

THE CATHOLIC RECORD

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AT 600 RICHMOND ST. LONDON, ONTARIO.

REV. JOHN F. COFFEY, E. A. L.L.D., EDITOR

GEN. AGENTS: Messrs. Donat Crowe and Luke King.

OTAWA AGENT: S. J. Coffey, General Agent, 74 George St.

REVENUE PER ANNUM.—One Copy, 62c.

ADVERTISING.—Ten cents per line

per week.

Subscriptions.—Ten cents per line

per week.

Advertisements.—Ten cents per line

per week.

very positive in its assertion of the sovereign's supreme headship over the church, which is stated to be of divine institution. Yet when the Provincial Episcopal Synod laid before the other Protestant bodies a proposal to secure by legislation compulsory religious education in the schools, the Congregational Union resolved at its June meeting:

"We deprecate compulsory religious instruction, involving, as it practically does, a principle against which we as Congregationalists have ever protested, viz., the union of Church and State."

The difference of opinion between the two Churches, though it might at first glance seem to be trivial, and a matter of mere sentiment, is in reality a difference on a matter of vital importance. It involves the question whether the Church of Christ is an organization free to teach and to preach as Christ has commanded, or that she is to shape her teachings according to the whims and fancies of kings and parliaments, whether she received commission from Christ to teach all nations whatsoever he revealed, or to teach merely what the nations feel inclined to listen to.

The differences between the bodies which propose to become one are no less important. They include Presbytery, which Presbyterians have been accustomed to regard as a rag of Popery, but which is regarded by Episcopalians generally as of divine origin, and therefore essential to the Church, though the Methodists did not find such Presbytery, as some of them pretended to, an insuperable obstacle to union who repudiated it. The supremacy of the Queen would not form a serious difficulty as far as Canada is concerned, for the English Church in Canada is really no longer one with the Church in England. The doctrines of the necessity of Apostolic orders, and even the preposterous fatalism of all followers of John Calvin, might perhaps be so daintily handled that they would not form a serious obstacle to a union in name, though each of these doctrines is decidedly repudiated by two out of the three denominations between which union is proposed, and the last named, especially fatalism, is regarded with horror by Anglicans and Methodists. However, it is a very simple matter for the delegates on a committee of union to overlook these differences. It is a mere matter of fancy what doctrines are to be believed, and what may be passed over as of small account. Indeed these questions have been already weighed by advocates of Union, and that we have not misrepresented or misquoted their views will be seen from the following summary of the question by the Dean of Montreal in a small work lately issued:

"In connection with a tremendous doctrine of this nature, one might fairly hope that out of a Christian conference, some solution of existing difficulties might arise. That there must be an article on the subject seems a necessity, but it might be so framed as, on the one hand, to acknowledge the sovereignty of God, and, on the other, to allow the exercise of the right of private judgment as to how God uses that sovereignty for His own glory, and the good of His Church.—Organic Union."

It would seem incredible that a Christian divine should propose such a mode of arranging the doctrinal belief of a Christian Church. It is but a short time since we called attention to the falsity of the accusation made by Rev. G. Milligan, that the Catholic church "manufactures truth," yet here is a prominent Anglican divine proposing that the Anglicans, Presbyterians and Methodists shall deliberately meet in conference to manufacture a doctrine on the principle of mutual compromise and to declare that the doctrine so framed, meaning neither one thing nor the other, is the truth of God as originally entrusted by Christ to His Apostles, with the command that they should teach it to all nations as being revealed by Him! Certainly a union patched up in this manner may produce a numerous and socially influential body; but where are we to look for common sense if a body so formed can succeed in persuading a large following that it is the Church of Christ, "the pillar and ground of truth?"

A MISTAKEN VIEW.

Some Canadian papers are busy representing Mr. Wm. O'Brien, M. P., as an advocate of the total separation of Ireland from Great Britain. Mr. O'Brien has never taken this ground. His speech in support of Mr. Gladstone's Irish Government Bill of 1886, yet fresh in the public mind of both countries, a speech that drew complimentary references for its moderation from the Liberal leader himself—should be proof positive and sufficient of Mr. O'Brien's views on the relations between the two countries. We have, however, a more recent utterance of the hon. gentleman, his speech in Dublin on his return from Canada. In this discourse he said:

"This glorious meeting outside the window is assembled here to-day with nothing in their hearts but goodwill and God-speed to Gladstone in his glorious work. Like him, we desire that the democracies of the two nations should shake hands in honest friendship, and should bury the feuds that were invented by aristocrats for the benefit of aristocrats. We are prepared for conciliation upon terms which, without hurting England, will

satisfy the longings of the Irish heart; but we are determined to tell the Tory coxcombs and gaggers, ay, and to tell Mr. Joseph Chamberlain (groans), that there is a spirit coursing through the veins of all those multitudes outside and of many a million of the Irish race to-day—a spirit that all the terrors of their puny coercion won't subdue—a spirit that will display their ways and will trample their coercion acts in the dust. We dare tell them also that for every campaigner that they put into jail, and every leader of the people that they piece upon a plank here, there will be millions of true men like you to set as brave a part. And we are here to tell them that the spirit of Irish nationality will live and thrive when the Balfours and the Chamberlains and their coercion acts are buried in oblivion and condemned (cheers); ay, and that we will never rest and never falter until the crown of legislative independence is set once more upon the brows of this brave old motherland of ours."

This is not the utterance of a Separatist but of a true Unionist, who would have the two peoples bound together by ties of friendship and affection and not by chains and manacles. Mr. O'Brien is just as free to attack Lord Lansdowne in 1887 as were the Canadian Liberals to assail Lord Dufferin in 1873. The latter were not Separatists because they showed cause for condemning Lord Dufferin, nor is Mr. O'Brien a Separatist for justly holding up Lord Lansdowne to the execration of the world.

AN IMPARTIAL VIEW.

The American takes a very sensible view of the Queen's Jubilee celebration. In its issue of June 25th that journal remarks that during Jubilee week the British branch of the Anglo Saxon race had been showing its congenial inability to manage such affairs with any adaptability to sentiment or fine taste. The American finds that the Anglo Saxon on either side of the Atlantic is a clumsy animal when required to act out a sentiment of any kind. He has never succeeded in co-ordinating emotion and its visible utterance to any extent and apparently never will. Nothing, according to our Pennsylvania contemporary is, from an artistic or philoepic point of view, more absurd than the American Fourth of July except the British royal jubilee.

"An old lady is to be carried through a long series of London streets under the summer sun, in order that her loyal subjects may have the chance to stare and cheer. She is to attend public worship in the oldest of London churches and a dinner through whose selection and collection is out of harmony with any purpose of Christian worship. She is to be worn out in attending balls, receiving addresses of congratulation, receiving firemen and soldiers, and hearing speeches. If the intention was to get her out of the way and give her son a chance, as soon as the twenty years of her reign were up, the matter could not have been better arranged."

The American remarks that the Queen's reign has been on the whole one of substantial progress calling for some public recognition, and that the England of to-day is in many respects a better England than that of 1837. It cannot, however, say that the English people have cause to felicitate themselves on the way they have discharged the duties and embraced the opportunities of that half century, or that they can look forward to the coming half-century with equanimity. The problems of government have in that half century grown in difficulty, with the growth of wealth in the hands of the few, of political power in the hands of the many, and the spread of social discontent among the masses. If there be anything, thinks the American, which England might set of the fates in 1837 it is to be put back to her position in 1837 and allowed to approach the problem of the past half century with less of scholastic confidence and more insight than has characterized her councils in the reign of Queen Victoria. When Mr. Grover Cleveland, President of the American Republic, undertook to congratulate Her Majesty in the name of the American nation on the generally prosperous condition of her dominion, she evidently thought that the American press was as ignorant or oblivious of the political and social miseries from which England suffers as he is himself. One view of the social degradation of the England of to-day is given by an American newspaper correspondent from London who wrote:

"In visiting other weavers' homes, I found much that was heart sickening and wretched. By long, weary hours of labor enough could be made to keep a spark of vitality burning from day to day. The Bethnal Green weaver, as a rule, is thin, rather bent, with a complexion of celery white. His eyes are hollow and expressionless. He has no time to read, as he keeps his loom running long into the night and rarely mingles with humanity outside. When he lies down to rest, in the same room with his loom, he often makes the third visit during a reign of half a century to this part of her dominions. Of course the streets through which her most precious majesty will pass will be the most agreeable. There are some signs in this quarter which I could not conclude her to surpassing anything in horrible wretchedness that the mind of a Gustave Dore could conceive.

But all this is kept from the Queen. And while the government spends a hundred thousand dollars without a squirm to seat a handful of nobles in Westminster Abbey for an hour, or the people another million for an extra statue of the prince consort, which are now as thick as Ruben's paintings on the continent, thousands are starving to death for want of work."

If this is a generally "prosperous condition," Mr. Grover Cleveland has very strange views of prosperity, views so repulsive to the sound sense of the American nation that he will at the first opportunity given them, be, we firmly believe, relegated to that "innocuous desuetude" from which he had better never have emerged. The American thinks that if Queen Victoria's half century were to be done over again, there is not an important page in its history that would not be altered. The diffusion of the benefits of education among the people would not have been delayed to the last decade of the reign, the surrender of English agriculture to the pressure of foreign competition that Manchester and Birmingham might get cheap labor, not have been made, the railroad system not have been allowed to grow up in a haphazard fashion depriving the public of many of its advantages, while on the other hand the rapid growth of the great towns would have been directed and controlled in the interests of moral and physical health, and the severance of the peasantry from the soil and their reduction to the level of farm laborers and factory hands checked. Besides, America would not have been alienated by the ambiguous policy of 1861-5, nor the continental influence of England sacrificed by criminal intermeddling in the domestic affairs of other nations.

THE PAPAL JUBILEE.

The Dublin Freeman's Journal calls attention, in commendatory terms, to the course intended to be pursued by the Belgian people in the matter of their gifts to the Holy Father on the occasion of his Jubilee. It says that that eminently practical and industrial people are availing themselves, even of this act, as an opportunity to emphasize their industrial progress and to call the attention of the world to their manufacturing perseverance. All the objects for presentation to the Pope will, before transmission to Rome, be displayed in an exhibition at Brussels, toward the end of July. Two purposes will thus be served. The Belgian people themselves can see what their country is able to produce in the way of sacred objects, or of those suitable for the personal use of His Holiness, and also prepare for a combined and effective display in the exhibition at Rome. The Freeman then recalls Archbishop Walsh's admirable address at the Cathedral of Dublin, wherein, whilst suggesting that some object of Irish workmanship should form part of Ireland's presentation, he lamented that from causes over which they had no control, his people could not rival foreign countries in laying at the feet of Pope Leo some creditable specimens of the industry of his Irish children. The Irish journal then adds that the opportunities are indeed few, and the time brief, for the exhibition of all the Papal gifts opens in Rome in January, 1888, but thinks that, in the six months yet to disposal, something can be done not only to prove Irish loyalty to the See of Peter and Ireland's affection for his great successor, but also to show a fact not so well known, that genius and skill can, as of old, even under adverse circumstances, produce many articles creditable to Irish brains and Irish hands. The Freeman is informed that in addition to gifts from exalted personages, the clergy and religious bodies, working men's societies in various parts of the world are combining their resources and sending suitable gifts, emblems of that great union of faith and labor; and intimates that throughout Ireland many brains and hands are now busy planning and producing numerous tributes from Ireland, but these are mostly being made in the religious orders and communities which adorn that land of faith, and will, as far as they go, be no discredit to the dexterity and industry of the Irish people. Our Dublin contemporary wishes that time and opportunity would allow Irish trade societies to join in this work, by some special gifts of their own production, and suggests that the resources of the country in this matter should, if possible, be concentrated, and if time remained, collected and exhibited in Dublin. A meeting of the Bishops was at the Freeman's writing soon to take place and certainly offered an opportunity for concerted action. All bodies, especially the trade societies, could intimate to the central committee their intention of sending some object of Irish art or manufacture. The Freeman mentions that there had been lately some discussion as to the encouragement of home manufactured church furniture and requisites. An admirable opportunity now presents itself of showing what can be done in that way and a practical means of promoting the many industries involved in manufacture of this nature. The carpenter, wood-carver, brass founder, embroiderer, lace-maker, book-binders, all could find in their re-

spective trades many articles easy of production and making excellent specimens of Irish handicraft. The Freeman then dolefully but justly remarks: "It is only at such moments as these that our industrial backwardness appeals us. The riches, the prosperity, the abundant population, the practical education, the influence of a resident Government, make every other nation in the world able to avail on the shortest notice of such opportunities as the Pontifical Jubilee Exhibition affords. It is Ireland alone that lags behind. Neither riches nor prosperity, neither population nor education, neither resident Government nor fostering care, enable her to take her place in the rivalry of nations in the arts of peace, for she covets not those of plunder nor ambition."

The Dublin journal hopes, however, that something may be done to enable Ireland to make as creditable a show as possible in that universal exhibition in the Eternal City, where the gifts of the entire world will be laid at the feet of the most illustrious Pontiff of modern days. We join the Freeman in this hope, and add a still further one of our own, that the whole Irish race, all over the world, may be fittingly represented on that occasion, proving its unity in the faith and its devotion to the See of Peter, under whose commission Patrick evangelized the Irish nation, and its special affections for a Pontiff who has himself manifested such great regard for the faithful people who have carried the teachings of Patrick to the furthest confines of the earth.

RECIPROcity.

There is very little doubt that the great majority of our agricultural classes are determined to secure reciprocity of trade with the United States. Our farmers are slow of motion. They think before they set out on any political movement—but once get them started and they are irresistible.

Upon the prosperity of the farmers depends the future of this country. Our farmers have, for many years, been suffering from a financial stringency that has driven many thousands of them from the country and plunged others into debt. They are naturally tired of this state of things and look, we think, with reason, to reciprocity as the remedy for the evils of which they complain. Our farmers, to put the case plainly, want money, or in other words, they seek for reasonable compensation for their labor, and to obtain this they need a good paying market for their produce. This they feel they cannot have so long as a tariff barrier stands between them and our American neighbors. It is a source of just satisfaction to all Canadians to see that our farming population are sinking all party differences in their demand for unrestricted reciprocity. This is a healthful and a hopeful sign. The placing of country before party is just what Canada at this moment specially needs. We notice that the only opponents of reciprocity are the advocates of the wild scheme of Imperial Federation, a scheme so monstrously absurd as to excite ridicule among all, but a few visionaries, content, if they be allowed to frame and enforce Utopian dreams, to keep Canada forever in subjection, inferiority and impoverishment. On the American side the question of reciprocity is generally discussed in a very friendly spirit. Leading writers on both sides insist that any treaty entered into by the two countries must be a fair, above-board bargain, between both. Neither one must seek to obtain any undue advantage over the other, but enter candidly into such an arrangement, as, being based on justice to all interests, must tend to augment the prosperity of both. We notice in the American a paragraph which sets forth, we think, in a very fair light the general view of our neighbors upon the whole subject. Our contemporary says:

Our contemporary, the West, of Toronto, used to advocate the policy of Commercial Union; but since Prof. Goldwin Smith came to be less intimately associated with its management, it has taken the other side. In general it takes the matter with fairness and candor; but we do not think it quite fair to mix up our arguments for Commercial Union with those of Mr. Hill of Illinois, and treat the divergencies of view as mutual retaliation. We think the Reciprocity of 1857 was a fairly good bargain at the outset, when both countries were following the same commercial policy. We believe it became unfair when the United States became a protectionist country, and that it was repealed with justice when it was found to open our market for food to the farmers of Canada, without opening the Canadian market for manufactures to our manufacturers. But we hold that the increased intercourse between the two countries was a good thing otherwise, and we are glad to see that the abrogation of the treaty has not carried their commerce back to the old level. But we oppose any attempt to revive reciprocity on the old basis—and that is the basis proposed by the Brits through Hon. George Brown, and recently by the Tories—because that is unfair between a country still chiefly agricultural and a country whose manufacturing districts lie so close as ours do to the Canadian border. We do not expect, with Mr. Hill, to double our sales in Canada under Commercial Union. We do expect to see both countries buy more freely of each other, keeping the balance of trade much as it now is. We do hope to get rid of the costly custom-house lines, with its personal irritations, its army of needless officials, and its provocations to

smuggling in both directions. And we look for a final settlement of the Fisheries question on a basis which cannot be disturbed, and which will be acceptable to both countries."

The politicians on this side must be made understand that our farming classes will brook no nonsense in this matter. The agricultural classes were never before so hampered with debt. Never had they such hardships to contend with as at this moment. The lot of our Ontario farmers is indeed far from a happy one. Hence the unanimity and earnestness which mark this movement for reciprocity. It has our hearty sympathy, for we know that without some such market as that of the American republic thrown open to the farmers of Canada, all of them must suffer and many thousands of them seek a home elsewhere, to the grave loss and lasting detriment of the nation.

ABOUT STRIKES.

We were very forcibly impressed by the reading of the following paragraph in the Ottawa Evening Journal:

"Chicago bricklayers have decided to go back to work on the old basis after a strike which has cost them a couple of million dollars in wages. If they had won instead of losing, the additional wages they wanted would not have made up their loss anyway for six or eight years. By and by people will begin to see the value of arbitration as a mode of settlement for differences of opinion regarding wages."

The fact here recited is one claiming the most careful consideration from the working classes. A strike is something of a graver character than we fear, many realize. It is only when bread falls the wife and little ones at home that the real gravity of such a step is apprehended. Opposed as we are in every sense to the encouragement and growth of monopolies, believing as we do that a fairer distribution of wealth amongst the various classes of society is attainable, holding as we do that the concentration of riches in the hands of the few tends to impoverish the many, knowing and professing as we do that labor's not in many cases remunerated as it should be, fearing as we do that unless the rights of labor are further asserted and protected by sound and equitable legislation, the whole fabric of society stands in danger of disruption, and finally advocating as we do, and have ever done, the right of the working classes to combine for self-protection and preservation against the inroads of heartless monopolies, we cannot be accused of hostility to the labor element, when we say that one of the curses of the movement is the presence and the influence in its midst of base, unworthy and conscienceless leaders. These villainous adventurers use and trade upon their fellow workmen as if these latter were cattle to be led to the shambles. They sell them again and again to the politician and not infrequently to the monopolist himself. What care they for the gravity of a strike? What reck they if the wife and little ones of the striking mechanic are pinched for bread or shiver for want of clothing? Their pockets are well lined by gift and by bribe and they ruthlessly order a strike to prove their own importance in the eyes of the community. It is with them a trade to use their fellow-men, and these are to blame for allowing the existence and the continuance of such a gigantic fraud and blood-letting monstrosity. Is it not, we ask, an anomaly and a shame, that men too lazy to work should be permitted to pose and to act as leaders of the labor movement? We know of more than one case in this country, where men of the most worthless character, too lazy to do ought but talk of the rights of labor, to them dear in so far as they made by their gift and insouciant profession an easy living, ruled over the laboring classes. Their rule consisted of heathen dictation to the workman, of his sale to the highest bidder at election times, and their own promotion, in due time, to some position under government. We say that our workmen in their unions and their associations should be careful, first of all, as to the character of those whom they admit to membership, and secondly of the character of the men they place at the head of their organizations. None but some *bona fide* workmen should be admitted into any labor association, and none but *bona fide* workmen should above all be promoted to office therein. The constitution of such societies should place it out of the power of a few persons to order a strike. We feel convinced that a majority of the bricklayers of Chicago must have been in their hearts opposed to the strike entered on last Spring, but their mouths were gagged, their tongues tied, and they were forced to submit to a despotism more odious than that of monopoly itself—a despotism whose cruel injustice has inflicted on them the loss of so many millions of dollars, visited upon their families so much want and misery and imposed upon the whole social body so much needless loss and injury. We quite concur in the view of the Journal that the Chicago strike affords positive evidence of the value of arbitration to restore and maintain amicable relations between labor and capital.

THE SPALDING ELECTION.

The result of the bye election in the Spalding division of Lincolnshire has thrown the Tory unionist party into confusion and spread dismay through the ranks of Mr. Gladstone's foes in both houses of Parliament. This division has had till now an intensely Tory record, but the brutal policy of coercion so aroused popular feeling that there was a sweeping victory on Friday, July 1st, for the Gladstonian candidate. A glance at the figures will prove most instructive. In 1885 the Tory candidate carried the constituency by a majority of 178. In 1886 he increased his majority to 288, while now the same Liberal candidate, Mr. Stewart, wins the seat by the enormous majority of 747 on a poll larger by 639 than that cast in 1886. Is there not here plain and emphatic indication that the policy of coercion is not popular. We have here, in the Spalding division of Lincolnshire, a Liberal Home Rule gain in less than twelve months that is a revolution. We know not what it can be termed. We are not surprised that Lord Randolph Churchill deplores the result of the contest and seeks to hold the Liberal Unionists responsible for the catastrophe. Nor does it in any way astonish us that his organ the Post takes advantage of the reverse to make an ill-considered attack on the government. That journal remarks:

"The result of the Spalding election seems to show that the government have not met the demands of public opinion with reference to the Crimes bill. The government has dwelled over four months without the bill might have been passed forcibly in many weeks. The sooner a stronger government is formed the better. Great changes are necessary with a view to strengthen the ministerial hold upon the country."

Great changes are indeed necessary for the welfare of the empire, its stability and prosperity, but the changes that are necessary do not include Lord Randolph Churchill as Premier. The great change required, the great change that is coming is the recall of Mr. Gladstone to the post from which disension and indifference drove him a year ago. Already the country sees its error. Election after election has shown that the nation is fully alive to the great political mistake of 1886 and that were an appeal now made to the people, Mr. Gladstone would come back to Parliament with a majority as great, united, determined and enthusiastic as that by whose help he swept the Irish Church out of existence.

POSTAL REDUCTION.

We take the following paragraph from the Ottawa Evening Journal:

It is understood that the returns already received by the Government for the fiscal year just closed show a very gratifying increase over the figures for the preceding twelve months. The postal business of the country regarded as a good indication of prosperity—has been climbing upwards at a rapid rate. The sale stamps for the fiscal year, ending the 30th ult., realized \$2,577,703.94 as compared with \$2,480,208.25, in the previous corresponding period, showing an increase of \$97,495.69. The increase in postal revenue during the past five or six years has been about \$60,000 each successive twelve-month; but the big jump of the year is attributed to general prosperity including the stimulus given to trade by the opening of the C. P. Railway. The indications are that the showing for the present year will be even better than previous figures. The Grand Trunk & Canadian Pacific Railway draw in round numbers \$300,000 and \$280,000 annually respectively, for the conveyance of mail.

No man, whatsoever his political affections and sympathies, but will read the above statement with heartfelt gratification. The figures in reference to postal revenue are to us especially interesting. The increase of \$157,497.69 something extraordinary, and, in every respect, satisfactory. But we do think that the increase would be much nearer a half million had postal reduction which for so many years we have strenuously advocated been made in due time.

It is to be hoped that the time has come when government should reduce the letter postage from three to two cents—and every two cents permit the carriage of the mails of one or two letters. We have to pay six cents for a letter that our American neighbor can have carried from any one point in their own country or to any point in Canada for two cents. In other words, our letter postal tax is 200 per cent greater than that of our American friends. Here is certainly an inequity, and, we must say, an injustice which should not in any civilized country be looked on as a revenue producer. It is great humanitarian and educating that the government should not for almost any cost to extend, facilitate and strengthen. Just it is, indeed, the reasonable amount of revenue should be drawn from it, but revenue should be a mere secondary affair.

The main object should be the well-together of all people through a clean and very cheap postal system. Facilities should be at the disposal of the poor as well as of the rich. We hope