The Catholic Record.

Published Weekly at 484 and 486 Richmond street, London, Ontario.

Price of subscription—$2.00 per annum.

EDITORS:

REV. GEORGE R. DONAHOE,
Author of "Decades of Modern Infidels."
THOMAS COFFEY,

Publisher and Proprietor, Thomas Coffey. Messrs. Lynch, King, Donovan, P. J. Neven, and M. J. O'Donovan, are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transact all other business for the Catholic Record.

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

Approved and recommended by the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa, and St. Boniface, and the Bishops of London, 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.

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

London, Saturday, Feb. 18, 1893.

LENTEN REGULATIONS FOR 1893.

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 indult from the Holy See, A. D. 1884, meat is allowed on Sundays as 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. Tenbroek, Sec.

FANTASIES IN THE PULPIT.

According to the New York *Sun* the Rev. Mr. Read, a Baptist minister of Hackensack, has been preaching that heaven is an actual and material city situated in the star Alcyone, which is the brightest in the group known as the Pleiades in the constellation Taurus. In ordinary parlance this group of stars is called the "Cleaver," from its resemblance to the instrument used by butchers for cutting meat, and sometimes "the seven sisters," because of their close proximity to each other, and their supposed mutual affection. These stars are at this season a conspicuous object in the sky.

It is supposed by many astronomers that this star is the centre of the great arc or orbit around which the whole solar system is revolving; and Professor Mädler has even asserted that the whole stellar system which is within human vision, even within range of the largest and best telescopes, revolves about this same centre.

Regarding the truth of these scientific theories there is much well-founded doubt, though there is some ground for the former; yet even for this, the period during which accurate observations have been taken for determining the apparent motions of the stars is so short, and the distances are so great, that nothing has been demonstrated as yet. Another theory that Alcyone, or even the group in which Alcyone is found, is the centre of the known universe of stars is rejected by most astronomers, among whom may be mentioned Sir John Herschell, who shows that the Pleiades are too far from the centre of the Milky Way to be a probable centre of motion for the stellar universe. These considerations, of course, take away much of the ground upon which Rev. Mr. Read rests his fanatical conclusions to be assured that "Alcyone is of vast magnitude, and accordingly it is sufficient in size for the accommodation of the saints, and as the centre around which our solar system moves, it may reasonably be regarded as the place where the King eternal, immortal, and invisible, the only wise God reigns, and why should it not be so?"

There is no need we should seek for reasons why fantastic theories of this kind are not so; and thus we may answer the question which the propounder of this new gospel is preaching: "Why should it not be so?" There is no good reason for accepting it; and this is reason enough for the rejection of this and many other eccentricities which are propounded from time to time.

We believe that there is a heaven, where God abides in His glory, with His angels and saints, and we believe that this heaven has a local existence; but where it is He has not thought it proper to reveal to us, and we bow submissively to His will. We refer to this new-fangled theory of Rev. Mr. Read merely because fanciful theories like his are very common nowadays, and are promulgated very earnestly, and we desire to put our readers on their guard generally against being blindfolded by the like when they are urgently brought forward for acceptance as if they were indisputable truths.

We are told that the preacher "quotes passages of the Bible which seem to his mind to justify the inference that that great and bright star enjoys a distinction so incomparable."

We are not informed what passages he has thought it proper to quote; but we may presume that the clearest are those of the book of Job where the Pleiades are distinctly mentioned, namely,

"Shalt thou be able to join together the shining stars, the Pleiades, or canst thou stop the turning about of Arcturus?" (Job xxxviii, 31.)

In Job ix, 9, the Hebrew name thus translated Pleiades is, in the Vulgate, Hyades, another group in the same constellation, but even if it be taken for Pleiades, it no more favors Mr. Read's theory than the former text. It is, "Who maketh Arcturus and Orion and Hyades, and the inner parts of the South?"

These passages evidently prove nothing of the kind which Rev. Mr. Read would draw from them.

We have only to add that it is a misnomer to call such fantastic theories, when preached from the pulpit, the "Gospel of Christ" which Christ commanded to be preached to every creature. It would certainly not be allowed for a Catholic priest thus to profane the Gospel; and it is a fact that in Baptist and similar pulpits it is a common practice to preach human fancies, we need no further proof that the hierarchy which St. Paul tells us was in the Church of God in order that Christians may not be "tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine," (Eph. iv, 14,) is to be found only in the Catholic Church.

SCOTLAND AND HOME RULE.

In article under the above title, which appeared in a recent issue of the Toronto *Globe*, very properly takes to task the Toronto *Mail* for misrepresenting Scotch statistics in order to draw the curious inference: "It is consequently clear, so far as Protestant Scotland is concerned, that it has pronounced against Home Rule in Ireland."

In view of the fact that Scotland itself has had its land question, and that its crofters had suffered from landlord tyranny almost to the same extent as the larger number of people of Ireland, it would be little to the credit of Scotchmen if it were true that while they sought and gained some redress at least for the grievances of poor Scotch tenants, they had desired that the shackles should remain upon the limbs of their fellow-subjects in Ireland; for it is certain that without Home Rule the grievances of Ireland never will be redressed. But we are proud to be able to say that Scotch Presbyterians, educated though they have been with strong prejudices against all Catholics, and especially against Irish Catholics, stood up manfully, nevertheless, to fight for Irish Catholics—though for Irish Protestants as well—a similar battle to that which Irish Catholics aided them in fighting. We are proud to say that it is certain that the Home Rule cause of Ireland was supported, not merely by a certain proportion of Scotch Presbyterians, but by a good majority of them, notwithstanding the *Mail's* deceptive statistics.

Scotland has sent to Parliament 49 Gladstonian members as against 23 Unionists, making up the total of 72 members. So decisive a majority from the land of the Covenanters in favor of the liberty for the Irish people is a somewhat surprising fact in face of the pronouncement of the kirk Assembly against Home Rule; and an explanation is to be looked for somewhere; but where?

The *Mail's* explanation is briefly that a majority of the Protestants are Unionists or supporters of Lord Salisbury's late Government, but yet that they are so evenly divided between the two great political parties that a united Catholic vote of 10 per cent. of the voters would turn the scale; and that what has really happened is that such was the way in which the scale was turned in Scotland. The actual figures which the *Mail* adduces are that "Mr. Gladstone's actual majority in Scotland of 30,857 was brought about by 46,556 Irish Catholic votes." This would make the Protestant majority, or perhaps we should say, to represent the *Mail* truly, the united Protestant and Scotch Catholic majority against Home Rule, 6,719.

It will be noticed that this preponderance, if real, is very small where the number of voters is in the neighborhood of 400,000, and it shows a close division indeed of the Protestants of Scotland between the two political parties.

The *Globe* says to all this:

"To any one acquainted with the distribution of population in Scotland this remarkable assertion (of the *Mail*) carries contradiction on its face. But it may be well to show that the 10 per cent. of Roman Catholic voters in Scotland, which, by the way, is an imaginary proportion not verified by figures, *had little to do* with the result of the election which sent 49 Gladstonians to Westminster, and only 23 Unionists from all Scotland. To begin with we may at once admit that 10 per cent. of Roman Catholic electors voting solidly for Home Rule in every Scotch constituency would turn the election, as the *Mail* argues."

It goes on to show in what way the Catholic vote is divided among the counties. In Dumbarton, which is the locality chiefly indicated by the *Mail* as having returned a Gladstonian by means of the Irish Catholic vote, the *Globe* points out that the Catholics are there "hived most effectually;" and that three-fourths of the Irish Catholic population of Scotland are to be found in the four counties of Ayrshire, Wigtownshire, Lanarkshire, and Renfrewshire. But in these very counties the Ulster Orangemen are so numerous as to completely counteract the Irish Catholic vote, so that in Wigton a Conservative has been returned by a large majority. In North Ayrshire, where Catholics also are strong, a Conservative was elected, on the disestablishment issue, and similarly in three out of the six Lanark divisions.

The truth is that the *Mail's* estimate is purely visionary. But it has besides overlooked the fact that the majority of the Catholics of Scotland are Scotch, not Irish, and consequently the Home Rule issue would not appeal to them so strongly as if they were natives of Ireland. It is true the *Mail* asserts that "the overwhelming majority of them are either Irish or of Irish parentage." But it adds that "This ratio has varied but slightly during the last thirty years." As the ratio remains stationary, it is evident that Irish immigration must be exceedingly small, and that the greater part of the population which is in any sense Irish must be merely workingmen without a home or a vote in Scotland, or the children of Irish parents who having been born and reared in Scotland are now for all practical purposes Scotch Catholics. Indeed we know that these nearly always call themselves Scotch and not Irish. Thus the Irish Catholic vote is very much under what the *Mail* estimates, and the result of the Scotch elections is the voice of the Scotch people. As Catholics have equal taxation with Protestants it matters little whether Mr. Gladstone's majority came from the Scotch or Irish Catholic or Scotch Protestant vote; for the Catholics have just as much right to representation as their Protestant neighbors; still, as a matter of curiosity, and for the sake of the superabundance of proof the point affords against the *Mail's* argument, we are indebted to the *Globe* for its proof that the Catholics and Protestants of Scotland united to give Mr. Gladstone a majority from all sections of the people. The *Globe's* article was evidently written by one who is intimately acquainted with the locality of which he writes, and its testimony is the more valuable on this account.

WILL THERE BE A NEW LEADER?

A rumor has found its way into the papers to the effect that Mr. W. R. Meredith intends to resign his seat in Parliament and to retire from public life. The Belleville *Intelligencer*, a leading Conservative organ, says that the question of his retirement is in the hands of his party.

Regarding this question, a leading Conservative politician of Toronto has been quoted as saying:

"He has a large practice, and there is no temptation to him to remain, and his retirement will give the party an opportunity of changing its policy. This it could not do with Mr. Meredith as leader. He could never get back the Roman Catholic support his anti-Separate school course lost, and at the same time he will not go far enough to capture the ultra-Protestant element outright. The new policy will be one thing or the other. It will be to conciliate the Roman Catholics or fight them to the bitter end."

We have no doubt of Mr. Meredith's ability as a leader, but at the last two general elections we felt it to be our duty to oppose him and his following on account of the hostile policy assumed by them against Catholic education; and if similar circumstances arise again we should be obliged in conscience to pursue a similar course.

The policy failed, and we are glad to remark that Mr. Meredith and his followers appear by their present moderation to have accepted the situation.

In regard to the utterance of the unknown prominent Conservative who mentions two courses either of which may be followed under the leader who may be selected to succeed Mr. Meredith—"conciliation" towards Catholics, or "fight to the bitter end"—perhaps our advice will not be acceptable; yet we shall say that the race and creed issues which in the past caused so much dissension will not be raised again if those who have the power and authority to decide on a party policy have the good of Canada at heart. We hope they will have the good sense to understand this. But whatever policy may be adopted as the party shibboleth we shall know what path we ought to pursue, and we shall not hesitate to follow it when the occasion will come.

We notice that Mr. Clark, of Toronto, and Mr. Dalton McCarthy are mentioned in connection with the successorship to Mr. Meredith. Straws show which way the wind blows; and the choice between these two and others for the position may be some indication of the policy which is to be pursued.

But perhaps, after all, Mr. Meredith may not resign.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

THE poor classes of London are experiencing all the horrors of famine. Thousands are without bread. The squalid misery of the tenement districts is beyond description. Men, gaunt and hollow-eyed, drag themselves along the streets, in quest of work, and when they do secure it their weakness compels them to give it up. The scenes are heartrending. The east end of London is to day a veritable hell of misery. Fathers and mothers, with moans of emaciated, bare-footed children, sit around in rooms unwarmed by a spark of fire, waiting in dull despair for the bitter end. And this is happening in a city of vaunted civilization. Relief is indeed meted out, but it is wholly inadequate. The soup kitchens afford but to lengthen out a temporary immunity from the attacks of the fierce spectre of starvation; but what of the myriads of human beings without the necessaries of life? Have they no rights? Is pauperism a creation of a diseased civilization to be hounded down as a crime and to be concealed from "gentle folk," who have naught to do but to kill time during the "London season." Oh! the poor bore them, and they have no time and less money to bestow on the mass of rags and misery that forms the substratum of the London world.

HISTORY repeats itself. Who in reading these these direful accounts does not go back in spirit to the days when the poor and helpless found ever hospitable shelter in the monasteries inhabited by Franciscans and Dominicans. Then were the poor and helpless treated with consideration and love, inasmuch as they displayed in their persons the lineaments of the God and Saviour who from birth to death walked hand in hand with poverty. To the Reformation period, however, belongs the dishonor of banishing the monks after despoiling them of their property, and of branding the poor outcasts and pariahs, guilty of a nameless crime. No historian has ever yet succeeded in effacing this shameful page of English history. It has indeed been abrogated, that good and kindly law, but the victims of poverty still clamor for bread, and the "Poor Law," that magnificent monument to English generosity, seems unable to still the cry. We wait the result. Such a state of affairs would in other countries bring about a revolution.

THE editor of the *Presbyterian Review* scoffs at the *Catholic Register* for the utterance of a sentiment endorsed by every Catholic, that the voice of the Bishop is as a voice from heaven. The criticism of the Presbyterian editor is, from his standpoint, a perfectly logical one. A similar assertion from him would be indicative of manifest mental servitude. We say "*manifest*" because he never dares to champion a cause, be it ever so righteous, contrary to the opinions and directions of the Elders. Were he to use the "unfettered" freedom of which he speaks the editorial room would ere long be unadorned by his genial presence. He knows it, and so he considers it a bounden duty to indulge in the harmless pastime of ridiculing Catholics simply to show that he is not straying into forbidden paths or espousing any Briggsian opinion, but holding fast to Presbyterian traditions. But enough. The *Catholic Register* and the CATHOLIC RECORD look to the Bishops for support and advice. Not that they are infallible, but because they are well aware that their prelates, chosen and strengthened by the Holy Ghost to govern and guard the flock of Christ, are in matters of Catholic instruction not liable to be misled by falsehood or mere human opinion. Every Catholic knows the reason.

MANY complaints are made that, despite the rigid postal regulations, the sensational papers published in New York find their way into Canada, and do much harm to the morals of our young men. This may be true; but why not combat a home evil? Here at our very doors is a pest-house of immorality. We refer to the book edited by the man who has earned an unsavory and unenviable reputation—"Rev." J. Fulton. We have looked it over, and the most prurient imagination could not conceive anything more detestable than its loathsome account of things that St. Paul says should not be mentioned among Christians. We cannot but pity the parents who allow this wretched publication within the sacred precincts of their households. We have some respect for enthusiasts who view their own cavings or accept the vague utterances of others as religious oracles; but for the men who pose as social purists, and yet look with complacency on the vileness of Fulton's book, we have pity unmingled by contempt.

THE Catholic Truth Society is doing a good work in looking up the records of the various ex-priests and ex-nuns employed in revealing the "corrupt practices of the Church of Rome." Their stock in-trade is arrant hypocrisy and cowardice, and the old calumnies that have been refuted *ad nauseam*. Most of them, says the Truth Society, have at some time or place in their career been so ignominiously exposed by the secular press that if the facts were generally known their power for evil would be greatly diminished. These facts are to be collected and published in book form.

TO work, Catholics! Let us be enthusiastic in proving by our good works that we have the love and faith of Christ within us. We have opportunities of dispelling error from the mind of many a Protestant who is what he is only through early training or distorted views of Catholicism, or other circumstances. Try to obtain a firm grasp of the teachings of our holy religion, so that when information is asked of you you may give it in a clear and explicit manner, or when an error comes under your notice you may be able to meet and refute it. For this mission you must equip yourselves morally and intellectually, and, above all, you must labor enthusiastically for the extension of God's Kingdom. To help a human soul is a work far more glorious than the hoarding up of money or the conception of financial enterprises. To rise superior to routine and to sordid surroundings, and to view our neighbors, not as mere instruments that are useful in dock labor, or in building houses, or in our counting rooms, but as brothers redeemed by the blood of a God and with immortal souls appealing to us for instruction and good example, is the duty of every Catholic. In all charity let the good work be done. "If God has given us a perfect illumination of the faith He has laid on us the obligation of having the largest and most perfect charity towards those who are disinherited of the great heirloom which we have received."

SENATOR CHANDLER, chairman of the American Senate committee on immigration, is a strong advocate against unrestricted immigration. He advises a total suspension of it for a year, and for the future—in view of the fact that residence and citizenship in the United States is so valuable—that immigrants only possessing some knowledge of reading and writing be permitted to land. We are happy to learn that he is upheld by many who are tired of beholding the nations of Europe using America as the dumping ground for their surplus human refuse. Last year 161,368 illiterate immigrants—from Hungary, Italy, Poland and Russia—took up their abode in the United States. They band together; their cheap labor is detrimental to intelligent wage-earners, and, in time, as the novelty of the new civilization wears away, they become, as recent events proved, a menace to the peace and stability of the Republic.

THE Home Rule Bill has been drafted, and Mr. Gladstone in explaining its provisions will probably give the world another specimen of parliamentary eloquence of which he alone is master. But a few years ago there were orators, when Disraeli, Beaconsfield, Macaulay and O'Connell met and fought out political issues in in a manner worthy of their cause and of the traditions of the House of Commons; to-day, however, no one, save the "Grand Old Man," is anything but a debater. Mr. Gladstone is eighty-three years old. Whether his health will be equal for the arduous task of piloting the Bill through the House is a matter of conjecture. The political wise-acres say no, and name as his successor in the Premiership either Lord Rosebery or Sir W. Harcourt.

IT is stated that Queen Victoria has sent a letter to the Pope thanking him most cordially for the elevation of Archbishop Vaughan to the Cardinalate. It is certain, however, that the Duke of Norfolk is the bearer of a letter to the Holy Father congratulating him on the occurrence of his Golden Jubilee. Such facts as these ought to be an evidence to the bigots that the days of the ascendancy of fanaticism have passed away; but it would appear that persons of this class are unable to learn a lesson, and hence there are still some people who will persist in banding themselves together under such names as "Protestant Protective Association," "Equal Righters," and the like. But they are as impotent as the two decrepit giants whom Bunyan depicted under the names of "Pope and Pagan," glaring spitefully at the pious pilgrims as they tread the path that leads to eternal life. Evidently Bunyan did not read aright the signs of the times. He should have put No-Popery Bigotry as the toothless tyrant instead of the Pope.

THE Gladstone Government is giving constant proofs of the sincerity of its promises to redress Irish grievances, and in the appointment of magistrates Catholics have not been overlooked, as was the case in the appointing to office of any kind hitherto. Among the last appointees to the magistracy, a notable one is that of Mr. James Murray of Ballynahinch, county Down. This may not please the Ulster Unionists, but as even in Ulster the Catholics are nearly half the population they should be recognized more fully than even Mr. Gladstone has yet done. We recognize, however, that this is only the beginning of the new policy of justice to Ireland, and to Irishmen of all creeds.

THE Catholics of Italy are aroused against the measure which is now before the Chamber of Deputies proposing to give the civil rite of marriage precedence over the religious rite. They foresee that the effect of such a law will be to destroy the sacred character which marriage has not only in itself but also in public estimation, and thus the way will be opened to frequent divorces. They are accordingly petitioning against the bill. In 1888 they petitioned against it to the number of 200,000, with the result that it was rejected by the Senate. It is hoped that the present petitions will bear fruit similarly.

THE notorious Edith, otherwise Bridget, O'Gorman was recently greatly disconcerted at Kilburn, England, at several of her lectures by a Catholic lady who confronted her after the lectures were over and asked her to sustain some of her false statements. One of these was that Catholics are forbidden in the Catechism to read the Bible. When making this statement she held a catechism in her hand. The lady asked the mendacious lecturer in what part of the catechism and in what catechism such a prohibition is found, and she obliged Edith to acknowledge that it was Butler's catechism she held, but she would not show the passage, which she still maintained to be in it. The next lecture night the lady was also present, and again called upon Edith to state in what part of Butler's catechism such a prohibition is to be found. "I have read the whole catechism," she added, "and there is