisfaction over the appointment of a young Bishop, whose talents, wide experience and virtues have been long recognized.

UNNECESSARY ALARM.

"Cardinal Rampolla, the Papal secretary, has written a letter in regard to Cardinal Lavigne's recent declaration in favor of a republican form of government. In this he says that the Roman Catholic Church is not inimical to any form of government. The Church applies itself before all else to the progress of religion, and therefore thinks it right for the faithful to participate in public affairs when such action is demanded by the interests of religion, in order that the wholesome influence of Christianity may be exerted for the general welfare of the State."

The above despatch, which is probably correct, comes from Rome under date December 29th. It is difficult to understand how it could be misunderstood, yet a later despatch states that the Austrian Government has expressed to the Holy Father its desire that he should not express any favorable sentiments towards the French Republic or Republicanism in general. It is not likely that Austria has made any such remonstrance, and we

believe that the last mentioned despatch is erroneous. The Holy Father will not recede from the sentiments expressed in his reply to Cardinal Lavigne's declaration. The sentiments to which he has given expression are founded on right reason and Catholic principles, which enjoy submission to lawful authority, whatever the form of Government may be. Cardinal Lavigne may have his preference for the Republican form, and for this no blame can be attached to him, for Catholics are quite free to have their preferences on such a subject, and to maintain their opinions too, as long as they observe Christian charity in the discussion; but there is no decree of the Church giving the preference to one form of Government rather than to another. There is, therefore, no need that Austria should fear the Pope will say anything in his public utterances to disparage monarchical government or to injure that power in its relations with other countries.

JESUITS IN GERMANY, AND THE MAIL.

There are in Germany as well as Canada would be persecutors who desire to oppress the Catholic Church, and it is a coincidence not very surprising that their efforts in both countries are directed towards destroying the Jesuit Order, which has at all times been one of the most efficient of religious communities in the work of education and in the missionary field. In Germany the persecutions are now busily circulating petitions against the readmission of the Jesuits to the empire. But, with the resolute Herr Windthorst at the head of a powerful and influential Catholic party in the Reichstag, and the good will of Kaiser William and his Chancellor Gernsheim, Von Caprivi, it is to be expected that the extremists will get just such an answer as Lord Stanley gave Dr. Caven and his collaborators last year.

There is this difference between the fanatics of Germany and those of Ontario, that the former are not masquerading, as the latter are doing, under the title of "Equal Rights." The Germans are contented to appear under their true colors, as persecutors, pure and simple, enlisted under the banner of Protestant Ascendancy.

But while these efforts are being made in behalf of religious intolerance, the true friends of toleration are not idle. A bill is to be introduced into the Reichstag to repeal the penal laws which were enacted against the Jesuits under Bismarck's iron rule, and there is every hope that these absurd enactments will be blotted from the statute books.

The Toronto Mail of last Friday, in an editorial referring to the movement of the Catholic party to recover freedom for the Church, ludicrously enough declares that the May laws of Germany "asserted the independence of the State and the freedom of the people." Yet it acknowledges that they were "a legislative assault upon the Church," and that the Jesuits were expelled. Is it an evidence of freedom, then, that a community of priests whom Catholics hold in the highest esteem should be expelled the country, for no other reason than that they are an order faithful to their religion and to God? Is it freedom for the people to have the monarch assume religious supremacy?

Even during the occupation of Rome by the troops of Victor Emmanuel, while the Emperor William I. was at Versailles, the Emperor said in reply to an address presented to him by the Knights of Malta of the Rhine Provinces: "I consider the occupation of Rome by the Italians as an act of violence, and when the war shall be over I will not omit to take the matter into consideration in concert with other rulers."

Certainly the Emperor did not then think that in order to secure the liberty of the people it was necessary to oppress the Church. It was not until 1872 that Bismarck pretended to vindicate the rights of the Bishops and of the State by putting himself in opposition to the decree of the Vatican Council regarding the infallibility of the Pope. But he found that the Bishops refused to be patronized after this manner, and the persecution was at once directed against them and all the clergy who would not acknowledge the Imperial supremacy in matters of religious dogma and discipline. The May laws relegated to the Government officials the administration of the goods of the Church, made rules for the education of the clergy, regulated the conditions under which the dioceses were to be administered, and went so far as to appoint faithless priests to parochial charges, besides taking from the clergy the right of educating Catholic children in their religion.

All this could not be tolerated even in a Catholic monarch. Still less could the Church permit a Protestant sovereign to take the Pope's position. Yet this is what the Mail calls battling for the liberties of the people!

It is to this day the proud boast of Scotchmen that they fought against the kings of England who endeavored to impose upon them the tyranny of Royal Supremacy in religion. Why then should

the Catholics of Germany be stigmatized as criminals for refusing practically to receive their religion from the Chancellor of the Empire?

But Germany received its reward for thus oppressing religion, in the spread of socialism and irreligion. In 1871 there were 6,403 crimes prosecuted in Prussia. In 1877 the number reached 12,807—one more than double the former number. Bismarck himself, after boasting that he would not go to Canossa, found it necessary to relax his persecuting hand, and it is now to be hoped, even it is probable, that the last vestige of the May laws will be swept away in Protestant Germany in spite of the lamentations and protests of the Toronto Mail on the subject.

The Mail, of course, cannot conclude its article without an absurd falsehood concerning greed of power on the part of Jesuits being the cause of the May laws. It says: "But when, later, the Jesuits made their influence at Rome supreme a new condition of affairs was brought about. Freedom was at an end, and a battle between liberty on the one hand and intolerance on the other commenced and has ever since continued to rage." Bismarck and liberty! The Catholic Church and intolerance! This from the Mail quite equals in truth that journal's statement over a year ago of the impious oath which every Jesuit was said to take, a statement on account of which it is now the defendant in a libel suit, and the falsehood of which it has tortuously admitted by endeavoring to change the issue, first, into the incapacity of the Jesuits to enter such a suit, because they were illegally incorporated, and, being beaten on this plea, secondly, into their teaching doctrines which are substantially the same as those implied in the forged oath. It is not worth while to refute seriously what is based only on the brazen assertions of a notorious slanderer.

POLITICS IN ANTIGONISHE.

Some newspapers have been occupied for some time past in unreasonably heaping abuse upon the Right Rev. Bishop Cameron, of Antigonishe, on account of a letter which he wrote in February, 1887, to aid the candidature of Sir John Thompson while contesting that county.

His Lordship's letter was not written in a spirit of violent partisanship, nor was it couched in the abusive terms which are too commonly employed by the supporters of opposing candidates in our Canadian elections. On the contrary, it calmly reviews the relations of the Hon. Mr. Thompson to his constituents, and on public grounds maintains that it is to their interest, and that of the country at large, that the Minister of Justice should be returned by "an overwhelming majority."

The CATHOLIC RECORD has made it a principle to preserve neutrality in all matters which are merely political. It is a Catholic paper, and its purpose is to advance the interests and to maintain the principles of the Catholic religion and Catholic people of the Dominion. Yet so far are we from seeing anything wrong in Bishop Cameron's letter that we consider he was exercising his right, nay more, that he was fulfilling a duty in writing it.

His Lordship's letter was purely a political one, and he wrote as a citizen of the Dominion, as he had a perfect right to do. We know that there are many who are ever saying that the clergy should not interfere in politics. We concede that the clergy should not employ their office in declaring ecclesiastical penalties against those who differ from them in merely political opinion; yet even in this case they have the right, and it is their duty, to warn their flocks against perpetrating a moral wrong under the pretence that their acts are of a solely political character. Politics must not be made a pretext for wrong doing.

However, Bishop Cameron's letter makes no pretence that there would be a moral wrong in honest opposition to Sir John Thompson, and he does not threaten to inflict any ecclesiastical penalty on those who might oppose his election. Yet in being consecrated a Bishop, he did not forfeit his rights as a citizen. He believed that Sir John was the best candidate in the interests of his constituency, and of the country at large, and therefore, as a citizen, he strongly recommends the electors to support him. There was nothing here which any citizen might not properly do.

But the Bishop is not an ordinary citizen. He is a man of high culture and ability, and is therefore, altogether independently of his ecclesiastical position, eminently qualified to know what will most benefit the country; and, as the honest voice of the country is ascertained by the result of combining all the varied opinions and influences which can be brought to bear at the elections, the Bishop was merely taking his proper share in bringing about that result, as far as his influence extended. His influence is undoubtedly great, but it is no greater than is justified by his ability and the respect paid him on account of his unimpeachable integrity.

There are many who maintain that voting ought to be made compulsory on

every citizen, and it is quite a debatable matter whether those who take this view are not in the right. There is certainly some weight in the argument they employ to sustain their view. They say that every voter is bound in conscience to have at heart the good of the country, and, as in our theory of government by the majority the good of the country requires that the majority should rule, every citizen is bound to give his vote at the polls so that the representatives of the people may truly represent the wishes of the majority.

If this view of the case be correct it equally follows from the premises that every citizen should use the talents which God has given him to place his honest views before the people, and to influence them to adopt them. From this it would follow that it was not merely a right, but a duty, for the Bishop to do as he did. In any case, however, it was his right, and the journals which find fault with him are very unreasonable.

We would be sorry to see the Catholic clergy mix themselves in party squabbles when there are not important issues at stake. But Dr. O'Brien, the learned Archbishop of Halifax, writing to Bishop Cameron on the subject of the attacks which have been made upon him, says with great force that:

"A Bishop has a perfect right to take an intelligent interest in the political life of his country, and to use, should he deem fit, all legitimate means in favor of those who, in his opinion, are most likely to benefit the community."

This is so axiomatically true that it needs no further proof than merely to state it. In thus acting a Bishop does no more than what every citizen has a right to do.

But we have been told, especially by the Toronto Globe, that Bishop Cameron endeavored to corrupt the constituency of Antigonishe by placing before the electors corrupt motives for supporting the Minister of Justice. This charge is made because His Lordship reminded the people that Sir John succeeded in doing much for his constituency, by obtaining new postal facilities, repairing public works, constructing railroads, etc.

It is unjust in the extreme to stigmatize these considerations as corrupt. It is precisely such benefits conferred upon the people in diverse localities that make any government popular, and it is not corruption in the people of Antigonishe to manifest their appreciation of having such works done in their own constituency. It should be proved that these works are an injury to the general public before such a conclusion should be drawn, but this proof is not forthcoming.

We infer, therefore, that the attacks which have been made upon Bishop Cameron are unjustifiable, and that they have been made in the spirit of unmitigated partisanship. The Globe of the 24th inst., so far forgets the courtesy and respect due to the Bishop as to say that his conduct was such as "might be expected from some boodling layman . . . but it was utterly unworthy of a clergyman," and that "a certificate from the Pope would not alter that fact." Bishop Cameron's conduct does not need justification by the Pope, but we assure the Globe that a certificate of either good or bad character from the Holy Father will have a weight fully equal with, if not much greater, than that given by any sovereign on earth, or for that matter by the editor of the Globe, also, to boot.

A PARALLEL CASE.

The incident of which we give an account in another column, wherein Father Jutz was selected recently to negotiate for peace between the hostile Indians of the West and the United States Government, had its parallel in Canada in 1869. In that year, it will be remembered, the then recently constituted Government of the Dominion proposed to take possession of our North West, which has since been partially subdivided into Manitoba, Assiniboia, Alberta and Saskatchewan. The Hon. Wm. Macdougall was sent as Governor of the newly acquired territory, but the half breeds and Indians, and even the whites in large numbers, opposed the occupation of the territory, because intimations had been given that the vested rights of the people would not be respected. It was then decided that the learned and respected prelate, Monseigneur Tache, now Archbishop of St. Boniface, was the only person who could bring about a peaceful settlement of the trouble, inasmuch as the people were actually in arms and had already declared their intention to resist aggression.

Monseigneur Tache was in Rome, having just arrived there to assist at the Vatican Council which was to be opened on the 8th of December.

His Lordship had been informed of the insurrection a few days before, while still in France, at Paris, we believe, and on reaching Rome he received a telegram from Sir John Macdonald requesting him to return. Understanding that the situation was a grave one, he at once returned home, and his efforts were crowned with success. The insurrection was ended, and it was not until the Indians and half-breeds found that the promises of the

Government to preserve their land titles were not observed that later on a second insurrection broke out, which was terminated with the execution of Louis Riel.

It was on the occasion of the first insurrection that the Bill of North-Western Rights was agreed to by the Government, and it is this bill which guaranteed to Catholics and Protestants alike the privilege of having denominational Separate schools, which has been violated by the Manitoba Legislature. It is certainly the duty of the Dominion Government now to see to it that the promises then made to the population of the territory shall be fulfilled and that the new settlers shall not be allowed to violate the solemn compact then made. The provisions of the Bill of Rights would not have been agreed to if they had not been just, and, being just, they should not be violated now.

A MIXED RELIGIOUS SERVICE.

From the Woodstock Sentinel-Review we learn that on Christmas day the Rev. Dr. McMullen, late Moderator of the Presbyterian Church of Canada, preached in old St. Paul's Anglican church of Woodstock from the text Isaiah ix, 6. "For unto us a child is born, unto us a Son is given, and the government shall be upon His shoulder, and His name shall be called wonderful, etc." The Sentinel-Review says that this fact is "an event in the history of churches," and that it is likely to arouse widespread interest, and possibly some ecclesiastical discussion. It is described as an act which will tend to bring about "the true unity of Christian friendship and fellowship to replace the narrowness and diverse bigotry of the past. We are not surprised when we are told that the congregation of St. Paul's beheld this new departure with 'astonished eyes,' for notwithstanding the individual act of the Dean of Woodstock who invited Dr. McMullen to preach to his congregation on that day, the Church of England expressly decrees 'that no man might presume to execute any of them (the ministerial functions except he were . . . by public prayer with imposition of hands, approved and admitted thereto by lawful authority,' and that 'no man shall be . . . suffered to execute any of said functions except he be called, tried, examined, and admitted thereto, according to the form hereafter following, or hath had formerly episcopal consecration or ordination.'"

Order of ordaining in Book of Common Prayer. It is scarcely necessary to add that the form referred to is the form of ordination by a Bishop of the Church of England. Whatever we may think of the kindness of heart which so welcomed the Dean of Woodstock that he thus recognized the validity of Dr. McMullen's ministry, it is certain that he openly violated the decrees of his Church; and that it will be recognized as an admission of the validity of Presbyterian orders is clear even from the words of the Presbyterian catechism, which says: "The word of God is to be preached only by such as are sufficiently gifted, and also duly approved and called to that office." The texts of Scripture quoted in the catechism in support of this view clearly indicate that these words imply that the calling must be from God, and the approval from the constituted authorities of the Church. Among the texts quoted we find: "And how shall they preach except they be sent?" (Rom. x, 15) "And no man taketh this honor unto himself but he that is called of God as was Aaron." (Heb. v, 4)

It will not be very surprising, therefore, if the Dean of Woodstock be called to strict account by his ecclesiastical superiors for violating the Church laws. Nevertheless we do not see much incongruity in the course he pursued. Presbyterians and Anglicans alike rebelled against the Catholic Church in the sixteenth century, and the orders of both are equally valid; or rather equally invalid.

The hope has been expressed (that through such methods "the true unity of Christian friendship and fellowship" will be brought about. We must say we do not share this expectation. The object of the institution of the Christian ministry is described by St. Paul to be "that henceforth we be no more children tossed to and fro and carried about with every wind of doctrine by the wickedness of men."

This object will certainly not be attained by introducing all the varieties of doctrine which Protestantism has invented into the pulpits of the sects which have retained some larger measure of the semblance of truth. There are surely varieties enough in Anglicanism itself, with its High and Low Church parties, without adding to them those of Presbyterianism.

Matters have certainly changed since the Presbyterian ministers told King James I, when he wished to make an innovation in the Kirk discipline: "Dusk it up as bonny as you will, bring it in as fairly as you can, we see the horns of the mitre." And Sir Walter Scott adds: "And the horns of the mitre were, to their apprehension, as odious as the