

## The Catholic Register.

PUBLISHED EVERY THURSDAY,  
AT THE  
OFFICE 40 LOMBARD STREET TORONTO.  
TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION  
TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM.

FOR ADVERTISING RATES APPLY AT OFFICE.

TRAVELLING-AGENTS:  
Messrs. Patrick Mungovan, C. N. Murphy,  
John P. Mallon and L. O'Brien.

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 31, 1895.  
Calendar for the Week.

October 31—St. Francis, Pope. Vigil of All Saints. Fast.  
November 1—All Saints. Day of Obligation.  
2—St. Andrew.  
3—St. Charles Borromeo.  
4—Of the Octave.  
5—Of the Octave.

We publish in full to-day the letter in which the Holy Father refers to the exact nature of the Masonic outrage perpetrated in Rome on September 20th. This is a most important utterance for Catholics to study. Although Catholic judgment all over the world could not have failed to anticipate the views of the Supreme Pontiff, this protest is not of less importance as a most grave and solemn denunciation of the threat held out against religion and liberty in the recent demonstrations by "the sect which is the enemy of God"—as the Holy Father declares Masonry to be. The document will be read with the utmost interest throughout Christendom.

The generosity of Protestants towards their foreign missions is the best testimony of their zeal, but after all what is it when compared with the money Catholics subscribe to enable the true Church to send forth the preachers of the Word into the places of darkness? In the year 1894, the Society for the Propagation of the Faith collected in all 6,820,164,045 lire. Let the mind try to grasp it! Such an enormous fund may perhaps be imagined when it is observed that the collections for 1894 excelled the collections for the previous year by 22½ million lire. Those who vainly imagine that the French people have lost their faith must be interested to learn that out of the total sum France subscribed nearly 390 million lire, which is six and a half times as much as the whole of the American continent could spare. True it is that the glory and greatness of the Catholic Church to-day remain in those countries where the Faith has been longest implanted.

We have received a copy of the pamphlet entitled "Incidents in the Political Career of Sir John Thompson" by Senator Miller. The lengthy notice which the pamphlet claims must be unavoidably held over this week, but it can be said, from a careful reading of the little booklet, that it deserved a more dignified introduction to the public than the pamphlet form admits. No book has appeared in Canada of late years that reflects a more cheerful light upon the political life of this Dominion. The Bishop of the Catholic Church joined with the politicians in bringing forward, for the discharge of the high and honorable public duties which subsequently fell to his lot, a man in whom they recognised the great qualities of honesty, straightforwardness and patriotism. The evidence here produced by Senator Miller speaks credit for the venerable Bishop of Antigonish, the Right Reverend Dr. Cameron, for his priests, for his people, and last but not least, for Senator Miller himself. We will deal with the pamphlet more adequately later.

Two great Catholic priests have just passed to a better life almost together. The late Mgr. O'Brien and the late Father Hirst, President of Ratiocline College, were leaders in the priest hood, and each in his sphere will be deeply mourned. Old friends, too, who watched together for some considerable time the fortunes of the Leicestershire college, it is doubly shocking to those who deplore their loss, to know that both careers were terminated suddenly. In many respects there was a personal likeness between them. Both were men of striking dignity of manner and appearance, and withal, both had the rare faculty of winning the attachment of those who knew them. They were the typical priests, who gave their talents and all labor of their

lives, for the honor of God and the salvation of souls. Neither left enough of the world's wealth behind to pay the expense of a funeral. But the results of their active, earnest lives are worthily honored by their Church, and their names are confidently hope are written in the Book of Life.

Our contemporary, The Canadian Churchman, in a recent issue said much to the effect that it would never consent to believe in the English stream of conversions to the Roman Catholic Church. Well then, here are some facts that may help to shake its stubbornness. The Local Government Board has just issued some census returns which show that in the period 1871—81, the number of Non-Conformist ministers increased less than 8 per cent, the Established Church clergy in the same period increased less than 20 per cent, whilst the number of Roman Catholic priests increased over 60 per cent. The Catholic Church does not send her priests to labor where they are not required. But if the official statistics be not sufficiently satisfactory, let us quote for our contemporary the letter of a Moderate Churchman published in the Morning newspaper. He says:

"That the Church of Rome is rapidly increasing in this country I have no doubt. Here in Louisiana, where the service of the Mass has not been said since the Reformation, a church is being built, and another in Brooklyn. In Sussex there is hardly a village without a small chapel. Let every one reckon up the number of converts he has known in his own circle. For myself, though living a very retired life, without taking into account clergymen I knew at Oxford who have 'retired,' I have lost a daughter, a niece, one entire family of friends, and others with whom I have been more or less acquainted, from the priest to the dressmaker."

## Mr. Justice Curran.

The effects of the explosion of malice and prejudice that followed immediately upon the announcement of Hon. J. J. Curran's appointment to succeed Sir Francis Johnson may now be pretty accurately estimated. Regarded in the purely non-partisan light it was unfortunate. Independent journals, like The Evening Telegram, were quick to realize this, and not too timid to declare it; but prejudice had been aroused and still another example must be afforded of the intolerant ideas that rule political partisanship in Canada. Nothing can be more demoralizing and impoverishing to the nature of a community constituted as the Canadian people are than the making of attempts to subordinate the judiciary to the clamor of an intolerant public feeling. This is the first time it has been tried in Canada, and all respectable people must earnestly hope that we have seen the last as well as the first of such baleful force.

The incident, however, is important in more ways than one. Before the appointment had been made the English Protestants, with their bishop at their head, made the claim upon the Government that this office belongs to the Protestant section of the citizens of Montreal. The claim was denied by the Premier, and it was pointed out that the English practice which Sir John Macdonald had laid down as the best rule for Canada to follow, gave the first right to the Solicitor-General.

The latest British example of this rule has not yet been cited, and we take the present opportunity of referring to it. Mr. Justice Harrison, a Protestant, died in Dublin the other day. Immediately came the announcement that the vacancy would be filled at once by the appointment of Mr. Kenny, Q.C., Solicitor-General—a Catholic. The two cases are similar in this further particular that the Orangemen of Belfast made precisely the same uproar about Mr. Kenny's appointment to the Solicitor-Generalship as has now been made in Canada over the honor which has fallen to Mr. Justice Curran. They offered one of their own party, Mr. Barton, against him; but of course without success. We have not heard that they had the hardihood to endeavor to force their peculiar views upon the Government and seek to prevent Mr. Kenny from sitting on the bench. We do not think that any section of the press in the old country would lend its assistance to such an enterprise.

Political partisanship in Canada, however, we are asked to believe, are entitled to a system of their own in these matters.

Once the appointment of Mr. Justice Curran had been made the English speaking Protestants of Montreal said no more about it. As they had not picked out a candidate of their own for the honor, and as the Bar of Montreal had selected no one to question the right of the Solicitor-General to the vacant appointment, it must be presumed that their views were pressed perfunctorily as a matter of religious principle. But that as it may, they had gone far enough to arouse the watchful guardianship of the political press of Ontario over Protestant interests.

Comment at once showed itself in its worst aspects. Mr. Curran, a Catholic, had been appointed to a place on the Bench formerly filled by a Protestant. Bless your heart it was not that Mr. Curran was a Catholic who they abused him, but—mark the distinction—because Sir Francis Johnson was a Protestant. The "outraged public" looked at the matter from one side and the other, looked all round it, and could make nothing of it. There was no credit in howling at the religion of the new Judge, nothing to convulse the country over. Mr. Curran's political record was clean above the suspicion of the vindictive. Apart altogether from his religious convictions he was a man of honor, honesty and ability. "Ah! but," said some clever fellow among the pack "he knows no law." "That's it exactly," said all the editorial lawyers, and the chorus rang out loud and long that a Catholic Queen's Counsel, who knew nothing of the law, had been appointed in the room of a Protestant Queen's Counsel who was a distinguished jurist.

But when we come to look at the case as thus presented we must confess it looks originally quite as much as did the bald anti-Catholic bawl. Most of us remember the famous accusation made by Lord Hyndhurst against Lord Brougham when that great lawyer and orator was made Lord Chancellor: "Brougham" said he "would make a capital Lord Chancellor if he had any law." And so we are afraid that the malice which finds vent against Mr. Justice Curran in this very way is musty with age.

Whilst all this ill feeling against Mr. Justice Curran is a vain thing as far as he is personally concerned, there is one point which his fellow Catholics are fairly entitled to make. His withdrawal from public life is a distinct loss to the country. His political career has remained stainless and honorable through a period when even good men's public lives were not free from suspicion, and when political corruption has won decidedly more than political honesty. We say, and we believe we are speaking the opinion of the Catholic people of Ontario, that the Canadian House of Commons can ill afford to lose men of Mr. Justice Curran's integrity and character. We would have been better pleased than most of his enemies, albeit for an entirely different reason, to see him stick to public life; but since he was determined to retire to the bench, and the right of retirement was his according to regular practice, he was fully entitled to please himself. He acted independently: his retirement is a cause for regret to Catholics, but that he will be an honor to his new position is a point in itself that goes without question.

We notice that The Globe, not content with its former mendacious strictures upon Mr. Justice Curran, returned to the attack on Monday last. It has not the fairness to print the protest of the correspondent whom it undertakes to answer with the silly and off hand remark that "it is a great mistake to urge Mr. Curran's race and religion for exempting him from criticism." We opine that the correspondent had grumbled The Globe by showing the "great mistake" of attacking and abusing Judge Curran on account of "his race and religion." And although The Globe had not the magnanimity to publish the views of its correspondent, it has the bland assurance to inform him that it will acknowledge its error "if the new Judge develops on the bench, qualities of which his public career certainly did not give promise. This is the most pleasantly expressed piece of irony we have encountered in a long while. Imagine a judge of her Majesty's Superior Court coming forward as a character to a bad tempered political partisan inside a newspaper office. What a pretty way "to maintain the high standard of the judiciary."

## My Church Allegiance.

Right Rev. Moderator, Professor Rentoul, of Victoria, in his exposé of the reasons which keep him attached to the Presbyterian church, labours much to prove that the word Presbyter is synonymous, with elder, priest, bishop and pope. The inference drawn from such is that in the church of Christ, as organized by the Apostles, but one order existed for the ministry of the "word and eucharist," while another order of temporals was acknowledged, that of deacons, whose duty it was to distribute alms among the poorer brethren, especially among widows and orphans. Thus in spirituals elders alone attended to divine worship and to preaching, whereas the deacons were supplemented to look after the needs of all those who were of the household of the faith.

Professor Rentoul in explanation says: "In purely Gentile churches, where the meaning of the word 'presbyter' or 'elder' was not so well understood, the word 'episcopos' translated in our English Bible by the term, 'bishop' was used as its equivalent. The 'presbytery,' and the 'bishops' were the same persons; and in each congregation of any size there were several bishops or presbyters."

The "Gentile" nations spoken of were the Greeks and Romans, who were capable of understanding the meaning of both words. And as both "episcopos" and "presbyter" are Greek words, it is inconceivable that any Gentile nation could understand the full meaning of one word, and not know the other just as well. The explanation is meant only for the ignorant, who, having no idea of Greek, repose all confidence in the sincerity of their leaders.

It would have been far more satisfactory to explain that when the Apostles went on their heavenly mission from place to place, and were compelled by the divine command, to continue on to the ends of the earth, they were of necessity bound to leave in every city priests and bishops ordained and consecrated by them, as well for the ministry "of the word and teaching," as for offering up gifts and sacrifices. "Who taken from amongst men are appointed for men in things that appertain to God to offer up gifts and sacrifices for sins." (Hebrews x. v.)

It stands to reason that the men chosen by the Apostles to "offer up sacrifice" and teach the catechumens were the most venerable for age and piety in the city just made Christian. As both qualifications are included in the Greek "presbyteros," both priests and bishops could easily come under that designation. The word presbyter, or ancient, soon became the distinctive title of priest, which term may be traced to presbyter, as the word bishop is derived from "episcopos," or one who oversees all, both priests and people. In the Catholic Church to-day, as in all times, no man could be raised to the dignity of Bishop or Pope unless he had been previously ordained to the priesthood. The highest, most sublime honor, conferred on Pope or Bishop is that of offering up gifts and sacrifices at God's altar, and this honor they share with the most humble priest on earth. So that all may say truly with St. Peter: "The ancients or priests, or elders (Protestant version), that are among you, I beseech, who am also (an elder) or a priest, feed the flock which is among you, taking care thereof, not by constraint, neither for the sake of filthy lucre, but voluntarily."

Prof. Rentoul quotes this passage as showing that St. Peter could not be a Pope or a Bishop, whereas he called himself an Elder. But the passage only proves that St. Peter, on becoming Bishop and supreme visible Head of the Church, never ceased to be a priest. St. Peter was raised to the dignity of the priesthood with the other Apostles when, at the Last Supper, our blessed Lord said to them: "Do ye this in commemoration of me." He consecrated St. Peter, supreme visible Head of the Church when He said to him: "feed my lambs feed my sheep; whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound also in Heaven." It may seem to Prof. Rentoul a convenient way of casting off all church authority, and of rejecting Apostolic succession and jurisdiction, by falling back on the ancient usage of appointing venerable men (elders) to exercise the function of priest and bishop. But the use of such flimsy arguments

is only conducive to lead unbelievers to a contempt for God's word, and all men to spiritual socialism and license and to a fatal disruption of that unity which should be the distinctive mark of God's Church. For what unity can exist where no visible head is found to bind in one body all the members? What security and safe assurance can we possess of being on the right path that leads to the fulness of truth if there is none appointed as an infallible guide to lead, to warn, to guide and to govern? Dr. Brownson says: "It (the Presbyterian church) asserts the infallibility of God speaking." Indeed! Does any body deny that God speaking is infallible? "And that the evidence for all articles of faith is to be found in that Word." But what is the evidence that this or that article alleged to be in the Word really is so? Here is a link wanting in the Presbyterian chain of evidence "that they are to be believed on God's authority." Undoubtedly, if at all, for nothing but His authority is sufficient warranty for faith. "And not the authority of any uninspired church, prelacy or pontiff." Certainly not. Every Catholic holds that, and it is one great reason why Catholics cannot accept Protestantism. We believe the revelation on the veracity of God. But how do we come to the knowledge that this or that is a revelation? It is precisely here that Presbyterianism leaves us without such a guide to our own private judgments (TO ELDERS WITHOUT NUMBER) or to a usurped, fallible, human authority.

These arguments occurred to Dr. Brownson at the time he was hesitating in belief and was tossed about by every wind of doctrine. "My position was a painful one," he writes. "I had gained nothing, but lost much by joining the Presbyterian church. 'If you claim authority over my faith,' I said to them, 'tell me what I must believe, and do not throw upon me the labor and responsibility of forming a creed for myself. If you send me to the Bible and private judgment do not hold me obliged to conform to your standards, nor assume the right to curse me for departing from them.' It was clear to me that the Presbyterian church was not and could not be the Church of Christ, and, therefore, could have no legitimate authority over me. If Christ had a church on earth which he had founded, and which had authority to teach in His name, it was evident by the Roman Catholic Church."

## The Hopes of the Husbandless.

The ubiquitous statistician has been poking his nose into the chances of matrimony for husbandless women. It is a large subject, when we remember that in England alone there are no fewer than 5,000,000 women who ought to have husbands but who have not.

Five millions of the women with a vocation for marriage still looking around them to find excuses for their state of single blessedness!

Some of them—the majority of course—declare they are too young; others excuse themselves upon the grounds that they are unable to find candidates for matrimony of the other sex who will agree to keep them; others still protest, with less sincerity, that they prefer to keep bicycles. The statistics are full of warning for all classes. They show that between the ages of 16 and 19 only fourteen women out of every thousand of the unmarried marry within the period of one year. Between 20 and 24 as many as 107 women per thousand find husbands. Between 25 and 34 the rate falls to 96 per thousand, and after 35 it is but 13 per thousand. Some one is greatly to blame for these facts. The time is really very short—less than 10 years—when the husbandless women have even half a chance, and they should see to it that this brief season of promise is not lessened by the thousand and one modern influences which seriously conspire against wedding.

## Columbus Commemorative.

The regular meeting of Columbus Com-memorative, No. 210, was held last Thursday evening, President Angus J. J. Doucette in the chair. One new member was initiated and two propositions received. Amongst the visitors present were Sir, K. M. J. Brew, President of Leo Com-memorative who favored the meeting with some sensible and pointed remarks regarding the extension of one Order in the northern district. The Grand Secretary of the Order in Ontario was also present and delivered an interesting address, in the course of which he pointed out the necessity of making the meetings of the Com-memorative interesting and instructive; and also suggested ways and means for accomplishing this end. These suggestions were adopted and an amusement committee appointed who have promised a good programme for the next meeting on Thursday, Nov. 14, Sir Kt. Frank J. Burns leads in the race for the President's pipe.

## WINTER LECTURES.

Rev. Father Ryan on the Personality of the Primacy.

The Origin and Intention of the Primacy—The Powers of Error and Evil Shall Never Prevail Against the Church The Words of Christ Yesterday, To-day and For Ever the same.

Rev. Father Ryan continued the series of Winter Lectures at St. Michael's Cathedral on Sunday, the 20th. The church was crowded, and Protestants must have constituted a large portion of the congregation. Father Ryan said:

In our last lecture we proved from Scripture, and from the best interpreters, ancient and modern, Catholic, and non-Catholic, that Christ our Lord conferred on Peter supreme spiritual jurisdiction over the entire Church. Objections of course are made to the proofs and interpretations we have given. In our next lecture these objections shall be fairly met and fully answered. But this evening we would continue and complete the subject of the primacy of St. Peter, by showing that in the design, and intention, and by the express words of Christ our Lord, this primacy was, and is, to be perpetual. The origin of the primacy and the perpetuity of the primacy are two distinct things, and are so defined by the Council of the Vatican. It says: "We teach and declare, according to the testimony of the Gospel, that the primacy of jurisdiction over the whole Church of God was promised and given to blessed Peter, the Apostle, immediately and directly by Christ our Lord." And in the same session the council went on to declare that: "What the Chief Pastor and Supreme Shepherd of the sheep, Christ our Lord, instituted in the person of blessed Peter, the Apostle, for the perpetual welfare of the Church this must, by the divine institution of Christ, last for ever in the Church which, being founded upon a rock, shall remain ever firm to the end of the world." This last declaration of the Council is what we wish to explain this evening. In speaking of the primacy conferred on Peter we said it was personal; that is, Peter was personally addressed by the Saviour, and special power was given to him that was not given to the other Apostles, and a power that made him superior, supreme ruler, even over the other Apostles. Now, the power thus given to Peter might have been merely personal; that is, it might have ended with Peter. But what the Vatican Council declared, and what Catholics are bound to believe, is that the power given to Peter was not merely personal, but official; that in conferring the power on Peter, Christ, our Lord, expressly declared that it was to be perpetual—to continue in His successors to the end of time. Every Christian must admit that our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ "did all things well." He acted, not only with the wisdom of man, but with the wisdom of God. But He Himself tells us that when

A WISE MAN BUILDS A HOUSE, he makes the foundation so solid and durable, that when the rain falls, and the floods come, and winds beat upon that house it remains unshaken, because of the solidity and premanency of the foundation. He tells us too, that He, the Almighty God, built His house His Church, on Peter; and He foretells that rain and flood and storm will come and beat upon that house, but that it will remain ever firm, because Peter the Rock, shall be its permanent, over-riding foundation. He says again His Church is to last for ever: "I will be with you all days even to the end of the world." "I will send you the Holy Ghost, the spirit of Truth who shall abide with you for ever." He wishes all here to be saved and come to the knowledge of the truth. He prays that all may be one as He and His Father are one. Other of sheep He has, not of this fold, these also He must bring, and these shall be one fold and one Shepherd. Now, no house can continue to exist without a foundation; no church without a head. No society without a supreme ruler. No visible flock without a visible shepherd. No union without a principle of unity. No permanent peace without a permanent pastor. All these are proofs from the nature of the case; from the wisdom of the architect, and the durability of the edifice. But our blessed Lord does not leave us to these arguments only. The matter is so important, so dear to Him and so vital to us that He will give us His express word for it. "Upon this Rock I will build my Church," He says, "and the gates of hell shall never prevail against it." The "gates of hell" are the combined powers of error and evil. They will come on and they will continue. They came against Him and He said: "We stand together, let them come on." They will come against His Vicar on earth when He shall have gone to His Father in Heaven. The Gentiles will rage, and peoples meditate vain things. Kings will come together against the Lord and against His anointed viceregent; but He who sits in the Heavens shall laugh them to scorn and the Lord shall deride them. He