

The Catholic Record.

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

Price of subscription—\$2.50 per annum.

EDITORS: REV. GEORGE R. NORTHGRAVES, Author of "Mistakes of Modern Infidels."

THOMAS COFFEY, Publisher and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY, MESSRS. LEE, KING, JOHN NIGH, P. J. NEVEY and M. C. O'DONNELL are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transmit all other business for THE CATHOLIC RECORD.

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

Approved and recommended by the Arch-Bishops 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.

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

London, Saturday, June 3, 1893.

CORPUS CHRISTI.

Among the many feasts of our holy Church there is none more solemn and more consoling than that of Corpus Christi. It bids us reflect on the wondrous love of the God who deigns to remain with us, who veils His power and majesty under the humility of the sacramental veils, and who has a remedy for every sin and an unfailing balm for hearts weary and discouraged with the buffetings of the world.

"Come to Me all ye who labor and are burdened and I will refresh you," is the message from the tabernacle to humanity; for the God who dwells therein has sounded the depths of every woe and misery.

The Son of Man, who had pity on the multitude—whose great heart held no reproach or scorn for even the Magdalene, sinner though she was and the scandal of the city—is looking from the altar, with eyes of infinite love and compassion, upon the children of men. He never grows weary. He never refuses His grace, and no prayer of love and confidence was ever yet unanswered by Him.

And is it not a glorious thing for a Catholic to consider that his Church—the very gate of heaven—holds within its tabernacle a God whose heart's pulsation is one of love for him—who can still the angry gusts of passion as years ago He bade the tempest cease, and send him forth into the world with renewed strength and a peace of which the world has no conception.

What else could have created the types of sublime virtue that figure in the history of the Church? What sustained the men who for the sake of the salvation of human souls left home and kindred and bade farewell to all earthly pleasure? What induced them, while the world mocked, to labor on to the end, to never prove recreant to their duty; to spend every energy, and oftentimes to seal their mission with their blood? What source of strength had these holy women who went to their graves with bodies unstained and hearts unsoiled? The Blessed Sacrament explains all. The martyrs who braved every torment rather than renounce their faith, the confessors who carried the gospel to the uttermost bounds of the earth, and the virgins who offered to their God the oblation of a pure heart and body, were nourished and strengthened by the Body and Blood of Jesus. Hence their souls put on the resplendent vesture of perfect virtue; and though long since gone to their reward, they stand like sentinels on the heavenward path, warning us to adopt the means that caused their sanctification.

We, as they, participate in the blessings that flow inexhaustibly from the tabernacle. We are not influenced by the theories of men, for we possess Him who is the "way, the truth and the life." A Catholic views with pity the myriads of human beings who embrace this or that system in the hope of attaining the peace for which the human heart craves incessantly. The meaningless symbolism of the fad of the hour engrosses their attention, and then, finding it powerless to satisfy their desires, they hurry on in their fruitless quest. When shall they understand that a heart only can be the ministering angel of love to a heart? The most illiterate Catholic receives more true light in holy Communion than ever glean the apostles of culture from their literary or scientific treasures.

No wonder then that the voice of the Church breaks out on Corpus Christi into glad, exultant canticles in her joy and rapture at the Eucharistic presence of her God! Once before her voice was lifted up in thanksgiving, but its accents were low and trembling, for the dark shadow of Calvary lay athwart her path: but on this feast there is naught to restrain the song of triumph that thrills the hearts of her fervent children and proclaims to the world her faith in the Real Presence.

She goes back to Capernaum and

hears the Saviour telling the Jews that He was to give them a mysterious bread—His flesh, for the life of the world. She hears again the scornful words: "How can this man give us His flesh to eat?" and the Divine voice declaring His doctrine in more explicit and forcible terms. Up before her vision comes the memorable scene of the Last Supper of the Master with His disciples, and she hears the solemn words announcing the bestowal of the most wondrous gift of love to the world. Yes, most wondrous, for human reason stands aghast at the mighty mystery! Jesus, however, has said it, and He alone has the words of eternal life.

"How can this man give us His flesh to eat?" is the cry of the many to whom has not been vouchsafed the priceless boon of faith. They presume to put limits to the power of the Omnipotent God who became a helpless babe and so humbled Himself that He "was a worm and no man." They reject it because it is incomprehensible, and every day they believe things which they cannot understand! They are encompassed by mysterious shadows. The most ordinary phenomena baffle their reason, which is their sole guide. Ask them to explain the nature of the most ordinary plant that grows in their garden, and they must confess their inability to do so. And yet, powerless to pierce the gloom that overshadows even material things, they reject a doctrine revealed by a God whose very divinity is the guarantee of its truth. The presence of the Body and Blood of the Lord is perceived only by faith; and faith, says the Apostle, comes from hearing the word of God. But that word of God may penetrate only hearts that are humble and willing to accept without fear or wavering the "evidence of things that appear not."

Look forth upon the world and see how Holy Church makes on Corpus Christi her public and solemn act of belief in the Blessed Sacrament. In many a village and city the hidden God is borne through the streets blessing them all with His divine Presence. The houses are adorned with garlands of flowers, and from thousands of hearts comes the sweet incense of prayer and thanksgiving. Slowly He goes, attended by all the splendor of rubric and ceremony, and ever and anon is heard the chanting of that hymn of joy and adoration inspired by the devotion and genius of St. Thomas:

Lo! upon the altar lies, Hidden deep from human eyes, Bread of Angels from the skies, Made the food of mortal man, Children's meat to dogs denied, In old types foreshadowed, In the Manna loaves supplied, Isaac and the Paschal Lamb.

"Never," says a prominent infidel of modern times, "have I looked upon the long line of white-robed priests, nor seen the files of surpliced acolytes, nor watched the reverent crowds preceding and following the consecrated Host, without being deeply moved. I have never been able to listen to the solemn chanting by the choristers of the grand old Latin hymns and psalms without feeling my heart throbbing violently. Tears would rise to my eyes and my whole being would become absorbed in the contemplation of the public profession of faith coming from my fellows with better hearts if not better heads than mine."

PARENTAL DUTIES.

A Catholic home training is the most precious gift parents can bestow upon their children. There, and there only, can young minds and hearts be led to love what is true and pure.

And yet how many parents forget this sacred truth! Their children run wild. They are, of course, obedient, but what transformations are through parental negligence going on in these young souls? The frivolous conversation of the mother makes them look upon the world as a great stage whereon to display fine clothes or to indulge in sharp criticisms of their neighbors. No thought of resignation or of sacrifice is coupled with their views of life. Success, they are taught, is the criterion of merit. The taste for the material is so developed that it turns away in disgust from the spiritual. Their souls could have become living, breathing statues, but parents' hands have moulded them into images of clay. They were allowed too much liberty. They selected their company and reading. They devour the novels that are sheltered within the sacred precincts of the household. Who can blame them if they do not read Catholic books when their parents look upon them as dry and tedious and for display only? Who can manifest surprise at beholding them absorbed in the perusal of the questionable

allusions and vivid description of vice of the sensational newspaper when they never or rarely see a Catholic journal in the hands of those who should give them advice and example? They are to be pitied; and if in after years they stray away, the crime is upon the foolish and criminal father and mother.

THE PRESBYTERIAN EM-BROGLIO.

The Presbyterian Review quotes with approbation the opinion expressed by Rev. Professor Dr. John T. Duffield of Princeton College in regard to the "proper attitude of a professor in a Presbyterian Theological Seminary towards the church whose bread he eats."

The opinion referred to was published recently in the N. Y. Independent under the title, "What has Caused the Crisis in the Presbyterian Church?" in the course of which the writer remarks,

"It is not the business of a college professor to reconstruct the accepted theology and polity of the Church, but to maintain and defend it. If he cannot conscientiously do so he should find some other field of labor where he may prosecute his self-appointed work without disturbing the peace of the Church."

This is said, of course, with special reference to the case of Rev. Dr. Briggs, the Professor of New York Union Theological Seminary, whose trial for heresy before the presbytery of the same city has caused so much confusion and trepidation among Presbyterians during the last three years. This is the crisis referred to; but why is there a crisis?

The situation arises from the fact that Dr. Briggs is sustained by a large section of the Church in his attack upon those primary and fundamental doctrines of Christianity, which are acknowledged in the Westminster Confession of Faith, and without which Protestantism becomes nothing else than open Deism.

We have always been told by Protestant polemicists that the irrefutable basis on which the whole Protestant system rests is "the Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible." This statement has three parts. It assumes that the Bible is the Word of God, written indeed by men, the prophets, the Apostles, and the immediate disciples of the Apostles who wrote two of the four gospels, but men inspired by the Holy Ghost to write only what God Himself revealed. So far Catholics are at agreement with Presbyterians and most other Protestants. But on the second part of the statement there is wide divergence.

We admit and maintain that the whole Bible should be received and believed; but while Protestants proclaim that they too accept the whole Bible, there are seven whole books of the Bible and twelve chapters of two other books which Protestants, on one pretence or another, do not receive. They have, therefore, a truncated Bible; but if the Briggs doctrine is to be received it becomes still more mutilated, for, according to this theory, many books of the Old Testament are declared to be spurious, not having been written at the time when they claim to have been written nor by the persons who are claimed to have been their authors.

These discoveries are said to be the result of higher criticism; but one thing is clear from them, that they completely overthrow the basis on which all Protestantism is founded, and the farcical character of the proud boast of Protestants that they have given to the world "an open Bible" becomes apparent; for of what use is "an open Bible" if half of it, and perhaps the whole, be nothing more than the incoherent fantasies of eccentric men? This is what the Bible is reduced to if the theories of the New York professor are to be tolerated.

There is equal confusion on the third part of the Protestant palmary principle, "nothing but the Bible." Nothing is more clear from Holy Scripture than the fact that the Bible was not written as our sole guide to the knowledge of Christ's teachings; for Christ Himself never declared it to be such. Indeed during His life it was not a line of the New Testament written; but He established a Church which was the supreme teaching authority, and which is declared in 1 Tim. iii, 15, to be "the pillar and ground of Truth." It is this Church which Christ commands the faithful to hear under pain of being considered as "the heathen and the publican." (St. Matt. xviii, 17.) The Apostle St. Paul also in 2 Thessalonians ii, 14, clearly asserts that the doctrines He has inculcated are to be believed whether they have been communicated

by "word or our epistle, that is, in the form of Holy Scripture or ecclesiastical tradition."

Dr. Briggs here again joins issue with the generally received Protestant doctrine that the Bible alone is to be taken as a standard of Christian faith. He maintains that reason and the Church, equally with the Bible, constitute the Christian's rule of faith whereby doctrinal truth is to be known and tested.

As first sight this seems to resemble Catholic teaching, but the resemblance is only apparent, as it is not by elevating the authority of the Church, but by lowering that of the Bible to be nothing more than a human and fallible authority, that this conclusion is reached, and thus both the authority of the Bible and that of the Church are reduced to the rank of a human standard of belief.

The opinion of the New York Independent that Mr. Briggs and other college professors should conform to the teaching of the Presbyterian Church, because from her they derive their bread and butter, instead of because the teachings of the Church are true, places the motive of credibility in the Church and the teaching of Christianity on the very lowest level. But though this seems to be the general ground to which the majority of the strictly orthodox Presbyterians rest their case, it is not one which is admitted by the great bulk of the secular newspapers, which seem to sympathize with Dr. Briggs, merely because he is the advocate of Free Thought.

Altogether Presbyterianism is brought to face a most serious crisis by this uncomfortable debate, for it is acknowledged that Presbyterians are largely tinctured with Dr. Briggs' loose views of ecclesiastical and biblical authority, and it is feared that whatever may be the final decision, a large schism in the Church is to be expected.

If Dr. Briggs be sustained, the orthodox Presbyterians will be disgusted with a religion which tolerates so much looseness of opinion, whereas if he be condemned, his party have become so strong and determined that a secession equally disastrous may be looked for, and it will almost certainly take place.

Already the noses are being counted in the constitution of the coming Presbyterian General Assembly which is to meet in Washington on the 18th inst., and as far as the probabilities are to be relied on, the case will go against Dr. Briggs on the new trial to which he is to be subjected before it.

The New York Mail and Express has stated the expectation of the votes which will be cast, founded upon the known views of delegates to the Assembly to be that out of 310 names of delegates already known to have been elected to the General Assembly, 220 are against Professor Briggs, 62 in his favor, and 28 doubtful. If this forecast be correct there is little room to doubt that a huge secession will take place in the direction of Free Thought, which is a euphemism for infidelity. There is not the least doubt that the Free Thought section in the Church includes its most determined members, and it is not at all likely that they will submit to a decision of the majority against what they consider to be scientific research.

This whole debate is a curious episode at the moment when we are assured that the union of the Protestant denominations is on the point of being effected. The air seems rather to be full of the germs of approaching schism, which is only the natural consequence of the principle on which all Protestantism is based—the supreme authority of individual judgment over the decisions of the Church.

SPECIMENS.

Some time since we heard of a shoemaker who was notorious for making false promises to his customers. One of them, becoming annoyed one day, asked the shoemaker what he meant by such conduct. He replied: "To be candid with you, my dear friend, I have become such a confirmed liar that you cannot believe a word I say." It is to be hoped some day the Fultons, the Chiniquys, Widdows, Leydens, Shepherds, Rigbys, Austins, and the rest of them will be struck with remorse, and make the same honest admission as the shoemaker. It is hard to follow up and prove false the statements made by those whose business it is to misrepresent the Catholic Church. We remember reading some time ago of an incident which will illustrate our purpose. A Catholic paper published in St. Louis twenty-five years

ago began an editorial in the following manner:

"If the Pope and the Jesuits ever obtain control of this country, we may bid adieu to civil and religious liberty. Such is the ridiculous statement made by our enemies."

A Know-nothing organ published the paragraph as the pronouncement of Bishop (now Archbishop) Ryan's official organ, but omitted the second sentence, which appears in italics. Archbishop Ryan lately stated that even to the present day he frequently receives letters asking him if such a statement were made. Another case of a similar kind recently occurred in regard to ourselves. In referring to Margaret Shepherd, we wrote as follows:

"We cannot defend the persons and the institutions she has attacked because we could not give their names in the same column with hers."

Mrs. Shepherd's official organ in this city endeavors to make capital out of our statement, having omitted the words we have placed in italics. This being the sort of warfare set on foot by the P. P. A., we may expect that its membership will be recruited only from the ignorant and the gross, who hold the 8th commandment in contempt.

AN ANTI-HOME RULE MEETING IN MONTREAL.

An anti-Home Rule meeting was held last week on 22nd May, in Montreal, the object being mainly to show that there is a certain class in Canada who are opposed to the granting of this measure of justice to Ireland—a fact of which we would have been perfectly conscious even if this meeting had not been held. But from the antecedents of those present it could be readily seen from what quarter that opposition proceeds.

Just as in Ireland the opponents of Home Rule consist of the privileged classes who have been pampered by the ascendancy policy which has hitherto been in vogue, the anti-Home Rulers in Canada consist of those persons who on every occasion push themselves forward as advocates of religious persecution and the enemies of anything by which it may be expected that any benefit may accrue to Catholics.

On the platform there were the usual number of persons always to be found on just such occasions when persecuting measures are to be proposed. There were the Rev. Dr. Smythe, Rev. Dr. Dixon, and Rev. Mr. Graham, besides the two notorious no-Popery lecturers—Justin D. Fulton, the obscene, and the apostate Chiniquy—both of whom being residents of the United States, of course, assisted simply because it was a no-Popery gathering; for they could not be suspected of entertaining those sentiments of loyalty to Great Britain which one of the speakers maintained to be peculiar to the opponents of Home Rule.

There were also present some others who always take an interest in attending any anti-Catholic gathering, such as Dr. Z. H. Davidson, the promoter of the defunct Equal Rights movement. Some of the speakers dwelt very much on the loyalty of the opponents of Home Rule.

The Rev. Dr. Smythe, who is, we believe, a Presbyterian, discoursed lengthily on the loyalty of the Ulster Orangemen. He said: "He had no sympathy with Mr. Gladstone's efforts to sever Ireland from the British Empire. He had been born in the north of Ireland, and he knew what the feeling of the people of Ulster was toward the British crown. Three years ago he had witnessed a demonstration at Belfast, and he had then seen what the loyalty of the Ulster people meant. It is a question of life or death with them, and they dreaded the moment when British bayonets might be turned against them to make them disloyal to the British crown. It is a strange fact that the people who went Home Rule are not those actuated by feelings of loyalty and respect to the Queen, while those who are opposed to it are those most warmly attached to the Queen. The North of Ireland is determined to stand by the British crown, no matter what may take place."

It is not necessary to discuss the respective loyalty of the Irish Catholics and the Orangemen of Belfast every time that an avowed partisan may bring it up. It is a well known fact that the loyalty of the Irish Orangemen is conditional on the fact that they shall be permitted to ride roughshod over the Catholics, as they have hitherto done. This conditional character of their loyalty has been often enough proclaimed by themselves, and the question is whether loyalty which is dependent upon such conditions is worth preserving.

Thackeray was no special friend of either Irishmen or Catholics, yet he tells us that the decreasing number

of Irishmen in the British army is due chiefly to the fact of a general discontent arising out of the ill-treatment of Ireland during past centuries. The question is, therefore, whether it is worth the sacrifice which the people of Great Britain have been making, to retain the paltry minority of Irish Orangemen in such dubious loyalty as they have, while making the bulk of the Irish people discontented under oppression.

The question of the desirability of Home Rule is not a religious question, except as far as the fact goes that the people of Ireland who are to be benefited by it are for the most part Catholics. Opposition to Home Rule which is based upon religious considerations means therefore that Catholics, because they are Catholics, are not deserving of the enjoyment of citizens' rights. It is well that we should know what these people who are always prating about civil and religious liberty, think about the granting of civil and religious liberty to Catholics. The truth of the matter is that they wish Catholics not to enjoy the common rights of citizenship, either in Canada or Ireland, and it is on this understanding that their arguments are to be met.

It is for this reason that they persist in maintaining, as Fulton did at the meeting in question, that "Home Rule simply means Rome rule. Mr. Gladstone for a good many years had never been with the Protestants if he knew it, but had championed the interests of Romanism, as earnestly as if he had been a devotee."

Thus the secret is out. The Montreal anti-Home Rulers oppose Home Rule simply because they wish the Catholic people of Ireland to remain under oppression, and for this purpose they are even willing that those Protestants, being comparatively few in number, who would be equally benefited by Home Rule with their Catholic neighbors, should continue to be oppressed. Mr. Gladstone is animated with a different spirit from these talkers. He sees with the eye of a statesman that continued oppression had alienated the Irish people, and, knowing the generous character of the Irish, he is convinced that generous treatment will make the bond of union between the two countries stronger than it has ever been, or than it could ever be expected to be if the policy of oppression were to be continued.

The people of Great Britain have uttered their verdict that the policy of conciliation is now to be tried, and a score of such meetings as the Montreal one will not avert the inevitable.

Nothing more clearly shows the need of Home Rule than the riot of the Belfast Orangemen as soon as it was announced that Mr. Gladstone's Bill had passed its second reading. This proved that the Orangemen detest the idea of Home Rule because they foresee that it will deprive them of the impunity with which they have hitherto borne themselves as tyrants.

Mr. William Galbraith, Provincial Grand Master, was careful to say that the meeting was not an Orange gathering; but though there were a few present who are not perhaps Orangemen, it was evidently under Orange and mock-Equal Righters' auspices. The very prominent part which Mr. Galbraith and the others whom we have named above took in working up the assemblage is sufficient proof of this. But those concerned might as well endeavor to arrest the waters of Niagara Falls as to delay the Home Rule Bill, by means of which the Liberal party of Great Britain have honestly and honorably determined to grant that justice which Ireland has so long demanded in vain.

PROBABLY FALSE.

A special to the Mail of the 23rd ult. from Buda Pesth states that the authorities in the district of Zala have caused the arrest of the Mother Superior of the convent at Tapoleza because of cruelty to the children under her care. It is very remarkable that incidents of this kind are always related as having taken place in some country thousands of miles away, and it is likewise peculiar that this despatch has not, so far as we know, appeared in any other Canadian newspaper. We will not say that it was written in the Mail office, but if such were the case we would not be astonished. With P. P. A. people, such as the Mail management, the publication of anything inimical to the Catholic Church—whether true or false—is as sweetmeats to a child. The professional bigots in Zala, no doubt, occasionally publish some such item as the one we have referred to, and place its occurrence in Canada or the United States. It

would be a revelation were they to know how manufacture of sensation carried on in the edito-some of the great daily

STILL DRIFT.

The question whether its integrity is to be a Word of God, which has of so much trouble to P the United States during years, is now threaten an equally troublesome those of Canada.

Much has been said concerning the position Bible by Protestantism been often told that tantism gave to Chris Bible was the full au sacred book recognize ble Word of God and authority on all questi morality.

Catholics pointed to borne out by experie cannot be a sufficient since it is incapable itself, and it is there misinterpreted, either ance or malice. This out by St. Peter, who i, 20, that "no proph is made by private and elsewhere that in St. Paul "there are t understood which the the unstable wrest, as other Scriptures, to th tion." (iii. 16.)

An adequate gui morals must theret authority, such as e Old Law, the count was instituted by Cl New Law.

In the Book of D read that if "there a hard and doubtful ment between blood and cause . . . to the place which th shall choose. And th the priests of the Lev to the judge that sha and thou shalt ask o shall shew thee the t ment. And thou sha they shall say that place which the Lord what they shall teach to His law; and thou sentence, neither sha the right hand nor t (xvii. 8, 11.)

Under the New La supreme living an Church to whom al trovery must be ref court of appeal; fo the living God" is ground of truth." ( And whosoever will n let him be to thee a the publican." (St. Catholic polemicists pointed out that th makes the individual the interpretation o open the door to ev sult in the denial itself as the undoub It is only what we m we find the profes seminaries setting teaching of ages in now that the bible parts erroneous, an tual who sets himse in what he calls " is the judge of wh received as the Wo deserve to be so co must be regarded a of man.

The Presbyterian of late peculiarly matter, and most come from profess to train the rising byterian clergymen sary to be strongly phetic powers to f such circumstances ation of clergymen tinged with Latit Deism, and even than the present, this respect is bad

The difficulty teachings of Prof Smith of New York been such as to existence of Pres United States; and from being settle events have shown byterianism is men trouble.

The Rev. Profes Presbyterian Sem has come out recent which is certainly