

The Catholic Record.

Published Weekly at 481 and 486 Richmond Street, London, Ontario.

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

REV. GEORGE R. NORTGRAVES, Author of "Mistakes of Modern Liberals," THOMAS COFFEY.

Publisher and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY, MESSRS. LUKE KING, JOHN NICH, P. J. NEVEY and M. C. O'DONNELL 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.

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

Persons writing for a change of address should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

London, Saturday, Oct. 17, 1891.

NEXT Monday, 19th instant, will be the anniversary of the consecration of His Lordship the Bishop of London.

Owing to the large number of places which he has promised to visit during the fall for the purpose of administering confirmation he will be unavoidably absent on that occasion from the Episcopal city.

THE CHURCH AND THE FRENCH REPUBLIC.

THE APATHY of the mass of the French people in permitting themselves to be ruled by an infidel minority, whereas, if the practical Catholics of the country were to take a greater interest in its politics they could undoubtedly secure that freedom which is now denied the Church, has long been to outsiders a matter of surprise.

It is quite certain that the suspicion with which the Republic was looked upon had a great deal to do with this condition of affairs; for the majority of the Catholics certainly entertained such a suspicion.

The leaders of the Republican movements in the country were almost always men hostile to religion, and the Catholics were thus naturally thrown into antagonism with them.

Many Catholics were always favorable to the Republic, and thus, in the face of a united anti-Catholic minority, the political dissensions of the Catholics gave the minority an opportunity to rule.

To this consideration we must add that the anti-Catholic element is to be found chiefly in the cities, which, and Paris especially, have hitherto been always able to dominate the country.

This element is both boisterous and aggressive, while the quiet people of the country districts could scarcely be induced to go to the polls at all when elections were held.

There is besides a natural desire with many to exercise power, and this inclination operated in favor of the Republicans, who were supposed to be willing to let every man have a vote.

But since Cardinal Lavigier's bold declaration that the time has come when the hopelessly defunct dynasties of past days should be abandoned, and the Republic unreservedly accepted, a new era seems to have been inaugurated, which promises that at an early day the Catholic majority will assert itself.

What happened in Belgium, where the state of affairs was similar to that of France, may well occur in the latter country also.

It took some years before the Catholics of Belgium were roused to indignation by the hostility of their Government to religion; but when once they realized this fact, the infidels were swept aside, and an era of good government began.

Present appearances indicate that a similar issue is about to result in France.

It is but a short time since M. Fuzet, Bishop of Rouen, stated that Cardinal Lavigier had struck a most fortunate blow in favor of the Church by refusing to identify it with parties which, besides being now powerless for good, are resorting to the weapons of corruption and conspiracy against a form of government which is popular, notwithstanding that it has been administered by the wrong class of men.

Already there has been a great change for the better in the treatment of the Church by the Government, though it is still far from being satisfactory.

But the infidel element is already alarmed at the prospect that a storm is coming which will sweep it out of existence.

Mons. Lockroy, one of the most bitter of the infidel leaders, has admitted that the Catholics are organizing for the coming elections in such a way that their efforts are likely to be crowned with success.

Their energy, he says, is formidable. They understand now the aspirations of the masses, and through the many Catholic associations which are spread throughout the country, they are an

influence which threatens to be of "considerable magnitude;" and he is at a loss to discover any means of combating it.

He would not experience such a difficulty if he were not conscious that he belongs to a party which constitutes but an insignificant minority of the people; but he is not the only one who entertains this fear.

It has become general, and the whole infidel press is in a state of alarm which gives good reason to expect that France will soon show itself to be a Christian Republic.

President Carnot himself, though far from being a model Catholic, has wisdom enough to foresee what the future will bring forth, and he has recently expressed himself in favor of concessions to the religious sentiment of the nation.

He acknowledges that the legislation has been hitherto blamably hostile, but he says that all this may be changed without giving up the Republican form of government.

In a recent speech he said: "It is a fact that in consequence of the attitude of many of its advocates, people have grown to look upon the Republic as an impious and sectarian Government; but in itself the Republican form of government is not necessarily connected with anything of the sort."

This is precisely the view of the leaders of the new Catholic movement, and from this it may be inferred that the President will not be found in the ranks of the enemies of the Church, if the new movement be even tolerably successful.

But the demoralization of the infidel party is so great that they seem danger now from another most unexpected quarter.

It will be remembered that the forced military service which was imposed by the anti-Catholic majority in the Chambers upon clerical students, was passed in the expectation that these young men, exposed to all the temptations and dangers of military life, would lose their vocation to the priesthood, and would come out of the army imbued with the spirit of the dominant party; and indeed the bishops themselves feared that many vocations would be destroyed amid the temptations of a military atmosphere.

The result has dispelled these fears to a great extent; though, of course, a military camp is not the field where the best ecclesiastical training is to be obtained.

The priesthood is an occupation for life; and students for that sacred office should be allowed to apply themselves to the study of theology, and the devotional practices which are needful to the ecclesiastical state.

The time they are obliged to spend in camp is so much time wasted of a life which is to be led in a very different sphere; and for this reason the bishops and the true Catholics in the Chamber opposed the infidel scheme.

But it has turned out that, instead of losing their vocation, the ecclesiastical students in almost every instance have not only themselves kept the ecclesiastical spirit, but have inspired among the soldiery also a respect for religion which, under the present regime of France, had been growing less from year to year.

The infidel papers which before were loudest in advocating the Government measure, are now loud in denouncing the young men who led pious lives, thus edifying the soldiers, and making them better Christians.

These papers now complain that the students have sown the seeds of clericalism in the army!

Man proposes, but God disposes; and it is an evidence of the infinitely wise Providence of God, if He has turned the means by which the infidels had hoped to dechristianize the country into a potent instrument towards establishing religion on a firmer basis than ever.

The infidel party, however, show that they are hard to please, whereas they are now in alarm at the results of a law of which they were the only advocates. "It is hard to kick against the good."

MR. GLADSTONE has excited considerable indignation in aristocratic circles by his threat to extinguish the House of Lords if the Peers hold out against an Irish Home Rule Bill.

Mr. Gladstone says that if the recent hint thrown out by Lord Salisbury that the Peers will set themselves in opposition to the will of the people as expressed by their representatives in Parliament, the Lords must either bend or break.

As the case stands now the House of Lords is said to be in danger of dying out of existence through the inattention of the Lords to their Parliamentary duties.

The average daily attendance at sessions of the House is only about 40 in a peerage numbering between 600 and 700.

THE MARKS OF THE STIGMATA.

SOME of the American journals are discussing the correctness of the reports circulated as to the manifestation of our Blessed Lord's favoring in a very particular manner a Catholic lady in Louisville.

It is said that Mrs. Mary Stuckenburg, of that city, is believed by her confessor, Rev. Father Raffo, to bear the blessed marks of the stigmata.

The first manifestation appeared in the latter part of May last. The trance into which she entered, the first emission of blood from the five points described by the New Testament in its history of the Crucifixion, caused great alarm in her family.

She remained in a state of ecstasy during three hours; then appeared in the palms of her hands, on the insteps of her feet, and in her side, the marks of the Crucifixion, similar to those on the body of our Blessed Lord.

The newspaper reports mention that these marks are of a dark reddish color, something like what is known as birth-marks. The spots, since their first appearance, are visible at all times, but only on Friday at 3 p. m. do the bleeding and ecstasy recur.

We have not heard from Father Raffo or from any direct source if these reports be correct or not. As to the correctness of the statements made in irresponsible journals, we have nothing to determine until some better information reaches us from a source that cannot be suspected.

We must necessarily withhold our judgment. But there is no reason why our blessed Lord may not favor in this manner a very pious person, and thus give an additional proof of the truths of the New Testament's history.

In an age like ours, when Infidelity speaks boldly and aloud in private halls and public platforms, it should not be wondered at if the God of the Christian world would make manifest His Divine Presence in the manner that may seem best to His infinite wisdom.

The ways of God are not like the ways of men; for He has told us that he would make use of the "weak to confound the strong, and of the simple and the foolish to confound the great and the wise of this world."

Over eighty cases of stigmatization are recorded in legends or in Church history similar to that reported of the pious recipient in Louisville.

The first one we read of is that of St. Francis of Assisi, who in 1224 had a vision of a seraph with six wings, between which appeared the image of the Crucified; and on returning from his ecstasy, and recovering consciousness, he found himself marked with the wounds of the Crucifixion in his hands, feet and right side.

St. Bonaventure, who lived in St. Francis' time and was a disciple of his, wrote his biography, and gives in his "Life of St. Francis" a very accurate and detailed account of the visions that were vouchsafed to that eminent man of God, and of the stigmata, or marks of the Crucifixion, that were deeply impressed on His hands, feet and side.

He says: "However careful the saint was to conceal the stigmata, he could not prevent the marks on his hands and feet from being seen; although it is true that from that time he never went abroad barefoot, as had been his custom; nor did he allow his bare hands to be seen. The marks were noticed by several of his co-workers and brethren of well-known sanctity of life, whose word cannot be doubted, and who afterwards, to remove all doubt, confirmed their assertion by sworn affidavit.

Some Cardinals who lived on terms of familiarity with the holy recluse witnessed the stigmata and saw the blood issue from the wounds. They have memorialized them in canticles and Church antiphons, published in honor of this great saint, and testified to the truth of them by written word and public utterance.

Pope Alexander IX., when preaching in my hearing, and in presence of a large number of priests, assured us that during the lifetime of the saint he had seen with his own eyes the sacred stigmata, or marks of blood, that were visible in his (St. Francis') hands, feet and right side.

On the day of his death, more than fifty religious brothers of the community over which he presided saw them, and the holy virgin, St. Clare, with several sisters, and many seculars, came to the monastery, who not only saw, but kissed with fervent piety those miraculous marks, and passed their hands over them for greater certitude."

St. Veronica Juliana, who died in 1727, and was canonized in 1831, is mentioned as the last person who is certified to officially, and acknowledged authoritatively, as having borne those sacred marks.

Instances have occurred in our own time, however, notably that of Louisa Mary Lateau, a Belgian young lady of great sanctity and simple piety, who died in 1868.

Protestant writers have no doubt endeavored to make believe that the stigmata, as witnessed on the person of St. Francis and others, may be attributed to the action of the imagination on an enfeebled body.

Even some Catholic authors have put forward theories of physical derangement of the nervous system, etc.; but they were silenced by the official decision of the Church, which instituted the most searching investigations, and obtained the sworn testimony of truthful witnesses and scientific declaration, as she ever does before pronouncing upon any supernatural manifestation.

In the canonization of St. Francis of Assisi, the Church, after every possible precaution and long waiting, declared that the stigmata of that favored child of God "were evidences of special and wonderful favors vouchsafed to him in Christ."

TORONTO POST OFFICE.

WE DESIRE to draw the attention of the Postmaster-General to what appears to be an unfriendliness, to give it a mild term, on the part of the Toronto letter-carriers towards the CATHOLIC RECORD.

We believe there is a form provided by the Department for the purpose of notifying newspaper publishers of changes of address, but so far as the CATHOLIC RECORD is concerned, these forms are very rarely brought into requisition.

Some time since we wrote the postmaster of Toronto in regard to the matter, after which we received two notices containing present addresses of subscribers who had removed.

These two notices, so far as we can recollect, were the only ones we have ever been favored with from the Toronto office, although hundreds of our subscribers have during the past twelve years changed their residence from one part of the city to the other.

Mr. Patterson is, we believe, one of the most efficient postmasters in the Dominion and endeavors to have the work of his office performed in a straightforward and business-like manner; but if his assistants at times make up their minds to indulge in "ways that are dark and tricks that are mean," he is powerless to remedy the evil.

We do not expect, of course, that letter-carriers should travel about the city in search of our subscribers who have removed their residence, but if by asking they can ascertain this information, surely it would not be much trouble to send it to us on the official form.

We will give an illustration of how this business is done at Toronto and in other offices:

Chicago, Ill., Sept. 11, 1891. Your paper addressed to Mrs. D. Galbraith should be changed from 137 Wells street to 108 Lincoln avenue.

Rochester, N. Y., Aug. 2, 1891. Your paper addressed to Thos. O'Neil should be changed from 58 South street to 38 South street.

Detroit, Mich., Sept. 23, 1891. Your paper addressed to A. D. Vanzandt should be changed from 84 Harrison avenue to care of Mr. Radigan, River Road.

Montreal, Oct. 9, 1891. Your paper addressed to Thos. O'Neil should be changed from 182 St. James street to 182 Notre Dame street, Hochelaga.

The Toronto system is to wrap up a bundle of papers once in a while and return them to us. We give the printed address as it appears on the label and the information at the end is written under it:

J. Green, 65 Defoe street. Left. W. Stringer, 187 Arzyle street. Left. Mrs. Olivia M. Daly, 239 Myrtle avenue. Left.

This information is oftentimes varied by the remarks "Gone away," "Removed," "Not at No.," etc. The mail which brought us these papers also brought a letter from Mrs. Daly, stating that her new address was No. 317, on the same avenue.

It is only reasonable to suppose that the carrier knew Mrs. Daly's present address, or could have ascertained it by the asking. We fear the Toronto staff of letter-carriers contains not a few individuals who believe that it is their duty to prevent the spread of Popery, and therefore the circulation of the CATHOLIC RECORD should be made as difficult as possible.

Men who have worked themselves into a lunacy of this description should not be permitted to occupy positions in the civil service. We hope the Postmaster-General will be good enough to look into the matter, and have this evil rectified.

It is a positive weakness to the Government, as well as a great injustice to the public, when such an important service as the Post Office Department gives employment to men who allow their prejudices to interfere with the performance of their duty.

We might also state that the Brantford office needs a little shaking up. Some of our subscribers there complain that for many weeks the word "Nothing" meets them when they present themselves at the general delivery, and then a bundle of half a dozen RECORDS is handed them, which had all along been allowed to remain in the box, the clerk being too tired to get 'em out, to look them up and hand 'em out.

THE CANON OF SCRIPTURE.

THE REV. DR. CAVEN, in an address delivered at the opening exercises of Knox College on the 7th inst., maintained with great plausibility the theory that the Protestant canon of Scripture is the one which was received by Christ and His Apostles, and that the early Christian Church did not accept the seven books and twelve chapters which have been called Apocryphal by English and Scotch Protestants.

He makes the strange assertion that "the Lord never quoted any of the Apocryphal books, nor referred to them."

These assertions are contrary to fact. It is true that the books of Tobias, Judith, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Baruch, and the two books of Maccabees were not admitted as divine by the Jews of Palestine, because, with the exception of Baruch, they were only written after the canon of the Jews was fixed by Esdras; but it was as much the duty and the right of the Christian Church to decide upon their canonicity as it was the duty and right of the synagogue to do so before the coming of our Blessed Lord.

The book of Tobias is quoted as holy Scripture by Sts. Polycarp and Cyprian, Basil, Ambrose and Augustine; and not only Tobias but all the books we have named were declared by the third Council of Carthage, A. D. 397, to be canonical Scripture.

The book of Tobias is plainly referred to by our Lord in St. Matthew vii, 12, and St. Luke vi, 31.

All things therefore whatsoever you would that men should do to you, do you also to them, for this is the law and the prophets."

This passage is not to be found elsewhere in the Old Testament than in Tobias iv, 16.

The book of Judith is spoken of with praise by St. Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Sts. Ambrose, Fulgentius, Augustine and Chrysostom, and also by Tertullian, all of whom quote it as being part of Holy Scripture as recognized and received by the Church in their day.

The book of Wisdom iii, 7, is quoted by our Lord in St. Matt. xiii, 43: "Then shall the just shine as the sun in the kingdom of their Father."

Christ's title mentioned in St. Matthew xxvii, 43, "For he said: I am the Son of God," is taken from Wisdom ii, 13; and in the 18th verse of the same chapter we find a prophecy of the reproaches uttered by the Jews against our Lord while He was suffering on the cross.

"For if he be the true Son of God he will defend him, and will deliver him from the hands of his enemies."

In St. Matt. xxvii, 42, 43, this prophecy is declared to have been fulfilled.

St. Paul also quotes from Wisdom ix, 13, the following passage, and in several others place the same book is quoted by the Apostle:

"For who hath known the mind of the Lord? Or who hath been his counsellor? (Rom. xi, 34.) Ecclesiasticus is quoted as Scripture by St. Clement of Rome and Ignatius in the first century, and later by Origen, Tertullian and Sts. Clement of Alexandria, Ephrem of Syria, Basil, Cyril of Jerusalem, Gregory of Nazianza, Gregory of Nyssa, and many other early Fathers.

This book is also evidently referred to by our Lord in St. John xiv, 23, where the sentiment is the same with that of Ecclesiasticus ii, 18, though there is a slight change in the wording: "If any one love me he will keep my word."

There are many other passages both of Ecclesiasticus and other of the books we have enumerated which are quoted in the New Testament by Christ and His apostles, showing that they were held in the same veneration which was shown for the other books of Holy Writ.

We shall give here but one other instance from the life of our Lord which proves that the books of the Maccabees were recognized as sacred even by the Jews, and that our Lord acted upon them by keeping a feast which was established by Judas Maccabeus. We read in St. John x, 22:

"And it was the feast of the Dedication at Jerusalem, and it was winter. And Jesus walked in the temple in Solomon's porch."

This winter feast of the dedication was the dedication of the altar instituted by Judas Maccabeus when he erected a new altar, according to 1 Macc. iv, 56. Thus the authority of the 1st book of the Maccabees rests upon the act of our Lord Himself, for there is no record of the authoritative establishment of the feast of the dedication except this history of its institution found in the first book of Maccabees.

It is not, however, from Scripture that we are able to ascertain which

books are canonical, for if we had nothing else to guide us it would be impossible to prove the canonicity of Ruth, Esther and Job, which are nowhere quoted in the New Testament as being of divine authority.

Nor is it the right of any private individual to sit in judgment upon the canonicity and inspiration of any book which is proposed as a part of the Scripture canon.

We are aware that Dr. Caven rests his case upon the testimony of Josephus. Josephus is certainly a respectable human authority, but we protest that as he is but a fallible man, the list of divinely-inspired Scriptures which is given by him is not to be received as settling the matter for the Christian Church.

The Church of Christ, and not any private individual, however respectable and learned, is the sole authority which is declared in Scripture to be "the pillar and ground of truth" (1 Tim. iii, 15); and we cannot accept the dictum of Josephus as overriding the decisions of the Church, to which alone Christ committed the authority of deciding all controversies of faith.

It was the office of the Apostles of Christ and their lawful successors to approve of those books which were sacred, and to reject those which were spurious, for to them Christ gave the commission "as the Father hath sent me, so do I send you."

And it is by the testimony of the Fathers of the Church, succeeding to the Apostles, that their teaching on this subject can be ascertained.

If private individuals were to be allowed to sit in judgment upon so important a matter we would have as many canons of Scripture as there are self-opinionated people in the world.

Dr. Caven would give us a Bible according to his notion of the fitness of things; but Luther and Calvin and Beza, who were quite as capable as the Doctor to form a canon, furnish us with one which is quite different from his.

We hold, therefore, that the Catholic canon of Scripture, which was fixed by the Catholic Church from the beginning, is the only one which has divine authority.

THREE NOTABLE DEATHS.

WITHIN a few hours of each other three leading members of the British House of Commons were stricken by the hand of death, namely, Mr. Charles Stewart Parnell, Sir John Pope Hennessy and Mr. Wm. Henry Smith.

The death of these three must cause a great change in the relation of parties to each other in the House. It was due to Mr. Parnell that the Irish Nationalist party became an important factor, and that the cause of Home Rule was adopted by the Liberal party as a plank in its platform; and it may be said that the organization of the party was his work.

The Irish people were duly grateful to him for the spirit of self-sacrifice with which he labored for the redress of the grievances under which Ireland has been suffering for centuries, and so great was the confidence reposed in him that he gained the title of Ireland's uncrowned king.

The revelations of the Divorce Court, however, made it impossible that he should continue to be regarded as the political leader of a virtuous people, and his fall from that position was both sudden and complete.

Nevertheless a section of the Nationalist party continued to adhere to him as the only leader who was able to bring the cause of Ireland to a successful issue; and he himself seems also to have been of this opinion, as he persisted in claiming the leadership of the party when the majority decided to depose him from his position.

It is difficult to foretell whether Mr. Parnell's death will result in the reunion of the Irish Nationalists. At the present time Mr. Parnell's followers declare that they will continue the fight; but when it is borne in mind that the issue was largely a personal one, and that it was founded upon a sense of gratitude to Mr. Parnell himself, because he had brought the Nationalist party to be a power in the House of Commons, it does not seem likely that the unfortunate division of the party can be lasting.

There is, of course, a difference of opinion between the two sections as to whether any confidence can be reposed in Mr. Gladstone and the English Liberal party; but, after all, Home Rule cannot be obtained except through English votes in Parliament; and it seems to us that the Irish Nationalists have more to expect from those who acknowledge the justice of Irish claims than from a party which is so positively opposed to them as the Conservatives are.

We do not doubt that among Mr.

Parnell are not men of that as from the honest the into to heal disaster cherish National unite thus se factions divided We p issue an attendi funeral where t and Sm

THE THE NE by a vo Dr. Cha charge taught elably cardina Scriptu ards of the Ser Testam rule of That tlicity of phecy or was for Assemb vetoed If Biblical gical ma that m Testam "have fulfilled to asser erronee by Aln had been a that P believe Scriptu on which him to proof t the Pre longer tion of that the in Ratio as the dropping lay vote to proce therefore majority New Yo in the t Dr. B by the of with pronou General the facu him at it is diff Church minister clear in the infan sor Bri it is notab trine; that the decide a single v to susta that he Presbyt opinion the re is ine such vit appear for both ents of tion of S the two bitter C Bible a to toler Church the Bil while o deny th tion are ing the

There at large outnum not so e gain th bytery; in an R alent an of that S

From that enjoy a those in