

The Catholic Record
Published every Friday morning at 428 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 or more 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.

Catholic Record.

LONDON, FRIDAY, NOV. 11, 1881.

DIOCESE OF LONDON.

The following are the recent Ecclesiastical Appointments in the Diocese of London.

Rev. Fr. Molphy transferred from Strathroy to the charge of the Maidstone Mission.

Rev. P. F. Feron from Lambton to Strathroy.

Rev. P. J. Colovin has been appointed Pastor of Lambton and Sombra.

Rev. J. Ronan has been appointed Pastor of Bothwell and the adjacent missions.

Rev. M. Cummins has been appointed Assistant Priest to the mission of Mount Carmel.

Rev. A. McKeon has been appointed Assistant Priest to the missions of Park-Hill and Williams.

Rev. J. Walsh and Rev. T. Cornyn are employed as Assistant Priests in London.

The mission of Ridgetown has been attached temporarily to that of St. Patrick, Raleigh.

DEATH OF ARCHBISHOP McHALE.

Intelligence by cable on the 8th brought us the announcement that John McHale, Archbishop of Tuam, was dead. This will be sad news to Irish hearts in every corner of the globe.

ITALY AND THE PAPACY.

The relations between the Papal and Italian governments have been of late brought into marked prominence, invite earnest reflection and honest discussion. It is not Italy alone that is interested in the status of the Papacy. The Catholic body throughout the world is deeply concerned in this, without doubt, the really vital question of the times. If every monarchy of Europe is to-day menaced by revolution—if thrones be insecure, and dynasties doomed, it is, we have no hesitation in saying, on account of the treacherous course pursued by monarchical Europe towards the Papacy, the mainstay of legitimate authority everywhere. Instead of meeting the menacing attitude of revolution by the vigorous, united, and chivalric action becoming their names and greatness—action in which they had the support of the vast majority of their people—they quailed before the clamor of socialism and sacrificed the Head of Christendom to the folly and criminality of an active and restless minority. The sad results this pusillanimity of European royalty has led to are too well-known. They are pitifully and eloquently summarized by the Bishop of London, in his pastoral promulgating the Jubilee of 1881. The learned prelate declares: "The Vicar of Christ is dethroned and discredited. He is practically a prisoner, and at the mercy of his enemies. He exercises the functions of his august office only by the toleration of a hostile and usurping power; and the Father of the Faithful, to avenge whose wrongs a million swords flashing the light of battle, would in other days have leapt from their scabbards, is robbed of his liberty and rights, and is made dependent on the contributions of the faithful for the support of his dignity and for the means of enabling him to exercise his divine ministry. Kings and governments cooperated with, or regarded with shameful indifference, the monstrous and sacrilegious crime by which the Vicar of Christ was reduced to this sad and deplorable condition; but in co-operating with, or conniving at this crime, they have, Sampson-like, in their blind folly, torn down in whelming ruins the pillars that supported the temple of their authority and power. In the dethronement of the Vicar of Christ, the majesty of Kings, the security of thrones, the authority of governments, the stability of States, and the safety of society, have been on principle dethroned and overthrown, and the principle is, now, alas, in fatal and active operation in the world, and kings and rulers may

well turn pale at the decrees of destruction which it is writing with the hand of fate on their palatial walls."

These words, penned before the outrages of July and October last, which disgraced the Italian government and dishonored the Eternal City, are fully borne out by these sad occurrences and by the recent manifestation of socialist strength in various portions of Europe. It is now, indeed, become evident that the spoliation of the Papal States has led to assaults on religion itself, as well as shaken to its foundation regal and governmental authority in all countries. The advocates of an undivided Italian monarchy under the sovereignty of the House of Savoy, were wont to dwell on the practicability of the Holy Father's ruling in the spiritual, and the Sardinian King's in the temporal order, each independently of the other, as if things spiritual and temporal can ever be completely dissociated; or, as if the Supreme Ruler in the spiritual order, of two hundred millions of Catholics scattered throughout the world could be as safe while subject to the caprices, prejudices, jealousies, fortunes and mutations of another monarch and perhaps one bound by oath to discourage the practice and growth of Christianity, as when ruler of his own states; or as if the Pope, brought by his spiritual authority into contact with every government in the world, could, as such subject, exercise the immunity or enjoy the privileges and consideration in his dealings with these governments so necessary for the welfare of Catholics in the various countries of the world. They even laughed to scorn the repeated statements of the late Pope Pius IX. that he was a prisoner in the Vatican. But their contention and their mockery are now taken at their proper worth by the world, abashed at the impracticability of the former demonstrated by the experience of ten years, and mortified by the hollowing of the latter. It now seems clear that the purpose of the revolutionary party in supporting the long cherished designs of the House of Savoy on the other states of Italy, was not only the destruction of the temporal power of the Papacy, but the very obliteration of the Papal authority itself, and then the overthrow of the monarchical form of government in Italy. The utter helplessness of the administration of King Humbert to keep the revolutionary bodies in Rome within check—has rendered the *modus vivendi* with the Holy Father, imprisoned and outraged as he is, daily more difficult. Neither the person nor life of the Sovereign Pontiff is at this moment safe in Rome. His weakness is the weakness of the Italian Kingdom, for were he to morrow to leave Rome the dynasty of Savoy were completely at the mercy of the radical element in that and other Italian centres of population. Thoughtful Italians, friends of the Savoyard dynasty, now themselves seeing the impracticability of the present state of things in the Eternal City, fail not to affirm that the government of the Quirinal must give way to that of the Vatican. We publish elsewhere an important statement from a leading Italian patriot, lately transmitted by its Roman correspondent to the London Times. His declaration bears evidence of a growing feeling on the part of prudent and far-seeing supporters of King Humbert, to the folly of maintaining the results and persevering in the criminality of the spoliation of 1870. If that feeling be given time by radicalism to mature it must lead to great good for Italy. But we believe that radicalism has been nursed into such strength and activity by the hybrid monarchy of the House of Savoy as to place the sovereignty of the latter in exceeding great danger. As for the Papacy itself, we hold that notwithstanding all the efforts of the radical chiefs and the transient success which may crown these efforts, the interests of law, order, and public security will before long restore to it undisputed possession of temporal independence. That independence, coming from the want now felt throughout Europe for the consolidation and strengthening of authority—will be as secure, we can

not doubt, as in the great Catholic ages of the past.

THE SENATE OF CANADA.

The Senate of Canada is, as our readers are very well aware, composed of seventy-seven representatives, of whom twenty-four each are chosen from Ontario, Quebec and the Maritime Provinces, with three from British Columbia and two from Manitoba. The members of the Senate are nominated by the Crown and hold office for life. In theory the Senate is supposed to represent not individuals but classes, with the view of securing all portions of the people some share in the work of legislation. The Upper Chamber in the neighboring union was established for the purpose of representing the individual states as separate and distinct commonwealths. It therefore enjoys an influence in shaping legislation and governing the political life of the American people which our Senate has never, to the present, at all events, enjoyed. But our Upper Chamber is vested with very great and far-reaching power, and it is the duty of citizens to see that it is so composed as to secure the just exercise of these powers. With the members now actually composing the Senate, we have, as individuals, no fault to find. Our readers are, no doubt, divided in opinion on the merits of the Senate as to its past record. There may be even some who favor its abolition. These are questions, however, with which we do not propose to deal. What we desire to say is this, that while we have a Senate, it is our bounden duty to see it filled with the very best material at command to give it that just influence which the constitution intends it should under our system exercise.

We have said that the Senate is not designed to represent individual but class interests. If it have any other purpose of being it is an anomaly, and interferes with the liberties of the people represented in their capacity of individual citizenship in the House of Commons. If we examine the list of Senators from the various provinces, we find that in one especial respect regard has been in a certain measure paid to class representation. This is particularly true of the Provinces of Quebec and Manitoba with respect to representation of religion and race. The former has, as we previously remarked, twenty-four members in the Upper Chamber. Of these no fewer than six are Protestants, all respectable gentlemen, but not superior to several eminent Catholics, any of whom might, if bigotry had obtained preponderance in the counsels of the leaders of the Lower Canadian people, have been chosen in their stead. The late Sir George Cartier was too broad-minded to take advantage of his power to deprive any class in Lower Canada of its share of legislative influence. Besides its Senatorial representation, it may be here incidentally remarked, that the Protestant minority in Lower Canada also enjoys control of several seats for the House of Commons. The Senatorial representation of Manitoba is evenly divided between the Catholic and Protestant inhabitants of the Province, and cannot be complained of. We regret that we cannot speak in terms of like approval in regard to the Senatorial delegations from the other Provinces. From Prince Edward Island there is but one Catholic Senator out of four, although the Catholic population is nearly one-half of the whole—and there are several Catholic gentlemen there as well qualified for the post as any of the Protestant gentlemen who now represent it in the Upper Chamber. Mr. Howland, its sole Catholic representative in the Senate, is a gentleman of marked talent, and we doubt not the ablest Senator from the Island. Of the Nova Scotian Catholic body, we must also say that it is entitled to at least three members in the Senate. It has now nominally two, but in reality one, Mr. L. G. Power, of Halifax. The city of Halifax alone contains Catholics enough of ability to fill the whole ten seats which Nova Scotia holds in the Upper House. As to New Brunswick, we need only say that in the matter of the selection of Senators, as well as in many others,

the Catholic body has been very unjustly treated. There is but one Catholic in the Senate from that province.

Ontario has twenty-four members in the Senate, and but one of these, Hon. Frank Smith, a gentleman second to none in business capacity in the Senate, is a Catholic, notwithstanding that the Catholic minority in this Province is entitled to a representation as full as that given the Protestant minority of Quebec. We have men in our midst in every part of this Province as gifted and as useful in every respect as the gentlemen who represent the Protestant majority. If we had not, we should not make claim for increased representation in the Senate. But it may be told us that we should elect our representative men to the House of Commons. We have just one answer, and a very plain one, to give any such advice. It cannot be done. In very few instances, indeed, can Catholics be elected for Protestant constituencies in Ontario. All fair-minded Protestants will bear us out in this, that religious prejudice is still so strong in this province that it is only with the greatest difficulty a Catholic can secure election in any place in Ontario except where the Catholic body is numerically very large. We well know that many Protestants have in various constituencies of Ontario generously supported Catholic candidates—but in how few instances have Catholics in this Province obtained election in Protestant constituencies? As we cannot then get adequate representation in the House of Commons, we are certainly all the more in a just position to firmly demand the recognition of our rights to representation in the Senate. There are at present several vacancies in that body. The Catholics of Ontario are entitled to at least four representatives on Ontario. Of these one should be a French Canadian, the others taken from the Irish Catholic body. There is now an opportunity to give us an instalment of justice. Let us insist on it, and it must be done. We speak not in this sense to find fault with one political party more than another. Neither party has yet done the Catholic of Ontario justice in this matter—or rather the Catholics of Ontario have not done themselves justice. With nothing less than the representation to which the great Catholic body of Ontario is justly entitled in the Senate can we rest satisfied. We ask it not as a favor, but as a right, and feel assured that in the position we assume our readers and friends will loyally support us.

THE IRISH QUESTION.

The government has now, it appears, in its good keeping more than four hundred Land League "Suspects." It is certainly singular that in a time of peace, so many Irishmen, for proclaiming truths at one time vehemently maintained by several members of the present government, should be loaded with prison chains. Such is, nevertheless, the fact, and proves the complete inability of the British Government to deal either humanely or justly with Ireland. Last fall Mr. Parnell, with several of his associates in the land agitation, was indicted for sedition, but the government, after an extraordinary effort, failed to convict him. He is now cast into prison, and refused even the formality of a trial. Is this just or humane? It certainly is not, and we cannot blame the Irish people for the exasperation they feel on account of this wanton act of tyranny.

If the Land League leaders ever required proof to establish the rectitude of the agitation they have set on foot, they have it in the very action of the court established under the land act recently passed. That act, with all its imperfections, is proving by its workings that landlordism is the monstrous infiction which Mr. Parnell so rightly denounced.

they will silence the enemies of Ireland and her people. But they will satisfy all just-minded men that the land system of Ireland requires such a thorough reform as to justify the Irish people in holding the very strong views they do hold in reference to landlordism, which the rapacity and confiscation of centuries alone enabled to subsist against the force of public opinion.

"FAITH AND FREE THOUGHT."

The Rev. Dr. Burns is, we believe, Principal of the Wesleyan Female College, Hamilton. During a few leisure moments recently abstracted from the busy occupations of this prominent post, the duties of which must in their adequate fulfillment require all the ingenuity and diplomacy which even Dr. Burns possesses—he indited a letter in support of the position assumed by Dr. Thomas, the Methodist "heretic," who has of late disturbed the prayerful in the naughty, restless, and sinful city of Chicago. Dr. Burns has long been considered by the body to which he belongs a thinker of a profound character. His letter has, therefore, fallen upon our Methodist friends like a thunderbolt from a clear sky. We may with reason look for a prolonged struggle among Wesleyans in reference to the course of the learned doctor. But the doctor is evidently assured of support of no inconsiderable influence, for not content with sustaining Dr. Thomas by letter in a position which no sound reasoning can reconcile with the "essential" truths of Christianity, he last week enlightened the people of the quiet town of Strathroy with his views on "Faith and Free Thought." The lecture was, as far as we can gather from the newspaper reports, of a very remarkable character. We do not know how Dr. Burns defined either faith or free thought—but whatever his definition, if any, it will no doubt seem to our readers anomalous that any man assuming the title of a Christian minister, and one, too, charged with the education of youth, should seek to reconcile faith and free thought. If free thought be, as Dr. Burns maintained it should, the basis of faith, we ask him what does he really mean by faith? It cannot be a faith proceeding from divine revelation and dependent upon divine authority, but merely an emanation of the human mind, having no other foundation save that of the foolish reasoning of man. According to this theory we ask our Methodist friends what would become of Christianity? Its doctrines would be held and accepted not because they come from God, but that to the mind of each individual they seem reasonable. If this be the Christianity of Wesleyans, no wonder to us that it is pronounced a delusion and a mockery.

There are certain of Dr. Burns' statements at Strathroy to which we desire to make special reference, greatly tearing at the same time that their publication will go very far to prove his reputation as a scholar and thinker to be largely fictitious. The learned gentleman declared (1) that the essence of thought is in its freedom, (2) that thought was in thrall during the dark ages, (3) that our creeds are unnecessarily long, and our trouble has been in our creed-making propensities, (4) that the creed of Christianity should contain only the essentials of truth, (5) that we do not know how Christ's death saves us, and (6) that free thought had eliminated from the Bible errors which had crept in in the process of translating and transcribing. We have here a series of assertions taken from Dr. Burns' lecture, which would, we believe, appall even Dr. Thomas himself. We are told that the essence of thought is in its freedom! Shades of departed philosophy! let not your anger fall on the "ambitious city" or on the Wesleyan Female College because of Dr. Burns. Freedom the essence of thought! We wonder if Dr. Burns' metaphysics contain a definition of essence and of thought. If so even he must see that freedom is an attribute, not the essence of thought.

We pass over in the silence, not indeed of contempt, but of pity, the Dr.'s reference to the dark ages. He knows better than he would fain

have us believe that these ages which he calls dark were ages of the greatest intellectual advancement since the days of Augustine. When, however, he asserts that "our trouble has been in creed-making propensities," we agree with him that Protestantism has brought on its own difficulties and paved the way for infidelity by its restless tendency to invent new and modify old standards of belief. As to whether the creeds of the sectaries be too long, as Dr. Burns intimates, we have only to remark that if there be any further curtailment in certain of them there will be nothing left. But Dr. Burns' system of free thought could at any time be utilized to construct others. The lecturer also declares that the creed of Christianity should contain only the essentials of truth. But who, Doctor, is to define the essentials of truth? Surely not the principal of the Hamilton Wesleyan Female College, who asserts that freedom is the essence of thought.

When Dr. Burns tells us that we know not how Christ's death saves us, his language calls for the very severest condemnation. It proves him to have no belief in revelation, and a very anti-Christian perception of the truth and efficacy of the Divine atonement. We commend this blasphemous assertion—for blasphemous it certainly is, coming from a Protestant divine—to the earnest reflection of our separated brethren. The last assertion of Dr. Burns which we desire to note is that free thought has eliminated from the Bible errors that had crept in in the process of translating and transcribing. When was this marvellous elimination made? There was certainly room for excision and emendation in King James' Bible, which so many Protestants still regard as their rule of faith, but if the revised edition be the product of free thought to which Dr. Burns refers, he will find that it has taken no hold of the Protestant religious world, and failed to satisfy men that free thought has removed those errors in the Bible of which he speaks. Free thought in its usual acceptance is in direct antagonism to divine faith, and cannot be reconciled with it. Dr. Burns' attempt to bring about such a reconciliation is the most egregious failure we have ever yet witnessed. We might have noted many other assertions in his lecture, but we have given it notice enough to show that its purport and tendency are anti-Christian to an extent so palpable as to be appalling.

RUSSIAN AGGRESSIVENESS.

While Russia is at home threatened with civil strife she is just as aggressive as ever in the East. Since the practical obliteration of British influence in Afghanistan, Russia has the field there clear for that kind of intervention to which she is so well accustomed with weaker states in her neighborhood. We learn that she now proposes to acquire Mero, an important town in command of all north-eastern Afghanistan. Mero once acquired will give the Russians a foothold in that much disputed country which will, we believe, be the vantage ground of further aggression. If Lord Beaconsfield had lived we should certainly now see him at the head of an agitation calling for British interference to resist the Russian acquisition of Mero. It will no doubt be a cause of mortification to many in Britain who firmly held to Lord Beaconsfield's policy to see it so completely reversed in so brief a time. That policy led Britain into a position of aggressiveness in every portion of the world, which could bring no enduring results of a peaceful character. But it pleased Britons to assert some sort of sway in the counsels of the great nations of Europe and dictate terms to barbarous nations in the furthest ends of the earth. Lord Beaconsfield would certainly, if now at the head of affairs, bitterly resist Russian interference in Afghanistan as a direct menace to British India, for the Russians will no doubt be enabled through their acquisition of Mero to hold easy and constant communication with India. They will thus be in a position to build up a Russian feeling there which may eventually lead to the very gravest results. The possession of India may sooner than

we believe become even more an object of contention and offer the world the spectacle of struggles the most bloody that have ever engaged the attention of the human race. We do not expect that Mr. Gladstone will take any action in reference to the Russians acquiring Mero. But the British people may yet, notwithstanding their ill-success in Afghanistan, hold him to account for not preventing the so near and rapid approach of Russia to the very gates of their Indian empire.

THE AMERICAN CABINET.

Secretary Blaine is credited with the statement that after the first of January the Cabinet will be a thorough reflection of Grantism. The retirement of the Secretary of State in December will certainly remove the only power in the Cabinet adequate to the repression of the Grant and Conkling influences. These influences will certainly, in the absence of Mr. Blaine, hold sway in the Cabinet, but will they obtain control of the republican element in Congress? This must be the consideration which now seriously troubles the stalwarts, for without an unbroken republican congressional support it will be impossible for them to enjoy the fruits of the possession of power. There has been for some time a rumor in circulation that Secretary Blaine contemplated an early return to the Lower House of Congress. He would, if honored with a seat in that body, at once undoubtedly assume the leadership of his party therein. As a leader he might not prove so ready an instrument in the hands of the Cabinet as its exigencies required. We should then witness the anomalous spectacle of a republican cabinet thwarted and opposed by the republican element in Congress. Mr. Blaine may not, for the sake of his party's harmony, seek re-election to Congress; but there is no doubt that he bitterly feels his sudden fall from power. His was the ruling spirit in the late President's Cabinet. So great was his strength with his party that he succeeded for a time in driving into oblivion his rival Conkling, the first of republican orators. But the sad death of President Garfield has again called into prominence the ex-Senator from New York. He will assuredly be the "power behind the throne" as long as President Arthur rules from the White House. The coming year, then, from the present outlook, promises to be one of unusual interest in American politics, for it may witness a disruption of the great party which has ruled the Union for twenty long years.

GUNPOWDER PLOT DAY.

On Saturday last, gunpowder plot day, there were throughout Canada some slight manifestations of the usual character. In many places, however, where in former years the recurrence of this anniversary excited the fanaticism of those who disgraced their country by brutal exhibitions of a morbid acrimony, there was no display of any kind. We are happy indeed to chronicle this fact as an indication of a better feeling, without which our country could neither advance nor prosper. We are glad, indeed, to note a growing determination on the part of the truly patriotic element amongst our people to frown down the revival of the feuds that have divided and distracted older countries. The introduction of the bigotry and hatred which in this Province itself caused at one time so much bitterness, is due to designing and malicious men of the narrowest type of mind, eager to acquire place through the folly of those they succeed in deluding. Men of this class—at one time the honored leaders of a deluded populace—are now estimated in most places at their proper worth. It is a well known fact, indeed, that our legislative halls have often held men whose presence there reflected no honor upon Parliament. They come there by the support of the large body whose suffrages are unfortunately not cast on account of the public or private merit of the candidate, but on account of his frothy declamations against Popery, and cannot easily be got rid of. Their numbers and influence are, however, on the wane, and we hope to see the day when such men will be no longer honored with a prominence which dishonors the legislature and injures the country. When that day comes, as come it must, if citizens of all classes really devoted to the interests of peace, order and progress, exercise their best energies to free the people from the baleful control of demagogues whose malice is their best developed quality, such anniversaries as that of the fifth of November will be no longer celebrated by even a fraction, however small, of our people. Then we may look back with painful surprise to the time when on that day men devoted themselves to the trade of insulting their fellow-citizens, and bringing obloquy on the country whose interests they declared it their purpose to serve.

We have been furnished by cable with a report of an attempt to destroy human life by an infernal machine. It was discovered, the report says, just a moment before it was