

THE HOME BANK OF CANADA

SEVENTEEN BRANCHES IN ONTARIO. Head Office: 8 King Street West

RICHMOND STREET London

BRANCHES ALSO AT St Thomas, Ilderton, Thorndale.

W. H. Mason, General Manager

WANTED AT ONCE on salary and expenses. One good man in each locality with rig or capable of handling the business.

RAILROAD POSITIONS OPEN to competent men. Many officials place our graduates in the best positions.

MISSION SUPPLIES

A Spirituality made of Mission articles of Mission articles. Send in for prices and samples.

J. J. M. LANDY 416 Queen St. West TORONTO, Ont.

CHRISTMAS CRIBS

BEAUTIFULLY DECORATED. The most beautiful and varied stock of Christmas Crisps.

E. Blake & Son Church Street, Toronto, Can.

BEAUTIFUL CHRISTMAS GIFTS

Books by Dr. William Fischer. "The Years Between"

The Toiler and other Poems. Beautiful and handsome cover.

William J. Fischer, Author of "The Years Between"

Beautiful Yearning Beautiful Illustrations. Year—JUST READY—26th Year

Catholic Home Annual FOR 1900

Containing Frontispiece in Colors and Profusion of other Illustrations.

PRICE 25 CENTS. By Mail. Per dozen \$2.00

Contents of the 1900 issue. History of Catholic Progress.

The Tide Came In. By MARIAN TAGGART.

Words of Wisdom. Civil War. By Hon. MAURICE FRANCIS BOAR, LL.D.

Romance of an Indian Maiden. By MAURENCE.

The Catholic Record LONDON, CANADA

The Catholic Record.

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

VOLUME XXXI. LONDON, ONTARIO, SATURDAY JANUARY, 16, 1900. 1578

Growing Old.

A little more tired at close of day, A little less anxious to have our way;

A little less care for bonds and gold, A little more zest in the days of old;

A little more love for the friends of youth, A little less zeal for established truth;

A little more leisure to sit and dream, A little more real the things unseen;

A little more love for the friends of youth, A little less zeal for established truth;

A little more laughter, a few more tears, And we shall have told our increasing years;

A little more love for the friends of youth, A little less zeal for established truth;

A little more love for the friends of youth, A little less zeal for established truth;

A little more love for the friends of youth, A little less zeal for established truth;

A little more love for the friends of youth, A little less zeal for established truth;

A little more love for the friends of youth, A little less zeal for established truth;

A little more love for the friends of youth, A little less zeal for established truth;

A little more love for the friends of youth, A little less zeal for established truth;

A little more love for the friends of youth, A little less zeal for established truth;

A little more love for the friends of youth, A little less zeal for established truth;

A little more love for the friends of youth, A little less zeal for established truth;

A little more love for the friends of youth, A little less zeal for established truth;

A little more love for the friends of youth, A little less zeal for established truth;

A little more love for the friends of youth, A little less zeal for established truth;

A little more love for the friends of youth, A little less zeal for established truth;

A little more love for the friends of youth, A little less zeal for established truth;

A little more love for the friends of youth, A little less zeal for established truth;

A little more love for the friends of youth, A little less zeal for established truth;

A little more love for the friends of youth, A little less zeal for established truth;

A little more love for the friends of youth, A little less zeal for established truth;

A little more love for the friends of youth, A little less zeal for established truth;

A little more love for the friends of youth, A little less zeal for established truth;

A little more love for the friends of youth, A little less zeal for established truth;

A little more love for the friends of youth, A little less zeal for established truth;

A little more love for the friends of youth, A little less zeal for established truth;

A little more love for the friends of youth, A little less zeal for established truth;

A little more love for the friends of youth, A little less zeal for established truth;

A little more love for the friends of youth, A little less zeal for established truth;

A little more love for the friends of youth, A little less zeal for established truth;

A little more love for the friends of youth, A little less zeal for established truth;

A little more love for the friends of youth, A little less zeal for established truth;

A little more love for the friends of youth, A little less zeal for established truth;

A little more love for the friends of youth, A little less zeal for established truth;

A little more love for the friends of youth, A little less zeal for established truth;

A little more love for the friends of youth, A little less zeal for established truth;

A little more love for the friends of youth, A little less zeal for established truth;

A little more love for the friends of youth, A little less zeal for established truth;

A little more love for the friends of youth, A little less zeal for established truth;

A little more love for the friends of youth, A little less zeal for established truth;

A little more love for the friends of youth, A little less zeal for established truth;

A little more love for the friends of youth, A little less zeal for established truth;

A little more love for the friends of youth, A little less zeal for established truth;

A little more love for the friends of youth, A little less zeal for established truth;

A little more love for the friends of youth, A little less zeal for established truth;

A little more love for the friends of youth, A little less zeal for established truth;

A little more love for the friends of youth, A little less zeal for established truth;

A little more love for the friends of youth, A little less zeal for established truth;

A little more love for the friends of youth, A little less zeal for established truth;

A little more love for the friends of youth, A little less zeal for established truth;

systems were ridiculed by the professors as superstitious and nonsensical, just as the Ptolemaic system is denounced as false by the scientific professors of to-day.

Then came Nicolaus Copernicus, better known by his Latinized name Copernicus, who introduced the system now held by the scientists as the last work of self-education searched out by "the intelligence of man."

Now all these systems are the teachings of science, each in its turn taught by science. What confidence therefore can be placed in a science that assures us of the truth of its latest system after having assured us with equal confidence of the truth of former systems that contradict its latest, and that stands ready on some new discovery to assure us of the truth of some other system contradictory of the present system?

What faith can be had in a science that is forever readjusting or throwing aside its latest conclusions, as astronomy has been doing during the past centuries?

Is not the experience of astronomical science like that of the fabled Sisyphus who was condemned to roll an immense boulder from the bottom to the summit of a hill, which, whenever it reached the top, rolled down again, and the task of Sisyphus had to be begun anew. The physical sciences toil wearily up the hill, but when near the summit and ready to deposit their burden of information there, some new discovery hurls it to the bottom where the upward toll must begin again.

It was thus that the discovery of the Roentgen rays hurled to the bottom the indestructible atom of the science of chemistry.

The word "science" is a Shibboleth of frequent use, a word of "damnable iteration" as Falstaff would call it, among the flippant and superficial gnomes of science. Science teaches this, that and the other; that ends it. Well, what did science teach yesterday and the day before, and the day before that? Its contradictory teachings cannot all be true; experience demonstrates that it is not infallible. From its very nature its latest affirmations are not ultimate; any moment some new discovery may cast them to the wind, like dead leaves in autumn.

The inefficiency of science as the ultimate criterion of the truths and facts of nature arises from the incompleteness of experience and the hasty and unjustified conclusions of scientists, and the erroneous confidence with which they ride an assumption, or an hypothesis as a hobby, until they finally lapse into the conviction that it is demonstrated. Thus they ride the road of an assumption; failing to observe that an assumption remains an assumption until it is demonstrated to be a truth.

Dr. Crapsey: "In geology the Church has taught that the world was four thousand years old."

The word "Church" as used by the doctor is ambiguous. Sometimes he means the Catholic Church. At other times he means some vague indefinite thing like an atmosphere or something floating in the air.

Knowing Dr. Crapsey personally we do not believe for a moment that he would intentionally misstate the doctrines of the Church or her attitude in relation to the sciences, for the purpose of helping along his argument. He simply uses supposed facts, believed by himself in common with his hearers, and refers to them as matters about which there is no question. In this both he and his hearers are the victims of false history. Like too many others he stands on the beach, and rakes in and appropriates and uses without due scrutiny the driftage that floats on the current of history.

Take for instance in the above extract "Dr. Crapsey took up some of the branches of science the Church had taught in the early days, when it held itself an infallible teacher—the astronomy of the Church that had taught that the world was the centre of the universe, but which now accepted what the personal intelligence of man had searched out, that the sun was the center of the solar universe; geology, in which the Church taught that the world was four thousand years old."

Knowing Dr. Crapsey personally we do not believe for a moment that he would intentionally misstate the doctrines of the Church or her attitude in relation to the sciences, for the purpose of helping along his argument. He simply uses supposed facts, believed by himself in common with his hearers, and refers to them as matters about which there is no question. In this both he and his hearers are the victims of false history. Like too many others he stands on the beach, and rakes in and appropriates and uses without due scrutiny the driftage that floats on the current of history.

Take for instance in the above extract "Dr. Crapsey took up some of the branches of science the Church had taught in the early days, when it held itself an infallible teacher."

This leaves a false impression. The Church never taught or claimed authority to teach any branch of science. She claims and has always claimed to be the only divinely appointed and commissioned teacher of divinely revealed truth—faith and morals.

Again: "The astronomy of the Church that had taught that the world was the center of the universe."

The Church has not now and never had an astronomy. The present Copernican heliocentric system is not hers, although excoqueted by one of her pious members. She neither approves nor condemns it. She leaves to the industrious student the problems of physical science.

Again: The Church has never "accepted what the personal intelligence of man had searched out, that the sun is the center of solar universe."

The "intelligence of man" has searched out several systems of astronomy; it is the oldest of the sciences, "The Chinese, the Chaldeans, the Hindus, the Egyptians and the Greeks, all had their systems, and most of them have them still, and would say with Dr. Crapsey that "The intelligence of man had searched them out." And they were just as certain of their correctness as Dr. Crapsey is the system now in vogue, a system that has never been demonstrated.

The scientist Ptolemy, five hundred years before the Christian era, excoqueted a system of astronomy. Hipparchus discovered another, Ptolemy, in the second century of the Christian era, devised another which was held and taught by the scientists until the sixteenth century, that is, over twelve hundred years. They all believed it to be the true system, the last word of science uttered by "the intelligence of man." All previous

systems were ridiculed by the professors as superstitious and nonsensical, just as the Ptolemaic system is denounced as false by the scientific professors of to-day.

Then came Nicolaus Copernicus, better known by his Latinized name Copernicus, who introduced the system now held by the scientists as the last work of self-education searched out by "the intelligence of man."

Now all these systems are the teachings of science, each in its turn taught by science. What confidence therefore can be placed in a science that assures us of the truth of its latest system after having assured us with equal confidence of the truth of former systems that contradict its latest, and that stands ready on some new discovery to assure us of the truth of some other system contradictory of the present system?

What faith can be had in a science that is forever readjusting or throwing aside its latest conclusions, as astronomy has been doing during the past centuries?

Is not the experience of astronomical science like that of the fabled Sisyphus who was condemned to roll an immense boulder from the bottom to the summit of a hill, which, whenever it reached the top, rolled down again, and the task of Sisyphus had to be begun anew. The physical sciences toil wearily up the hill, but when near the summit and ready to deposit their burden of information there, some new discovery hurls it to the bottom where the upward toll must begin again.

It was thus that the discovery of the Roentgen rays hurled to the bottom the indestructible atom of the science of chemistry.

The word "science" is a Shibboleth of frequent use, a word of "damnable iteration" as Falstaff would call it, among the flippant and superficial gnomes of science. Science teaches this, that and the other; that ends it. Well, what did science teach yesterday and the day before, and the day before that? Its contradictory teachings cannot all be true; experience demonstrates that it is not infallible. From its very nature its latest affirmations are not ultimate; any moment some new discovery may cast them to the wind, like dead leaves in autumn.

The inefficiency of science as the ultimate criterion of the truths and facts of nature arises from the incompleteness of experience and the hasty and unjustified conclusions of scientists, and the erroneous confidence with which they ride an assumption, or an hypothesis as a hobby, until they finally lapse into the conviction that it is demonstrated. Thus they ride the road of an assumption; failing to observe that an assumption remains an assumption until it is demonstrated to be a truth.

Dr. Crapsey: "In geology the Church has taught that the world was four thousand years old."

The word "Church" as used by the doctor is ambiguous. Sometimes he means the Catholic Church. At other times he means some vague indefinite thing like an atmosphere or something floating in the air.

Knowing Dr. Crapsey personally we do not believe for a moment that he would intentionally misstate the doctrines of the Church or her attitude in relation to the sciences, for the purpose of helping along his argument. He simply uses supposed facts, believed by himself in common with his hearers, and refers to them as matters about which there is no question. In this both he and his hearers are the victims of false history. Like too many others he stands on the beach, and rakes in and appropriates and uses without due scrutiny the driftage that floats on the current of history.

Take for instance in the above extract "Dr. Crapsey took up some of the branches of science the Church had taught in the early days, when it held itself an infallible teacher—the astronomy of the Church that had taught that the world was the centre of the universe, but which now accepted what the personal intelligence of man had searched out, that the sun was the center of the solar universe; geology, in which the Church taught that the world was four thousand years old."

Knowing Dr. Crapsey personally we do not believe for a moment that he would intentionally misstate the doctrines of the Church or her attitude in relation to the sciences, for the purpose of helping along his argument. He simply uses supposed facts, believed by himself in common with his hearers, and refers to them as matters about which there is no question. In this both he and his hearers are the victims of false history. Like too many others he stands on the beach, and rakes in and appropriates and uses without due scrutiny the driftage that floats on the current of history.

Take for instance in the above extract "Dr. Crapsey took up some of the branches of science the Church had taught in the early days, when it held itself an infallible teacher."

This leaves a false impression. The Church never taught or claimed authority to teach any branch of science. She claims and has always claimed to be the only divinely appointed and commissioned teacher of divinely revealed truth—faith and morals.

Again: "The astronomy of the Church that had taught that the world was the center of the universe."

The Church has not now and never had an astronomy. The present Copernican heliocentric system is not hers, although excoqueted by one of her pious members. She neither approves nor condemns it. She leaves to the industrious student the problems of physical science.

Again: The Church has never "accepted what the personal intelligence of man had searched out, that the sun is the center of solar universe."

The "intelligence of man" has searched out several systems of astronomy; it is the oldest of the sciences, "The Chinese, the Chaldeans, the Hindus, the Egyptians and the Greeks, all had their systems, and most of them have them still, and would say with Dr. Crapsey that "The intelligence of man had searched them out." And they were just as certain of their correctness as Dr. Crapsey is the system now in vogue, a system that has never been demonstrated.

The scientist Ptolemy, five hundred years before the Christian era, excoqueted a system of astronomy. Hipparchus discovered another, Ptolemy, in the second century of the Christian era, devised another which was held and taught by the scientists until the sixteenth century, that is, over twelve hundred years. They all believed it to be the true system, the last word of science uttered by "the intelligence of man." All previous

systems were ridiculed by the professors as superstitious and nonsensical, just as the Ptolemaic system is denounced as false by the scientific professors of to-day.

Then came Nicolaus Copernicus, better known by his Latinized name Copernicus, who introduced the system now held by the scientists as the last work of self-education searched out by "the intelligence of man."

Now all these systems are the teachings of science, each in its turn taught by science. What confidence therefore can be placed in a science that assures us of the truth of its latest system after having assured us with equal confidence of the truth of former systems that contradict its latest, and that stands ready on some new discovery to assure us of the truth of some other system contradictory of the present system?

What faith can be had in a science that is forever readjusting or throwing aside its latest conclusions, as astronomy has been doing during the past centuries?

Is not the experience of astronomical science like that of the fabled Sisyphus who was condemned to roll an immense boulder from the bottom to the summit of a hill, which, whenever it reached the top, rolled down again, and the task of Sisyphus had to be begun anew. The physical sciences toil wearily up the hill, but when near the summit and ready to deposit their burden of information there, some new discovery hurls it to the bottom where the upward toll must begin again.

It was thus that the discovery of the Roentgen rays hurled to the bottom the indestructible atom of the science of chemistry.

The word "science" is a Shibboleth of frequent use, a word of "damnable iteration" as Falstaff would call it, among the flippant and superficial gnomes of science. Science teaches this, that and the other; that ends it. Well, what did science teach yesterday and the day before, and the day before that? Its contradictory teachings cannot all be true; experience demonstrates that it is not infallible. From its very nature its latest affirmations are not ultimate; any moment some new discovery may cast them to the wind, like dead leaves in autumn.

The inefficiency of science as the ultimate criterion of the truths and facts of nature arises from the incompleteness of experience and the hasty and unjustified conclusions of scientists, and the erroneous confidence with which they ride an assumption, or an hypothesis as a hobby, until they finally lapse into the conviction that it is demonstrated. Thus they ride the road of an assumption; failing to observe that an assumption remains an assumption until it is demonstrated to be a truth.

Dr. Crapsey: "In geology the Church has taught that the world was four thousand years old."

The word "Church" as used by the doctor is ambiguous. Sometimes he means the Catholic Church. At other times he means some vague indefinite thing like an atmosphere or something floating in the air.

Knowing Dr. Crapsey personally we do not believe for a moment that he would intentionally misstate the doctrines of the Church or her attitude in relation to the sciences, for the purpose of helping along his argument. He simply uses supposed facts, believed by himself in common with his hearers, and refers to them as matters about which there is no question. In this both he and his hearers are the victims of false history. Like too many others he stands on the beach, and rakes in and appropriates and uses without due scrutiny the driftage that floats on the current of history.

Take for instance in the above extract "Dr. Crapsey took up some of the branches of science the Church had taught in the early days, when it held itself an infallible teacher—the astronomy of the Church that had taught that the world was the centre of the universe, but which now accepted what the personal intelligence of man had searched out, that the sun was the center of the solar universe; geology, in which the Church taught that the world was four thousand years old."

Knowing Dr. Crapsey personally we do not believe for a moment that he would intentionally misstate the doctrines of the Church or her attitude in relation to the sciences, for the purpose of helping along his argument. He simply uses supposed facts, believed by himself in common with his hearers, and refers to them as matters about which there is no question. In this both he and his hearers are the victims of false history. Like too many others he stands on the beach, and rakes in and appropriates and uses without due scrutiny the driftage that floats on the current of history.

Take for instance in the above extract "Dr. Crapsey took up some of the branches of science the Church had taught in the early days, when it held itself an infallible teacher."

This leaves a false impression. The Church never taught or claimed authority to teach any branch of science. She claims and has always claimed to be the only divinely appointed and commissioned teacher of divinely revealed truth—faith and morals.

Again: "The astronomy of the Church that had taught that the world was the center of the universe."

The Church has not now and never had an astronomy. The present Copernican heliocentric system is not hers, although excoqueted by one of her pious members. She neither approves nor condemns it. She leaves to the industrious student the problems of physical science.

Again: The Church has never "accepted what the personal intelligence of man had searched out, that the sun is the center of solar universe."

The "intelligence of man" has searched out several systems of astronomy; it is the oldest of the sciences, "The Chinese, the Chaldeans, the Hindus, the Egyptians and the Greeks, all had their systems, and most of them have them still, and would say with Dr. Crapsey that "The intelligence of man had searched them out." And they were just as certain of their correctness as Dr. Crapsey is the system now in vogue, a system that has never been demonstrated.

The scientist Ptolemy, five hundred years before the Christian era, excoqueted a system of astronomy. Hipparchus discovered another, Ptolemy, in the second century of the Christian era, devised another which was held and taught by the scientists until the sixteenth century, that is, over twelve hundred years. They all believed it to be the true system, the last word of science uttered by "the intelligence of man." All previous

systems were ridiculed by the professors as superstitious and nonsensical, just as the Ptolemaic system is denounced as false by the scientific professors of to-day.

Then came Nicolaus Copernicus, better known by his Latinized name Copernicus, who introduced the system now held by the scientists as the last work of self-education searched out by "the intelligence of man."

Now all these systems are the teachings of science, each in its turn taught by science. What confidence therefore can be placed in a science that assures us of the truth of its latest system after having assured us with equal confidence of the truth of former systems that contradict its latest, and that stands ready on some new discovery to assure us of the truth of some other system contradictory of the present system?

What faith can be had in a science that is forever readjusting or throwing aside its latest conclusions, as astronomy has been doing during the past centuries?

Is not the experience of astronomical science like that of the fabled Sisyphus who was condemned to roll an immense boulder from the bottom to the summit of a hill, which, whenever it reached the top, rolled down again, and the task of Sisyphus had to be begun anew. The physical sciences toil wearily up the hill, but when near the summit and ready to deposit their burden of information there, some new discovery hurls it to the bottom where the upward toll must begin again.

It was thus that the discovery of the Roentgen rays hurled to the bottom the indestructible atom of the science of chemistry.

The word "science" is a Shibboleth of frequent use, a word of "damnable iteration" as Falstaff would call it, among the flippant and superficial gnomes of science. Science teaches this, that and the other; that ends it. Well, what did science teach yesterday and the day before, and the day before that? Its contradictory teachings cannot all be true; experience demonstrates that it is not infallible. From its very nature its latest affirmations are not ultimate; any moment some new discovery may cast them to the wind, like dead leaves in autumn.

The inefficiency of science as the ultimate criterion of the truths and facts of nature arises from the incompleteness of experience and the hasty and unjustified conclusions of scientists, and the erroneous confidence with which they ride an assumption, or an hypothesis as a hobby, until they finally lapse into the conviction that it is demonstrated. Thus they ride the road of an assumption; failing to observe that an assumption remains an assumption until it is demonstrated to be a truth.

Dr. Crapsey: "In geology the Church has taught that the world was four thousand years old."

The word "Church" as used by the doctor is ambiguous. Sometimes he means the Catholic Church. At other times he means some vague indefinite thing like an atmosphere or something floating in the air.

Knowing Dr. Crapsey personally we do not believe for a moment that he would intentionally misstate the doctrines of the Church or her attitude in relation to the sciences, for the purpose of helping along his argument. He simply uses supposed facts, believed by himself in common with his hearers, and refers to them as matters about which there is no question. In this both he and his hearers are the victims of false history. Like too many others he stands on the beach, and rakes in and appropriates and uses without due scrutiny the driftage that floats on the current of history.

Take for instance in the above extract "Dr. Crapsey took up some of the branches of science the Church had taught in the early days, when it held itself an infallible teacher—the astronomy of the Church that had taught that the world was the centre of the universe, but which now accepted what the personal intelligence of man had searched out, that the sun was the center of the solar universe; geology, in which the Church taught that the world was four thousand years old."

Knowing Dr. Crapsey personally we do not believe for a moment that he would intentionally misstate the doctrines of the Church or her attitude in relation to the sciences, for the purpose of helping along his argument. He simply uses supposed facts, believed by himself in common with his hearers, and refers to them as matters about which there is no question. In this both he and his hearers are the victims of false history. Like too many others he stands on the beach, and rakes in and appropriates and uses without due scrutiny the driftage that floats on the current of history.

Take for instance in the above extract "Dr. Crapsey took up some of the branches of science the Church had taught in the early days, when it held itself an infallible teacher."

This leaves a false impression. The Church never taught or claimed authority to teach any branch of science. She claims and has always claimed to be the only divinely appointed and commissioned teacher of divinely revealed truth—faith and morals.

Again: "The astronomy of the Church that had taught that the world was the center of the universe."

The Church has not now and never had an astronomy. The present Copernican heliocentric system is not hers, although excoqueted by one of her pious members. She neither approves nor condemns it. She leaves to the industrious student the problems of physical science.

Again: The Church has never "accepted what the personal intelligence of man had searched out, that the sun is the center of solar universe."

The "intelligence of man" has searched out several systems of astronomy; it is the oldest of the sciences, "The Chinese, the Chaldeans, the Hindus, the Egyptians and the Greeks, all had their systems, and most of them have them still, and would say with Dr. Crapsey that "The intelligence of man had searched them out." And they were just as certain of their correctness as Dr. Crapsey is the system now in vogue, a system that has never been demonstrated.

The scientist Ptolemy, five hundred years before the Christian era, excoqueted a system of astronomy. Hipparchus discovered another, Ptolemy, in the second century of the Christian era, devised another which was held and taught by the scientists until the sixteenth century, that is, over twelve hundred years. They all believed it to be the true system, the last word of science uttered by "the intelligence of man." All previous

systems were ridiculed by the professors as superstitious and nonsensical, just as the Ptolemaic system is denounced as false by the scientific professors of to-day.

Then came Nicolaus Copernicus, better known by his Latinized name Copernicus, who introduced the system now held by the scientists as the last work of self-education searched out by "the intelligence of man."

Now all these systems are the teachings of science, each in its turn taught by science. What confidence therefore can be placed in a science that assures us of the truth of its latest system after having assured us with equal confidence of the truth of former systems that contradict its latest, and that stands ready on some new discovery to assure us of the truth of some other system contradictory of the present system?

What faith can be had in a science that is forever readjusting or throwing aside its latest conclusions, as astronomy has been doing during the past centuries?