

The Catholic Record.

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

VOLUME XV.

LONDON, ONTARIO, SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 16, 1893.

NO. 778.

THE CATHOLIC CONGRESS.

Notable Gathering of Clergy and Laymen at Chicago.

LETTER FROM POPE LEO XIII.—OPENING ADDRESS BY CARDINAL GIBBONS.—MONSIGNOR SATOLLI CONVEYS THE GREETING OF THE HOLY FATHER.—NOTABLE PAPERS AND LECTURES.—HONORABLE WELL REPRESENTED AT THE CONGRESS.

The Catholic congress at Chicago was auspiciously opened Monday, 4th inst. The present is Catholic week at the World's Fair, and it is safe to say that the city now contains the most remarkable collection of representative Catholics that has ever been brought together at one time and place in this country, with the possible exception of the last plenary council. A distinctive feature of the present meeting, however, lies in the fact that it is not a clerical gathering, but one in which priest and layman stand on an equal footing. The deliberations of the congress are bound to produce great results, which will greatly benefit the Church not alone in America but throughout the world.

The committee on organization decided that the congress should confine itself to the consideration of the "Social Question," as outlined by Leo XIII. in his encyclical on that subject, to which should be added the questions of "Catholic Education" and "Independence of the Holy See." It was conceded, however, that it would be most appropriate and fitting that the opening address at the congress and the first papers submitted should relate to the event and historic character commemorated by the World's Columbian exposition.

The congress is composed of delegates from the different dioceses and vicariates of the United States. New York is allowed the largest representation, 170 delegates; next to her comes Boston with 120 delegates; Chicago is third, being entitled to 110. The six New England dioceses have 326 delegates all told. Besides Boston, there is Hartford with 60, Providence with 49, Springfield with 44, Manchester with 27 and Portland with 26.

The exercises on Monday began with a solemn High Mass in St. Mary's Church at 9 o'clock, and nearly all the delegates attended. At the conclusion of the Mass the delegates repaired to the Art Palace, where the formal exercises were held. There were fully five thousand persons in the audience when Secretary Onahan, of the committee on organization, called the congress to order in the Hall of Columbus. Archbishop Feehan, of Chicago, welcomed the visitors to the World's Fair city and the congress. Thomas B. Bryan, representing the exposition, also made an address of welcome.

The opening address was delivered by Cardinal Gibbons, who enjoined upon the delegates that they should be marked by courtesy and charity and a spirit of Christian forbearance. Among other things he said: "During the last four months millions of visitors have come from all parts of the globe to contemplate on the exposition grounds the wonderful works of man. Let us no longer call Chicago the Windy City; but, instead, the City of Lofty Inspiration. Let us no longer call Chicago Porkopolis; let us christen her with another name. Let me call her Thaumtopolis, the City of Wonders, the City of Miracles. But while other visitors have come to contemplate with admiration the wonderful works of man, you have come here to contemplate man himself. Happily for you, children of the Church, you have nothing to discuss in matters of faith, for your faith is fixed and determined by

THE DIVINE LEGISLATOR, and we cannot improve on the creed of Him who is 'the way, the truth and the life.' But between the calm and luminous region of error there lies a vast field for free discussion. Let all your proceedings be marked by courtesy and charity.

"Perhaps the best model of courtesy and courtesy that I could set before you is William Ewart Gladstone, the grand old man. I happened to be in the House of Commons in 1880 when Mr. Gladstone was prime minister, as he is to-day. A very long debate was going on regarding taxation. The ministry were in favor of transferring a tax from the grain to the malt, and of relieving the farmer at the expense of the brewer. It was a measure that would bring joy to the heart of the Archbishop of St. Paul. A young lord on the opposition side was making a dreary speech to the effect that it was better to let well enough alone, and that the relations between the tax collector and the taxpayer were of an amicable character and should not be disturbed.

"As soon as it was announced that Mr. Gladstone was going to speak, the House was suddenly aroused from its lethargy and was inflamed with enthusiasm. He had spoken but a few words when he was rudely interrupted by the young lord. Mr. Gladstone gracefully bowed to his opponent, preceded a step, and sat down. When His Lordship had finished Mr. Gladstone resumed his speech.

"He dissected his opponent with his Damascus blade. His Lordship cheerfully submitted to the operation, because the blade was pointed, not with poison, but with honey. 'I have studied the subject of finance,' SAID MR. GLADSTONE, 'under Sir Robert Peel. I have sat at his feet like Saul at the feet of Gamaliel. I am an old man and have not the sanguine temperament of my honorable young friend. And as for me, I never expect to see the day when the tax collector and the tax payer will rush into one another's arms and embrace one another.'

"God grant that our fondest anticipations of your labors may be realized, and that the invocation to-day of the Divine blessing—which is so full of hope—may be crowned at the end of your sessions by a *Te Deum* full of joy and gratitude for the success of this congress.

"And as an earnest of this happy result I hold in my hand a letter that I received from the Holy Father, in which he blesses this congress. May his blessing and the blessing of God dominate this assembly. May it enlighten your minds and warm your hearts and be a harbinger of peace and concord in all your deliberations."

The letter of the Pope was read as follows: "To our beloved son James, by the title of *Sacra Maria* in Trastevere, Cardinal priest of the Holy Roman Church, Archbishop of Baltimore. Beloved son: Health and Apostolic benediction.

"It has afforded us much satisfaction to be informed by you that in the coming month of September a large assembly of Catholic gentlemen will meet at Chicago, there to discuss matters of great interest and importance.

"Furthermore, we have been specially gratified by your devotion and regard for us in desiring as an auspicious beginning for this congress our blessing and our prayers. This filial request we do, indeed, most readily grant, and beseech Almighty God that by His aid and the light of His wisdom He may graciously be pleased

TO ASSIST AND ILLUMINE all who are about to assemble with you, and that He may enrich with treasures of His choicest gifts your deliberations and conclusions.

"To you, therefore, our beloved son, and to all who take part in the congress aforesaid, and to the clergy and faithful committed to your care, we lovingly and in the Lord impart our apostolic benediction.

"Given at Rome, at St. Peter's, the 7th day of August, in the year of our Lord 1893, and of our Pontificate the 16th. LEO XIII., Pope."

Judge Morgan J. O'Brien, of New York, was made temporary chairman, and delivered a short speech, giving way to Archbishop Redwood, of New Zealand.

Monsignor Nugent, of Liverpool, then read a letter from Cardinal Vaughan, of England, and late in the afternoon the first formal address was delivered by Edgar H. Gans, of Baltimore. He spoke of the relations of the Catholic Church to the social, civil and political institutions of the United States.

He said in part: "The Catholic church, they say, is a wonderful, compact organization, the most wonderful the world has ever seen, through which its absolute ruler, sitting upon his throne by the banks of the Tiber, exerts an influence which, if unchecked, will change the ordinary channels of our national life and subvert our liberties. These false notions, often boldly proclaimed, but more frequently insidiously disseminated through the community, are gradually melting away under the sunlight of the truth."

The speaker then explained the American system of government, and added: "The Catholic is loyal to the American government, as the legitimately established government of this country, but not because it is stronger than he.

HIS PRINCIPLE OF SUBMISSION is not founded upon the idea of physical force, nor yet entirely upon his strong affection and patriotic predilection for its great principles. He is of necessity loyal because it is his conscientious duty. Patriotism is sublimated and becomes a religious obligation.

A paper of importance was "The Independence of the Holy See," by Hon. Martin F. Morris, of Washington, D. C. Judge Morris was unable to be present, but his admirable paper was read by Mr. Vincent Pope, of Chicago.

Beginning with the great battle between Constantine and Maxentius before the walls of Rome in the year 312, the writer traced the history of the city, and while declaring that this battle was not a direct conflict between paganism and Christianity, he asserted that when Maxentius was drowned in the Tiber paganism went down with him. When Constantine, Rome became the ecclesiastical centre of the world without even a shadow of solicitation on its own part.

Later on, when the barbarians threatened the city, it was the Popes rather than the emperors that the people turned for protection. And

thus their power became to be tacitly established and acknowledged without the need of any formal proclamation.

"Having established its legitimate claim to being free," the paper continued, "with the walls of Rome, the only power ever recognized by the public sentiment of Europe was that of the Roman Senate, the Roman people,

AND THE ROMAN PONTIFF, and down to the year 1870 this sentiment was strong enough to preserve unimpaired the institution that had thus been so quietly evolved and established. For one may unhesitatingly assert that the temporal power as well as the spiritual authority of the Roman Pontiffs is the assault of gradual evolution.

Continuing, the writer said: "Assuredly no temporal power was ever more justly acquired; no temporal sovereignty ever had more just or more legitimate foundations. The free will of the Roman people and the public sentiment of Europe made of Rome what a similar sentiment crystallizing itself in organic law has made of the city of Washington and the District of Columbia for the purposes of our federal union. Rome was intended to serve for the Christian world a purpose similar to that which the city of Washington serves for our federal union as a place where all may meet on terms of equal freedom and independence.

"The Christian church was established as a power on earth independent of the nations, but to act upon all the nations. To pervade them with its influence, to weld them into the bonds of a common fraternity, but with a purpose and a sphere of action entirely distinct and separate from that of nations.

"Give unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's and unto God the things that are God's was the mandate of the divine founder of the Church, and this mandate, as did our federal constitution with the Union and the States of the Union, established distinctly the co-ordination of the spiritual and the temporal power. The founder of Christianity no more contemplated the subjection of the temporal to the spiritual power, as in the Mohammedan system, than he did the subjection of the spiritual to the temporal power, which it is

THE BOAST OF PROTESTANTISM to have accomplished by a restoration of the infamous system of state religions characteristic of the old pagan world, and which it was the mission of Christianity to destroy. By the separation and co-ordination of the spiritual and temporal powers the freedom of both was to be secured. The world will be the gainer by securing anew the independence of the Holy See."

Other papers read were "The Missionary Work of the Church in the United States," by Rev. Walter Elliot, C. S. P., New York; "Civil Government and the Catholic Citizen," by Walter George Smith, Philadelphia; "Columbus—His Mission and Character," by Richard H. Clarke, LL. D., New York; "Isabella the Catholic," by Mary J. Onahan, Chicago. "Consequences and Results of the Discovery of the New World," written by George Parsons Lathrop, LL. D., New London, Ct., was read by M. Henry Guerin, as Mr. Lathrop was unable to be present.

The great lion of the second day was Monsignor Satolli, apostolic delegate to the United States, who made a brief address to the congress. The Archbishop of Lepanto was given such a reception as is seldom accorded any public speaker, and he was listened to with profound attention as he imparted to the delegates the greeting of the Holy Father to the Catholic congress.

Monsignor Satolli spoke in Italian, and his words were translated for the delegates by Archbishop Ireland. Among other things he said: "Go forth, then, in one bearing the book of Christian truth, and in the other the constitution of the United States. Christian truth and American liberty will make you free, happy and prosperous; they will put you on the road to progress, and keep your steps ever pure on that road.

"It is well that you study diligently the late encyclical of the Holy Father, for here in this country, more than elsewhere, it is the key of the future."

The formal work of the day was begun by Bishop Watterson, of Columbus, who spoke on

THE POPE'S ENCYCLICAL. He offered some suggestions for consideration, the first of which was the organization of Catholic workmen. Then he made a strong plea for the advocacy of temperance by all and closed with an appeal to all to instruct and elevate the ignorant and downtrodden.

Count Kuefstein, of Hungary, the representative of Cardinal Ledochowski, spoke briefly on the Berlin congress, and after he had finished, Hon. H. C. Semple, of Montgomery, Ala., read the first paper of the day, which was a consideration of the Pope's encyclical, with explanations.

Then came the addresses on social questions. Rev. William Barry, D. D., was the first speaker, and his subject was "The Rights of Labor—The Duties of Capital."

The Boston men were represented in the afternoon session with papers

on the social question. One was Thomas F. Ring, president of the particular council of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul, and the other was Dr. Thomas Dwight, of Harvard College.

Mr. Ring's paper was on "Public and Private Charities: How They Can Be Made More Effective and Beneficial." In opening his address he spoke of the investigation into the public institutions held two years ago, and described the good results of that investigation, for which he credited Mayor Matthews, whom he characterized as "the most energetic and capable public officer that this generation has seen in our city." After describing the methods by which charity was dispensed in Massachusetts, he said:

"If statistics were available to show us the extent of the loss of Catholic children throughout the whole country, we would be appalled at the enormous figures. If we admit that we cannot save all, shall we do right if we try to save none?"

"Coming now to the domain of private charities, the policy of the St. Vincent de Paul Society in Boston has been

TO JOIN HANDS at once with our Protestant fellow-citizens in any work where it felt it could be of any use to Catholic poor children.

"Don't meddle with the faith of the Catholic child and we will go along with you," is what we have said from the start. We have found our Protestant fellow-citizens, as a rule, well disposed, and we, without surrendering one jot or tittle of our Catholic faith, can work side by side with them for the good of the community of which we are a part. Our danger does not lie so much in the open or secret antagonism of our Protestant neighbors as in the apathy of our Catholic selves."

The speaker then gave some statistics on the work of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul.

Dr. Dwight's paper was on "Pauperism." The writer was unavoidably absent, but his paper was read by Mr. Ring. After drawing a vivid picture of the pauper in his tenement house the paper continued:

"And the children—no prophet is needed to foretell the future. Happily the mortality below five years is very large. But this speedy release is not for all. Who teaches their prayers to the little ones? What do they know of God but as a name to swear with? Even if, of a Sunday, they occasionally pass an hour in the crowded basement of a church, they may grow up without an understanding how to make even an act of contrition. How will they resist the temptations around them at their very doors? The father may have been originally a well doing man, but as he went deeper into

THE MIRE OF PAUPERISM he had to take such neighbors as he found. The drunken, the riotous, the lewd swarm on the same stairs, perhaps on the same floor. What future is before his little girls there? It is enough to make him drink the deeper if, in a lucid moment he thinks of it.

"Our warfare is not with want and dirt and ignorance only, but with principalities and powers, the old tendencies to evil, to say nothing of shiftless ways not easily overcome. At first the pauper will care little whether our motives are from above or below, so long as the health is his, but the effect may come in time. The little picture of Our Lady of Good Counsel, which we have placed on his wall, may say more to him than we know of."

At the evening session Thomas J. Gargan, of Boston, delivered an eloquent address on the "Past, Present and Future of Catholicism." Others who were heard from during the day and evening were Katherine E. Conway, of Boston, on "The Apostolate of the Home and Society"; Rev. Francis Maguire, of Albany, N. Y., and Warren Mosser, of Youngstown, O., on "Working Men's Organizations and Societies for Young Men"; Edward O. Brown and John Gibbon, LL. D., both of Chicago, on "Labor"; M. T. Bryan, of Nashville, Tenn., and Mary Theresa Elder, of New Orleans, La., on "Poverty: the Cause and Remedy"; Chas. A. Wingerter, of Wheeling, W. Va., and Richard F. Elliott, Detroit, Mich., on "Public and Private Charities."

THE PRIMACY OF ROME.

Is It True That the Papacy is an Exercise Upon the Catholic Church?

An esteemed correspondent, a Baptist, and a subscriber to and reader of the *Sacred Heart Review*, in a recent letter, speaking of the improbability of his ever becoming a Catholic, says: "The Papacy and infant baptism are excrescences upon the Catholic Church, neither of which has a shadow of warrant in Holy Scriptures."

We have entire confidence in the honesty and sincerity of our Baptist friend, and we are convinced that it would take a very special impulse of divine grace to change his views and make him a Catholic. It is not always reasoning, however conclusive, that can make a Catholic. It is not with

any expectation of converting our friend that we thus allude publicly to his very positive declaration, but as it suggests a burning question of the times we take it as a text for a few friendly remarks.

There are two topics suggested—the Papacy and Baptism. The discussion of the latter we postpone to a future occasion.

THE QUESTION now is whether the assertion of our esteemed Baptist friend that the Papacy has no shadow of warrant in Holy Scripture is well founded. It is a very strong declaration that makes us think we can show that there is something more than a shadow of warrant for the Catholic doctrine in Holy Scriptures—in fact that there are few doctrines which have a clearer and to the candid inquirer more convincing evidence than that of the Papacy.

We have so often had occasion lately to allude to this subject that it seems almost superfluous to repeat what has to our readers no doubt become as familiar as an oft-told tale. But the strength of Protestant prejudice and the constant repetition of the

OBJECTIONS AGAINST CATHOLIC DOCTRINE seem to render it necessary to repeat our contention "line upon line, and precept upon precept, here a little and there a little" as opportunity may offer.

Now there are at least ten to fifteen passages of Scripture which have a more or less remote bearing upon this subject and about five of them which contain a more direct and explicit testimony. The first class of passages have reference to the fact that Peter always takes the lead; he heads the list of the Apostles—"first Peter," then the rest of the Apostles. The Protestant Bishop Barrow in his celebrated book on the Pope's supremacy is compelled to acknowledge the prominent part Peter bore in the councils and in the public proceedings generally. At the consultation, he observes, "about supplying the place of Judas, he rose up, proposed and pressed the matter. At the convention of the Apostles and the debate about resolving the debate concerning observance of Mosaic institutions he first rose up and declared his sense. In the

PROMULGATION OF THE GOSPEL and defence thereof before the Jewish rulers he did assume the conduct and constantly took upon him to be the speaker, the rest standing by him in plying assent and ready to avow his word." This same Barrow, too, acknowledges that Peter was head of the College of the Apostles.

To the same purport is the testimony of Archbishop Potter of the Church of England in his book on Church Government. He says: "Our Lord appeared to Peter after the resurrection, and before this He sent the message of His resurrection to him in particular." He then relates the various acts of Peter after the ascension of our Lord, and concludes thus: "From these and other examples which occur in the Scriptures it is evident that St. Peter acted as

CHIEF OF THE COLLEGE OF APOSTLES, and so he is constantly described by the primitive writers of the Church who call him the Head, the President, the Prolocutor, the Chief, the Foreman of the Apostles, with several other titles of distinction."

But to come to the more direct passages. The command to feed the sheep and lambs of Christ's flock was a very remarkable one. "The solemnity of the circumstances under which it was communicated shows that it was no ordinary act of our Lord—no mere perfunctory ceremony. Thrice He asked Simon, son of John, if he loved Him, and being assured that he did, thrice He repeated the injunction to feed His sheep, to feed His lambs. Given all the Apostles, was, indeed, given the commission to preach the Gospel to the whole world; but to Peter was given the

SPECIAL PRIVILEGE OF FEEDING THE FLOCK of Christ with sound doctrine. This was more particularly emphasized on another and not less solemn and impressive occasion. Our Lord said: "Simon, behold Satan hath desired to have you (in the Latin *vos*, meaning 'you' in the plural, and referring to all the Apostles), that he may sift you (as) as wheat; but I have prayed *thee* (Latin *tu* singular, meaning Peter alone), that *thy* faith fail not; and *thou*, being once converted, confirm thy brethren." Nothing could be clearer. The danger to faith is foretold and Peter is appointed to confirm the others. And our Lord gives him assurance that his faith shall not fail.

"I have prayed for thee," He says; "I have prayed for thee, our Saviour himself Peter receives the assurance of an unerring faith, indefectible, infallible. By the very words he received at once the command to confirm the others and the power to do so without failure. This passage has always been understood by the Fathers of the Church from the very beginning as conferring upon Peter and his successors, in effect, the prerogative of infallibility.

In regard to the power of the keys it is true that our Lord did confer it upon all the Apostles. But

HE SELECTED PETER

and conferred the powers specially upon him. Why should he do so unless Peter was to have some special prerogative among them? St. Cyprian explains it. He says: "Even the other Apostles were certainly what Peter was, being endowed with equal participation of honor and power; but the beginning proceeds from unity and the primacy is given to Peter that the Church of Christ may be shown to be one and the chair one." It is for the sake of unity, which is necessary to the very being of the Church. Archbishop Potter, before quoted, says: "Our Lord received from God the keys of heaven; and by virtue of this grant had power to remit sins on earth; the same keys with the power that accompanied them were first promised to Peter as the foreman of the Apostolic College."

And what shall we say of the grand text, "Thou art Peter (*petra*, a rock) and upon this rock, *petra*, I will build my Church and the gates of hell shall never prevail against it?" Spite of the fanciful interpretations by which it has been sought to break the force of this passage the ablest and most candid Protestant writers admit that

PETER AND THE ROCK ARE ONE.

Bloomfield, a celebrated modern Protestant commentator, says that "every modern commentator of any note has abandoned the distinction between Peter and rock as untenable." The Protestant Bishop Marsh, says: "It would be a desperate undertaking to attempt to prove that Christ meant any other person than Peter," while Dr. Thompson, a Scotch Presbyterian, says: "Protestants have used all the hardihood of criticism in their attempts to reason away the Catholic interpretation."

Our good Protestant friends do not agree with us as to the meaning of these texts. But we would point out that this meaning was given to them by the early Christians, from the very first centuries. If this was not their correct interpretation, then our Saviour did not succeed in making His meaning understood, and—we say it with reverence—His mission would have been a failure.—*Sacred Heart Review*.

A SOUND PROTESTANT WRITER.

A Protestant clergyman of Andover, Mass., thus writes to our contemporary, the *Colorado Catholic*:

A valued friend, a Methodist clergyman, has, in correspondence, so well expressed in a few words the spirit of one part of our Protestant world, our irreconcilables, that I think you will be pleased to see his remarks:

"First, pound the Catholics because they are subject to a 'foreign power,' because the Pope lives in Rome, an 'Italian Papacy,' 'non-American,' etc. Secondly, now that we have a representative of the Pope on the ground, one who is here to study our institutions, then raise the cry, 'the Pope in Washington,' 'Rome right in the midst of us,' 'the tyranny brought home,' etc. So I fear that if the Pope should defer so far to our Anglo-Saxon feelings as to transfer his See to London itself—since it has never been defined as of faith that he cannot—the anti-Popery cries would be fiercer than ever. The spirit is never satisfied."

It is so much easier, and so, to blaze away at you and to follow the Lord for ever. It might be called the snap and easy way of going to heaven.

It is humiliating and heart-sickening to see circulating throughout our country a forged encyclical, of so coarse and clumsy a style of imposture that one would think that even our current Protestant ignorance of Papal formulas of speech and the course of Roman Catholic thought would suffices to detect it. How many religious papers have exposed it? The *Independent* and the *Christian Union* have, I know, and I hope they are not the only ones. If the Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church would issue an encyclical plugging their official character for its spuriousness, they might shake it out of existence, but I doubt whether the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church could do so. To think that fables as malignant and senseless as any of the stories of Titus Oates should be finding circulation two centuries later among us, whose great-grandfathers several times removed were Oates' dupes! However, there is one comfort, the whole thing rings hollow. No one is afraid, of the strength of it, that Archbishop Satolli will follow Archbishop Plunket to the gallows, or that the senator from West Virginia will take the place of Lord Stafford on the scaffold. After all, in spite of the devil and the Freemasons, and the A. P. A.'s, the descendants of Titus Oates are gradually approaching the condition of bodiless shades. Indeed, I fancy it is only a disreputable minority of the Freemasons that is art and part in this shame and scandal, notwithstanding the swaggering air with which one of their organs endeavors to bolster up forgery with a lie. CHARLES C. STARRICK.

Let no one wear a mask, otherwise he will do ill; and if he has one, let him burn it.—*St. Philip Neri*.