

The Catholic Record.

"Christianus mihi nomen est, Catholicus vero Cognomen."—(Christian is my Name, but Catholic my Surname.)—St. Pacian, 4th Century.

VOLUME XIV.

LONDON, ONTARIO, SATURDAY, OCTOBER 22, 1892.

NO. 731.

The Wind.

Meaning softly under the eaves,
Like a soul in sorrow it sadly grieves,
Filling my heart with a restless pain,
Bringing me back to the past again,
Sorrowful mind do you sob and sigh
Over my dead as you pass them by?
From the green grave veiling a noble brow?
And what of the living airtight to-night
On the ocean's wave long lost to sight?
If you pass one vessel far out at sea
Oh, Wind, bear a message, I pray, from me,
Say to one soul on that tossing foam:
"There are prayers still offered for you at home,
Where a lonely heart in the silence pleads
For your safe return and for all your needs,
Then turn to my birthplace quaint and old,
And the leaves of the bright vine gently hold
While you whisper low, thro' the twilight gloom
Of the old familiar sitting-room,
That the bird which flew from that cozy nest
On the wings of love flies home to rest
Till the father old and mother bent
That the child they miss has been only lent
To a loving heart, where they all may hide
This a lance door that is open wide,
O Wind! bring my message far to me
To my loved ones whether on land or sea."
—S. M. C. in Catholic News.

THE MIRACLES AT LOURDES.

The following is an interview which a reporter of the London Chronicle had with Hon. Everard Fielding, who recently returned from a visit to Lourdes: "Naturally, I am," said Mr. Fielding, "something of a sceptic. By that I mean I want proof before I believe. I went to Lourdes believing that miracles there were possible. If there were miracles in Scriptural days, why not now? Still, there is a difference between admitting the possibility of miracles, and being convinced about a specific one."
"I take it that you went with a perfectly open mind?"
"Precisely. I was there three days, during the three days of the great national French pilgrimage, the one which M. Zola accompanied. Each day I was at the side of the baths helping to immerse the men pilgrims; one of my sisters, Lady Clare Fielding, attended for the same purpose at the women's bath. I suppose you do not want me to go into a description of the pilgrims I saw immersed or helped to immerse; their sores, their sufferings?"
"No; the great point is the cures, the miracles."
"Well, during the three days I did not actually see a cure worked, a miracle worked, but I came in contact with various cases as to which the evidence of cure, of miracle, was ample. Take first the case of an Irishman resident in France. Some years back this man, while swimming, kicked his heel against a stone. A running sore was the result. It healed up once, but broke out again, and when the man went to Lourdes he could not put one side of his foot on the ground. He took a bath, and in the course of a day the heel healed up, and he could walk nimbly enough."
"Did you regard this as a miracle?"
"I did not accept this as proof of the miraculous; I thought that such a cure might be liable to natural explanation. Nor was this called a miracle at Lourdes, where three classes of cures are recognized, the first and second only being counted miracles. In the first class are counted tumors, cancers, and so on; in the second, internal diseases like consumption; and in the third—merely called cures—nervous diseases, as for example paralysis."
"Can you give me an instance of the miraculous in the first class?"
"In the course of my investigations I met a woman who had been cured five years ago. In thanks for the cure she, as others often do, has since gone to Lourdes annually to take a part in bathing the pilgrims. She was an intelligent woman, and she told me her story with perfect simplicity. She had an external tumor on the groin, and it had grown almost as large as a child's head. The doctors said they would cut it if she was willing to undergo the operation, but that it would simply grow on some other part of the body. She would not have it cut, and started from her home to make a pilgrimage to Lourdes."
"And did the waters cure the tumor, for I take it imagination could possibly affect such a disease?"
"Wait a minute; she never was bathed. She was taken to the Grotto, where Masses are continually celebrated, where the ailing go first. While standing in the Grotto she felt a shrinking where the tumor was. The feeling of shrinking continued, and in a little time, as subsequent examination by the doctors showed, the tumor had disappeared."
"You believe the case absolutely authentic?"
"Yes. Then there was a particular case of cancer which I investigated, and it was equally remarkable. A woman arrived at Lourdes with one side of her face wholly cancer-stricken. She was a sad, one might say a horrible and loathsome sight. She took the baths, and within two days the cancerous flesh peeled off, and healthy flesh came on below. Whether a mark was left where the cancer had eaten, whether the woman's face remained disfigured, I don't know. I don't remember if I asked about those points, but as to the disappearance of the cancer there could be no mistake whatever. The matter was so extraordinary that not unnaturally it attracted a great deal of attention at the time, and was much discussed. Another healing, which in the patient's district excited quite an enthusiasm among the people, also occurs to my mind."

"A case of tumor or of cancer?"

"Neither: of consumption. I cannot speak of it personally in any way; I only know it by having read the evidence. It happened last year. A nun was supposed to be at death's door from consumption. She had suffered for a long time, and the doctors had practically given her up. Weak as she was nothing would satisfy her but that she should go, or rather be taken to Lourdes. The journey, her doctors said, was simply exposing her to death, and when she did reach Lourdes she looked so terribly far gone that those in attendance were quite afraid to place her in the water. So she was merely put above the water—hardly touching it—and then taken outside. Almost immediately she got up, saying she was better, and, as the particulars have it, walked without the least assistance."

"Have you an example of this second class—internal diseases—with which you absolutely came in contact?"
"Yes, the cure of a woman named Maria Rayon, which I heard from herself. She had been as far gone with tuberculosis as one could be, and yet remain alive. She suffered pain, too, from some other internal complaint. She was carried into the grotto, and in a short time rose from her mattress cured. Certainly, when I met her afterwards she looked all right, and—a point of some moment—ate enormously. She said she had lost one of her lungs, but that it seemed to be growing again. Marie Lebranchu, another consumptive patient, whom I did not see, was also cured, she, I think, being bathed. A last case which I shall mention—the lengthening of a short leg—did come within the scope of my personal inquiries. At the first bath, the girl who had a short leg went away limping. At the second bath, 'I felt something give way,' she told me; and on leaving the bath she found herself able to walk straight. Strangely enough, a sister with a similar affliction had previously been similarly cured."
"Now, concerning all those cures, miracles, or whatever they may be called, are you yourself satisfied as to their genuineness?"
"As I mentioned before, my natural disposition is to be sceptical. But evidence came before me which I simply could not get over—there was no pooh-poohing it. You must remember that a patient who proclaims a cure reports to the doctors, and is examined. Most probably, too, there are certificates as to the previous condition of the patient. So a cure does not depend on the mere word of a pilgrim—far from it."
"I'm going to put a very blunt question to you. Do you believe that miracles do take place, or have taken place, at Lourdes?"
"Yes, I do. I was driven by hard evidence to that conclusion. I am perfectly well aware of the power of suggestion, and I recognize what imagination can do. I discount all that kind of thing—I make the most liberal allowance for it. But imagination, the power of suggestion, hysterical fancy, cannot pluck the roots out of a tumor and dissolve a cancer like mist."
"This is why you say miracles are still with us?"
"Precisely; I must say it. I couldn't, if I wished, help myself. Here's the thing, and that's an end to doubt."

HOW COLUMBUS WAS WRECKED.

And How He Was Treated by the Aborigines.

Guacanagari was eager to see more of the Spaniards, and sent numbers of his light-hearted people to welcome them and bring them gifts of every sort. Their enthusiasm was unbounded, their generosity unstinted. The land was very gay with festivities, the sea swarmed with canoes. On nearing the caravels, the Indians that crowded them stood up, tendering all kinds of offerings with gestures of devotion, as an idolatrous worship.
Beholding all this enthusiasm, Columbus despatched a formal embassy to Guacanagari, and on hearing their report he determined, despite the prevailing land-breeze, to weigh anchor and sail to the dominions of his friends, which were some five leagues distant. He set out at daybreak on Dec. 24. Little progress was made during all that day. The night came, Christmas Eve, and Columbus determined to celebrate it, as best befitted his own health and the comfort of his crew, by enjoying a sound sleep. He retired worn out by three nights of vigil following three days of herculean labor. Sweet must have been his rest! His discovery of that new world whose very existence had been denied, the end, less upspringing of Eden-isles, the simple races bound to nature by such mysterious ties and soon to be brought into the fold of civilization and Christianity, must have filled his mind with dreams on this the first restful Christmas Eve he had passed in thirty years of titanic contest with all the world, and at times even with his own self. It was midnight, when the echoes of childhood and of times long past fill the slumbering ear. The heavens smiled, and the sea was calm. The sailors slept soundly, sure of their bearings and sea-room because preceded by the little fleet of skiffs and canoes sent by Columbus to the Indian

king. A ship's boy held the helm, so assured were they all of the fairness of the weather and the safety of their course—when the flag-ship suddenly struck upon a sunken reef. Columbus instantly divined his peril and hurried on deck. With lightning rapidity he gave orders to cut away the mast and throw the cargo overboard. But the remedy was futile; it was no mere standing, it was a wreck. With the desertion of the *Pinta* and the loss of the *Santa Maria*, only the smallest and frailest of the three caravels that had set sail from Palos remained. He went on board the *Niña*, and sent a fresh embassy to Guacanagari, giving an account of the disaster, while he stood off and on till day broke. When the chief learned the misfortune, he sought in every way to alleviate it, sparing neither means nor sacrifice. Disastrous indeed it was to face such superstitious races, who confided in the prosperity and success of the super-natural, with the slender remains of such a wreck, which showed how the sea overcomes all created things and bows us all to its sovereign power. But the sentiment of hospitality was uppermost in that faithful tribe and in their kindly monarch. All the succor needed in that sad hour, and all requisite provision for the future, were given to the sufferers with admirable orderliness. The salvage of the wreck was piled on shore and, under the chief's orders, scrupulously guarded by the natives as though it were their own. The cargo was rapidly discharged and stored in a place of safety, without the loss of a pin's point.—*Emilio Castelar in the September Century.*

THE LABOR QUESTION.

Bishop Kain Ably Discusses It at the Meeting of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers.

At the meeting of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers which was held last Sunday afternoon in the Opera House in Wheeling, W. Va., Right Rev. Bishop Kain delivered an eloquent address on the "Dignity, Rights, and Duty of Labor." He spoke as follows:

Respected Chief and Members of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers:—Having accepted with pleasure your invitation to address you on this occasion when your membership is so largely represented, I have chosen for the subject of my remarks, "The Dignity, Rights and Duties of Labor." I know of no more appropriate theme, as you are among the most intelligent representatives of labor, and as a body have shown yourselves among the most conservative exponents of its dignity, its rights and its duties. It is conceded, I think, on all sides, that no class of American workman deserve higher praise for their sobriety and fidelity in the discharge of their responsible duties than our locomotive engineers. Such a body must exert a powerful influence in moulding the opinions and directing the conduct of those engaged in other avocations. Hence the greater reason why your views on the burning question of labor should be correct and your actions eminently prudent and conservative. The advice which I venture to offer you on this grave question I have endeavored to condense into as few words as possible.
At no time perhaps in the history of the world, has this complex question of labor, its rights and obligations, engrossed so much of public attention as in our day. The great mass of mankind are, in the strict sense of the term, workmen. With the spread of popular governments—governments of popular governments or less directly by the suffrages of the people at large—it is but natural that the interests of the majority should be more generally studied and promoted. But the true interests of all men, whether of high or low degree, must be sought by such means only as are consonant with the eternal principles of equity and justice. As no individual member of society is exempt from the law of his Divine Creator, so too no class of individuals may claim such exemption. The grave question of labor and capital is not a mere economic question. It has its moral side. Indeed it is only by the light which religion sheds upon it, that it can be thoroughly understood and satisfactorily settled.
I do not presume to discuss it in all its bearings, for this could not be done with the contracted space at my disposal. I can but lay down some of the general principles involved, and briefly outline some few of the practical conclusions resulting therefrom.

THE DIGNITY OF LABOR.

It is not an uncommon mistake to regard work as a hardship to be avoided as far as possible. Manual labor especially it but too generally viewed in this unfavorable light. Perhaps the workman himself is not without some blame for the dishonour supposed to attach to the condition to which he belongs. He seems to share the too common sentiment that wealth and station alone impart nobility. It is this impression that creates and fosters much of the discontent he feels with his lot. Now this false notion is as repugnant to the dictates of reason as it is to the spirit of our age and country.
Honest labor of mind or body should command the highest respect, since

it is the very law of our being. The mind is essentially active, and man's true nobility is to give to that activity the proper direction, that its exercise may contribute as fully as possible to his own and others' happiness. Whilst willingly assigning to the work of the mind the highest rank, I maintain that the work of the body is likewise most honorable. It is the most essential condition for the preservation of health and for the well-being and happiness of the family and society. Bodily labor is the main channel through which temporal blessings of every kind are diffused throughout the world. Ask the laboring man when he is most happy, and he will assure you that it is when he is most busily engaged at his wonted employment. Feel the pulse of any large town or city, and you will find it beats with most regularity when all industries are thriving under the busy hands of the toilers. Nothing in fact contributes so greatly to both individual and social contentment as labor in all its various forms, and therefore we assert that there is a dignity in honest labor, which compels the recognition of all good and great minds. In a Republic like ours, where class distinctions are unknown, labor, whether of mind or body, should be one of the chief titles of respect and honor, and if our workmen are always true to their manifold, they may greatly contribute to spread and uphold this correct view of the dignity of their condition.

THE RIGHTS OF LABOR.

Whether a man labors with his hands or his brains he has an inalienable right to a fair compensation for the work performed: "for the laborer is worthy of his hire." (Luke x. 7.) This principle is as true in its application to classes as to individuals. Innumerable indeed, are the circumstances which combine to determine what constitutes a fair compensation, and it would be impossible to regulate the value of labor by any code of unchangeable rules. But the strict claim which the workman has to the full value of his services admits of no question. It is guaranteed him by every law, human and divine.

On this view of the subject let me quote to you a few words from that admirable Encyclical letter published last year by His Holiness Leo XIII. "Let it be granted," says the Pope, "that as a rule workman and employer make free agreements, and in particular should freely agree as to wages. Nevertheless, there is a dictate of nature more imperious and more ancient than any bargain between man and man, that the remuneration must be enough to support the wage-earner in reasonable and frugal comforts. If through necessity or fear of a worse condition, the workman accepts harder conditions, because an employer or contractor will give him no better, he is the victim of force and injustice." Another right of the laborer is the choice of his work and of his employers. He is free to select, within all honest avocations, the one best suited to his ability and liking; free also to work or not, unless by his refusal he violates an obligation voluntarily assumed.

When he is convinced that his interests and those of his fellow-workmen justly demand concessions from his employer, he is not debarred from expressing his convictions, and using all lawful means to impress these convictions upon others, and to obtain redress of his grievances.

Labor unions and like combinations formed for the protection of the employed against unjust exactions of employers or for the advancement of the members' interests in their various occupations, should receive encouragement and support as perhaps the most efficient means of giving to labor the power to which it is entitled as one of the dual factors in the economic world. When these organizations are governed by the principles of justice and of prudence, and their actions are confined within the bounds prescribed by the laws of God and our country they never fail to enlist public opinion in their favor. The great masses of the people in every country are the toilers, engaged in skilled or unskilled labor, and there is no question but that their interests, which are best subserved by wise combinations. The right of thus banding together for mutual protection and co-operation, no one would think of denying.

In his encyclical "On the Condition of Labor," already referred to, the Pope says expressly that this right to enter into such union "is the natural right of man; and the State must protect natural rights, not destroy them; and if it forbids its citizens to form associations, it contradicts the very principle of its own existence; for both they and it exist in virtue of the same principle, *viz.*, the natural propensity of men to live in society." (As this encyclical of the Pope contains a most luminous exposition of this whole subject, I have placed some copies of it in the hands of the president of the local division for any who may wish to read it.)

But in justly claiming the right to a fair compensation for their work; the right to choose their work and their employers; the right to use all lawful means to redress their grievances and to organize themselves for mutual sup-

port and protection, workmen must not forget

THE DUTIES OF LABOR.
Inequality in the possession of worldly goods is a condition of society that has always existed, and that cannot be eliminated. Indeed there are many evident reasons why, in the economy of Divine Providence, this inequality should exist. The hardships it imposes may be more than outweighed by the blessings it confers. As reasonable beings we must deal with the inevitable facts of human life, and not suffer ourselves to be deluded by Utopian dreams which will never be realized. As members of society we must live in mutual dependence on one another, the poor upon the rich, and the rich upon the poor. If capital needs labor, labor also needs capital. Both have unquestionable rights as also correlative obligations.
A fair compensation for labor having been determined, the workman is bound in honor and conscience to perform the work agreed upon. The task he contracts to fulfill must be such in quality and quantity as the terms of his contract demand; otherwise he does not render to his employer an equivalent for the compensation received, and he is guilty of an injustice. Of every honest man, it must be truthfully said: "His word is as good as his bond."
Again, when employs bargain to work at a certain fair price for a fixed time, they are bound in justice as well as in honor to keep their engagement, if a failure on their part entails loss on their employers.

Moreover, whilst the right of workmen to strike or discontinue work, unless in doing they are violating engagements binding upon them, is conceded by all, the exercise of their right cannot be enforced by any means that are unlawful or unjust. They must not presume to take the law into their own hands, for no government can tolerate such usurpation. They must abstain from violence and from all malicious injury to the property of others.

Whilst claiming the right to work or not to work themselves, they must grant the same right to their fellow-workmen. They are not permitted to accomplish by violent measures what their employers' sense of justice and public opinion and the laws of the land cannot procure them. It is their duty, as it is the duty of all good citizens, to make any needed sacrifices in the interests of law and order and the peace of society. If we have witnessed scenes of violence enacted in connection with "labor strikes," we have seen also most commendable spirit of self-control and respect for law shown by our working classes under most trying circumstances. All the acts of lawlessness committed in the excitement inseparable from such abnormal conditions, cannot be justly charged to the men most interested in the outcome of such movements. In every large city, especially, will necessarily be found an element delighting in disorder and anarchy, and to this class may be attributed in great measure the troubles created at the time of strikes. These troubles can only be averted by the workmen themselves co-operating actively, under cool and prudent leaders, in maintaining the peace and repressing violent outbreaks. This is their duty, and its faithful discharge will always add strength to every cause in which they may be engaged.

That such will be engaged in the future as it has been in the past, I am firmly convinced—as long at least as you follow the wise counsels of a leader as clear sighted, as far-seeing, as just and prudent as is the present grand chief of your brotherhood.

I thank you, gentlemen, for the close attention you have given to the words of advice which I have presumed to offer you.

LONDON'S BIGOTS BEATEN.

The new lord mayor of London is a Catholic. Not only this, but he is an earnest, consistent, uncompromising Catholic. He declared before his election that he would not attend officially the religious services in the Church of England simply because he could not recognize such conduct with his sense of personal obligations to the Church. The bigots and fanatics at once set up a howl, and demanded, in the name of the established religion of Great Britain and of the three tailors of Tooley street, that some other person be put in the lofty place made famous by the late Mr. Whittington and his cat.

To this appeal the subservient liverymen, a sort of antiquated body of representatives of the guilds, responded by nominating first on the list Mr. Phillips, a Hebrew. The method of electing a lord mayor is as old and moth eaten as are the yeomen of the guard and the practice of inspecting the cellars of the Parliament houses before the formal opening of each session to see if Guy Fawkes or any of his gang of explosionists are located under the arches. The aldermen must choose one of their own number; the liverymen must present two names, one of whom shall be the senior member, by virtue of his having seen the longest service. His name comes first, and the aldermen always elect him. In the present instance the bigots in-

duced the liverymen to give the first place to Aldermen Phillips, but the aldermen made a departure also by electing Alderman Knill, whose name was second on the list.

Mr. Phillips had agreed to attend religious services in the Protestant church on state occasions and to appoint a Protestant chaplain to himself. This offer of religious tergiversation pleased the cranks and they howled for his election. But public sentiment was against the Hebrew. The London Times scored him for his backsliding proclivities. It said:

"In Shylock's days the Jewish merchant was ready to buy or sell with his Christian fellows, to talk with them, walk with them, and so following, but neither to eat with them, drink with them, nor pray with them. To-day he is more complaisant, and is prepared to do all three, and certain Christians of the city of London seem to believe that the cause of orthodoxy is somewhat strengthened by the change. While we congratulate the members of the Jewish communion upon the deservedly high position which they hold in the confidence of their fellow-citizens, we cannot see that their readiness to attend the services of a church in which they do not believe constitutes any special merit upon their part."

Defeated in their purpose, the bigots propose to incite the ignorant and besotted to riot on the occasion of the formal investiture of the Lord Mayor with the insignia of his office. For this purpose, Chancellor Moore, who led the fight against Mr. Knill, issued a card after the election inviting all who desire to protest against the election of a Roman Catholic (Papist he calls it) Lord Mayor to communicate with him. The purpose behind this is to organize a rival procession in the streets on inauguration day and to bring on a fight. The police and the military will, doubtless, take care of Mr. Moore and his band of fanatics and insure the peaceable installation of Lord Mayor Knill. It will be a bitter pill for the bigots, but they must swallow it.—*Boston Republic.*

The Kin of Christ.

This interesting inquiry deserves immediate attention: Springfield, O., Sept. 6, 1892. *Editor Catholic Columbian:*

DEAR SIR—Will you please answer a question for me?
Yesterday was Labor Day. Rev. Barnes of the M. E. Church was orator of the day. In the course of his remarks he said that Jesus Christ, the Son of God, in his lowly life as a carpenter was the sole support of his brothers James and Jude and of two or more sisters. I was astonished, for I always believed as a Catholic that His blessed mother was a virgin from first to last. Several times before have I heard that the Son of God had brothers.

As a reader of your paper, I wish you would fully answer this.

ENQUIRER.
You are right and the Rev. Mr. Barnes is wrong—the Mother of Jesus lived and died a virgin. This is proved by Scripture, by the testimony of the Fathers, and by the tradition handed down in the Church for nineteen centuries.

Mr. Barnes has been led into this error by misunderstanding the custom of the Jews in calling their near relations their brethren, as reported in St. Matthew's Gospel (xiii, 55 and 56): "Is not this the carpenter's son? Is not His mother called Mary, and His brethren James and Joseph, Simon and Jude; and His sisters, are they not all with us?"
But the Bible itself shows that Mary was not the mother of those brethren, but that her sister, Mary of Cleophas, was their mother, and that consequently, according to the word we use, they were His cousins. For St. Matthew says (xxvii, 55 and 56): "And there were many women afar off who had followed Jesus from Galilee, ministering unto Him; among whom was Mary Magdalen, and Mary the mother of James and Joseph, and the mother of the sons of Zebedee." And St. John shows which of the two Marys was here mentioned (xix, 25): "Now there stood by the cross of Jesus His mother and His mother's sister, Mary of Cleophas and Mary Magdalen."

Mr. Barnes ought to study his Bible more.

The two testaments are full of passages proving that the close kindred of a man among the Jews were called his brothers and sisters. If Mr. Barnes doesn't know and can't find them, we'll point them out to him.

Lots of it.

An anecdote is related of a certain Methodist parson who was loudly inveighing, before a ministerial assembly, against schools of theology, and finished by thanking God that he had never "rubbed his back up against one." Do I understand the brother to say that he thanks God for his ignorance? "Well yes, if you want to put it that way," he replied. "Then all I have to add," said the Bishop, unctuously, "is that the brother has a great deal to be thankful for.—*Argonaut.*"