

The Catholic Record.

Published Weekly at 494 and 496 Richmond Street, London, Ontario.

Price of subscription—\$2.50 per annum.

REV. GEORGE R. NORTHGRAVES, Author of "Mistakes of Modern Infallibility."

THOMAS COFFEY, Publisher and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY, MESSRS. LUKE KING, JOHN NICH, P. J. NEVIN and W. A. NEVIN, are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transact all other business for the CATHOLIC RECORD.

Rates of Advertising—Ten cents per line each insertion, adagio measurement.

Approved and recommended by the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa, and St. Boniface, and the Bishops of Hamilton and Peterboro, and the clergy throughout the Dominion.

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

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

London, Saturday, March 9, 1895.

LENTEN REGULATIONS FOR 1895.

(OFFICIAL.)

The following are the Lenten regulations for the diocese of London:

1st. All days of Lent, Sundays excepted, are fast days.

2nd. By a special indulgent from the Holy See, A. D. 1884, meat is allowed on Sundays at every meal, and at one meal on Mondays, Tuesdays, Thursdays and Saturdays, except the Saturday of Ember week and Holy Saturday.

3rd. The use of flesh and fish at the same time is not allowed in Lent.

The following persons are exempted from abstinence, viz.: Children under seven years; and from fasting, persons under twenty one; and from either or both, those who, on account of ill health, advanced age, hard labor, or some other legitimate cause, cannot observe the law. In case of doubt the pastor should be consulted.

Lard may be used in preparing fasting food during the season of Lent, except on Good Friday, as also on all days of abstinence throughout the year by those who cannot easily procure butter.

Pastors are required to hold in their respective churches, at least twice in the week during Lent, devotions and instructions suited to the holy season, and they should earnestly exhort their people to attend these public devotions.

They are hereby authorized to give on these occasions Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament. Besides the public devotions, family prayers, especially the holy Rosary of the Blessed Virgin, should be recited in every Catholic household of the diocese.

M. J. TIERNAN, Sec.

THE POPE'S CRITICS.

The Encyclical recently sent by the Holy Father to the Bishops of the United States has attracted considerable notice from the non-Catholic press, as every document emanating from the Holy See does. It is natural that a letter which in its ethics is sure to be received and accepted with the greatest reverence by ten millions of the population of the country, should attract the notice of the rest of the community; and we know by the experience of the past that every public act of the Pope is closely scanned, and if there is any flaw, even imaginary, contained in it, it becomes a fruitful source of indignant commentary by those who make it their special business to abuse the Holy Father on every possible occasion.

It is somewhat of a relief in the monotony of the thing to find that the present document has been received by non-Catholics with more favor, or rather, we should say, with less disfavor than is usual.

It has been very generally admitted by the non-Catholic press that, in the first place, the apostolical letter is well suited to the country, or, in the words of one of our Protestant religious contemporaries, "is sagaciously adjusted to the condition of things existing in the United States." A Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church, Bishop Paret, of Maryland, who has told the public his views of the position, says that "the Pope has shown an exhibition of statescraft, of worldly wisdom, and of adroitness far beyond his prerogative."

This gentleman points out that the Archbishop of Canterbury would trespass beyond his proper sphere if he were to address authoritatively any but his own flock, and that a letter sent by him for the guidance of the people of America would be regarded as a piece of interference beyond his right.

This is correct. The Archbishop of Canterbury has not, and by the very theory on which the Anglican Church is based, cannot, have any right to address the people of America.

Does not the Act of Supremacy, to which every clergyman of the Church of England is bound by a solemn oath, declare that "no foreign Prince, Prelate or Potentate hath or ought to have any jurisdiction within this realm," England?

If this be good theology or Christianity, the same rule holds good in the United States against all Englishmen or other foreigners, and no English

Church prelate can ever exercise jurisdiction in the United States, even by taking a legislative part in a "Pan-Anglican Council." There have been held a couple of Pan-Anglican Councils, but they have fully recognized the fact that they could not exercise any real jurisdiction, and they made no attempt to do so. They decided, it is true, to uphold a couple of dogmas on which the various parties of Anglicanism could agree, but further they did not presume to go; and what they did agree upon, they made no pretence of inculcating authoritatively. It was quite a different assemblage from the Council of Jerusalem, where the assembled Apostles could prefix to their decrees the saying: "it hath seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us."

The Archbishop of Canterbury feels perfectly, and so do his colleagues, that it would be ridiculous to suppose that the commission of Christ, "Teach all nations," was meant for them.

With the Pope the matter stands differently. His authority is not contracted within the bounds of any "pent-up Utica." He is the successor of St. Peter, and his authority is co-extensive with the authority given by Christ to St. Peter, and to all the Apostles. There is, therefore, no analogy between the Pope and the Archbishop of Canterbury in this matter, for two reasons: 1. The Archbishop derives his authority from the State, which cannot give spiritual jurisdiction at all; 2. Whatever jurisdiction it could give cannot go beyond England and its dependencies, whereas the authority of the Pope is that which came by succession from Christ Himself, through St. Peter, and extends over the whole world.

Others beside Bishop Paret have spoken in similar strain, and this answer will suffice for all: yet we must say they have on the whole spoken of the Pope with unprecedented mildness and even kindness on this occasion, though they do take offence at some things said by the Holy Father.

They attribute to the Pope, for example, an astuteness and worldly wisdom, which they evidently mean to say is a deceitful cunning. He professes great esteem and love for the young and vigorous American nation, in which he "discerns latent forces for the advancement alike of civilization and Christianity." They doubt the Holy Father's sincerity in this; but why should he not be sincere? In America the Church has prospered, because the laws regard and protect the people, whatever may be their creed. The Church, with its great vitality, has profited by this, and it is no wonder the Pope should be gratified at the result. But if he had not praised America, or had been disposed to condemn instead of praising, we may be sure the critics who are now finding fault with him would be glad to find greater fault. In fact they would find fault whatever the Pope might say.

One journal tells us that in thus lauding the Americans the Holy Father gives evidence that the Church is changing, and thus negating her vaunted immutability and identity with herself at all times.

Such a statement shows an unparalleled ignorance of what is meant by the Church's identity with herself in all ages. We might reply by asking where the Church has claimed that she should be always the same in her manner of dealing with nations? Her identity is in her unchanging faith—in the sameness of her doctrines with those which have been handed down from Christ through His apostles and their successors, and in all things which are essentially connected with unity of faith, such as the essence of the sacraments, and the universal authority of the Pope. It is not pretended by Catholics that in matters of mere expediency the Church should be always the same, or in matters of ecclesiastical discipline or law. Nevertheless we venture to say that it cannot be shown that the Church was ever unfriendly to the United States. The contrary is shown by the Encyclical, wherein the Holy Father proves that the first Bishop appointed by apostolic authority over the American Church was on terms of the greatest intimacy and friendship with George Washington, and that, therefore, the United States ought to be joined in peace and friendship with the Catholic Church.

The Pope, however, does not state that everything in America is the best possible. He is the father of the whole Church, and not of the Church of America only, and it would not be pro-

per he should unreservedly praise everything which Americans institute. He pronounces himself as strongly as ever in favor of Christian education, especially referring to the importance of the Washington Catholic University, and he declares that we are not to infer that because the Church and the State are dissevered and divorced in America, that they should be divorced everywhere.

The Pope's critics find fault with this statement; but they look at the matter from a local point of view. They assume that whatever exists in America must necessarily be the right.

But the Holy Father thinks of other Governments and other lands than the western world. He is grateful to America for according liberty to the Church, and he does not propose to interfere with the liberty of American Protestants. But he will not pander to American prejudice by asserting that the only good or that the best possible government is that which is entirely divorced from religion. We may safely say that even those who criticize the Pope for the view he takes on this matter, are themselves of the same opinion, for as a matter of fact they wish the Government to sustain the observance of Sunday, to put down Mormon polygamy and to restrict divorce. It is with an ill grace that they condemn the Pope for laying down a theory which they themselves maintain in practice.

GETTING EXCITED.

The agitation in regard to the Manitoba school question puts the average Orangeman into his native element; and probably there is no happier man in the world than the average Orangeman when he is given an opportunity of dealing out injustice to his Catholic neighbors. The average Orangeman, both of high degree and of low degree, invariably acts as though the world were coming to an end when the Catholic people are placed on the same level as all others. The Williamite code—a divine one, he fancies—suggests ascendancy for the Orangeman, at all times and in all places. The Orangeman, in fact, to his mind, seems to have been created first, and the Catholic afterward, for his special use and benefit.

A striking instance in proof of this contention occurred recently in Gananoque, at the meeting of the Leeds County Lodge, at which Brother W. H. Clarke and Brother Wm. McKenzie moved, and it was unanimously resolved, and that they would give moral and material support to the bigots of Manitoba in their efforts to impose a double school tax on the Catholics of that province.

It was also decided that the members would not support any candidate for the House of Commons who was not opposed to any interference with the school law of Manitoba.

This is truly a dreadful state of affairs. Resolutions of the County Lodge of Peel and many other sister lodges would lead one to think that Confederation would be broken into smithereens if Catholics got justice in the province of Manitoba. There is only one gleam of hope. The average Orangeman sometimes ceases to be an average Orangeman when his material interests are affected by the carrying out of his principles.

A BARBAROUS ACT.

The Compulsory Education law has scored another victory in England! Not that we imagine that there is much cause for rejoicing and self-glorification. The story has gone the world over, and reads more like some barbarous action perpetrated by imbruted savages than the effect of nineteenth century legal enactments. And they hold meetings to denounce the cruelties of Armenia, etc., when crimes of unparalleled iniquity are committed at their doors, and are unpunished!

A Mr. Grainger, living in Sunderland, kept his children from school, and upon being arraigned by the magistrate said that ill health had incapacitated him from working and had prevented him from clothing and feeding his children so that they could appear in public. He was sentenced to a fine of 10 shillings. He pleaded the direst poverty, and the judicial luminary had him consigned to prison for three days. At the expiration of his term he was set at liberty, and the penitless and enfeebled man turned his face homewards. But it was at a distance of fourteen miles, and the weather was cold and stormy. He, however, was nothing daunted, but the emaciated frame was not able to endure the fatigue, and when half of the distance was

traversed he crawled into a lime kiln for shelter. He was found next morning half frozen. The law again lent him its assistance and sent him to the Poor Asylum. But this humane condescension came too late, for the poor fellow died. An inquest was held and the jury rendered the verdict: "Death from exposure." Impartial men say that it should have been: "Judicial murder."

The judge may not be censured except as the too willing exponent of a law as cruel as it is unwise; but the Government that framed it has proved but too conclusively that it has forgotten the fundamental principles of justice and equity, and merited the scorn and opprobrium of the nations. It is a thing of no moment, they say—of no international importance: but it is a mighty event to Him through whom kings reign and lawgivers decree just things.

LOFTY ASSUMPTIONS.

It is stated that a number of Protestant missionaries to China attached to the Chinese Inland Mission have resigned because the Rev. J. Hudson Taylor, who has the chief charge as General Superintendent, has imposed upon them conditions which they are unwilling to accept.

Mr. Taylor has issued a new and revised "Book of Arrangements" whereby he virtually claims to rule the missions, not as representing the people, or the clergy associated with him in the work, but as the representative of God, not responsible either to the clergy or the people for his methods. He maintains in his new Book of Arrangements that "elective rule and government by majorities find no place in the Word of God. Those who have rule are spoken of (in Scripture) as the representatives of God, not as the representatives of the people."

These assumptions have created great discontent, and the missionaries have not hesitated to dub Mr. Taylor as "a Protestant Pope, desirous of settling by virtue of his own divine authority all questions relating to the government of the missions."

The New York Independent is very outspoken in condemning Mr. Taylor's course, saying that "he condemns oracularly nearly every Christian body in the world, for they all adopt the elective principle."

The Independent points out that if the Scriptures do not enjoin government by majorities, neither do they demand that government shall be by minorities. The Scriptures, in fact, are not a directory to tell the particular way in which everything is to be done, and thus it infers that the system which would permit each person who claims to be divinely authorized to rule, to do so unquestioned, would produce confusion and not order. It is not to be wondered at, therefore, that Mr. Taylor's assumptions have produced confusion.

Mr. Taylor is very positive about what the Bible teaches, but he is reminded that others who are just as competent as himself, and who might also claim to have the divine afflatus, may draw quite a different conclusion from that which he has reached.

The reason advanced for the very existence of the religious body to which the missionaries belong, is that the authority of St. Peter's successor is a usurpation, and after rejecting the only authority which can claim at all to have been divinely constituted to rule the Church of God, it is not likely they will submit to the dictation of a self-constituted Pope.

WELSH DISESTABLISHMENT AND THE COMING CONFLICT.

Mr. Henry Asquith, Home Secretary of Lord Rosebery's Administration, on the 25th February, introduced into the House of Commons the bill for the disestablishment of the Welsh Church, and as he introduced it he made the statement that it is identical with the measure introduced during the session of 1894.

Concerning the justice of this bill there can be but one opinion. The people of Wales have long demanded that they be relieved from the incubus of supporting a Church in which three-fourths of the population do not believe, and so earnest is their demand that they have been for years in a sort of semi-rebellion against the Government, and in actual warfare against the officials who have attempted to collect the tithes. If they have been somewhat more peaceable of late, it is not that they have changed their opinions, but because they are convinced that redress of their great

grievance is about to be granted to them.

About the wishes of the Welsh people in this matter there is not the shadow of a doubt, as all the representatives sent by the Principality to the House of Commons, except two, are pledged to their constituents to support the Disestablishment Bill, and they have persistently urged the matter on the Government. The House of Commons, too, has done its part manfully to give the redress demanded, but the opposition to the Bill has come from the Lords, of course, and it is to be expected that while the present Bill will also pass the Commons, it will be again vetoed by the Lords, even out of mere bravado, for they will probably not eat their leek by retreating from the position they took in 1894.

This will precipitate the conflict between the Commons and the Lords which Lord Rosebery promised to inaugurate, and will probably be the circumstance which will be made the basis of an appeal to the country to restrict the legislative powers of the Lords, so that the way may be prepared both for Welsh Disestablishment and Irish Home Rule.

There is little room for doubt that with the issue of reform in the constitution of the House of Lords as a shibboleth, the Liberals will successfully appeal to the country, notwithstanding the fact that the political prophets are predicting a Tory triumph at the next election.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

WE DIRECT special attention to the Pastoral Letter of His Grace the Archbishop of Kingston, which we publish in this issue of the CATHOLIC RECORD.

A careful study of the Pastoral will bring to the reader much useful instruction. Indeed it could be read with profit more than once, for the more it is studied the more will it become apparent that the distinguished Archbishop's whole soul is devoted to the work of guiding and guarding the flock committed to his care. That his spiritual children should lead profitable and Christian lives seems to be the golden goal at which he aims, for, in season and out of season, he is ever found on the watchtowers—ever ready to fulfill his duty to the utmost.

His reference to the treatment of the Catholic charitable institutions of Kingston by the aldermen of that city might be taken to heart by the civic officials of almost every other city and town in Ontario. The words of His Grace, dignified and judicial as they are, must bring the conviction to the mind of every reasonable person that bigotry is the motive which guides the conduct of many of our civic dignitaries when questions affecting the Catholic Church and Catholic institutions come before them for deliberation. We doubt not His Grace's words will have due weight. His pronouncement is an eloquent plea for justice.

SPEAKING lately at New Haven, Archbishop Satolli paid a graceful compliment to Yale University, which he described as a great sanctuary of rational and natural sciences. When he was asked his opinion of the A. P. A. he replied, "I do not care to discuss the matter. I look upon the organization as every sensible Catholic does—I overlook it."

OFFICIAL statistics show that the number of Catholic clergy in the United States is 10,366. Of these the Jesuits number 684. Yet it is supposed by the Apatists—a belief encouraged by all the anti-Catholic parsons—that these few Jesuits have the awful design to seize upon the Government of the United States, and to destroy the Protestant population. The Jesuits in Canada are about in the same proportion to the Catholic population as they are in the Republic. The number of Jesuits in the Dominion is about 72, all of whom are engaged in teaching, or in parish work, a great part of which is performed among the Indians of Algoma and the North-West. It is hard to imagine why the Drs. Wilde, Carman, etc., have such a horror of these zealous workers in the Lord's vineyard, except that they are jealous that the fruits they themselves produce fall short of the results of Jesuit labors. But, "by their fruits ye shall know them."

The Jesuits have commenced a series of missions to non-Catholics. It is useless to predict their success, for rarely fail the sons of Loyola in any undertaking. Earnest and enthusiastic,

learned and self-sacrificing, they are admirably equipped for the work; and experience has proved full often that courage in the face of difficulties and indomitable perseverance in any good work are not words without meaning to the Jesuit order.

"They were the first," writes Spaulding, "to put the forest brambles aside, they were the first to cross the threshold of the wigwams of every native tribe, the first to plant the cross of Christ in the wilderness and shed their blood cheerfully at its base."

"They are," says Dean Harris, "the Imperial Guard of the Church that dies but never surrenders. And in our day they go forth with the same message of justice and truth that their sainted brethren preached with the primeval forest for a temple and untutored savages for auditors. We wish them success, not indeed fearing failure, but that we may put ourselves on record as favorable to such a mission, rich with infinite possibilities."

THE Rev. Mr. Watson, of Kingston, N. Y., pastor of the Protestant Episcopal church of that town, is on trial before Bishop Potter, of New York, for heresy, especially for having celebrated High Mass, and having offered prayers to the Blessed Virgin Mary asking her to intercede with her Divine Son on behalf of his congregation. We cannot well foretell what may be the result of the trial, but the Church of England, which is the mother Church of the American P. E., cannot restrain its clergy from the exercise of their private judgment on the very same points, and we cannot well understand how clergymen who would be perfectly orthodox in England, and in full communion with the Church, should be heretics in America as members of what is claimed to be one and the same Church of Christ with the Church of England.

A MOTION in the French Chamber to separate the Church from the State was lost by a vote of 305 to 205, and another motion to suppress the budget for the ministry of Public Worship was lost by 379 to 111. We can appreciate the good intentions of those who constituted the majority in both these divisions. They feel that the country needs religious direction; but when we consider the kind of religion to which the rulers of France have given adhesion for the last quarter of a century, we may well doubt of any advantage accruing to the people by continuing the connection between Church and State. The Church might have much greater influence if she were freed from such State interference and dominance as is claimed in virtue of the miserable pittance voted out to the clergy in France as a recompense for the revenues of the Church which were stolen by the State. It is now considered a great compliment to restore a tenth or a twentieth part of the original plunder.

A CURIOUS report has been circulated that M. Faure, the recently elected President of the French Republic, is a Protestant; but it is without truth. The report was originated to injure the prospect of his election and secure the election of M. Brisson, whom the Socialists favored. An incident in connection with the origin of the report has been published as authentic, which throws some light upon the matter. While the scrutiny was going on, a member of the Chamber who acted as Whip seated himself between two Republican deputies, and carelessly remarked, "What a pity it is that M. Faure is a Protestant. Except for that several of my friends would have voted for him." One of the Republican members immediately replied: "A Protestant! You surprise me. M. Faure never fails to bring his daughter to Mass on Sunday, and to assist at it himself." The Whip immediately retired crestfallen.

THE resolution which has been for some time under consideration in the German Reichstag for the repeal of the anti-Jesuit law, has passed triumphantly its third reading, notwithstanding the opposition of the Conservative, Imperialist, and National Liberal parties. The Centre or Catholic party in the Chamber received the announcement of the vote with prolonged applause. It does not follow that the law will be repealed, as the question must now be brought before the Bundesrath, which once already refused to confirm the resolution of the Reichstag to the same effect, but there is this in favor of the expectation that the Reichstag's vote this time will be approved, that the Bundesrath will find it difficult to resist a second vote of the representatives of the people of the Empire on the same subject.