

The Catholic Record.

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

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

REV. GEORGE R. NORTHGRAVES, Author of "Mistakes of Modern Ireland."

THOMAS COFFEY, Publisher and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY.

Messrs. LUKE KING, JOHN NIGH, P. J. NEVES and W. A. NEVIN, are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transact all other business for the CATHOLIC RECORD.

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

Approved and recommended by the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa, and St. Boniface, and the Bishops of 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, Feb. 23, 1895.

LENTEN REGULATIONS FOR 1895.

(OFFICIAL.)

The following are the Lenten regulations for the diocese of London:

1st. All days of Lent, Sundays excepted, are fast days.

2nd. By a special indulgent from the Holy See, A. D. 1884, meat is allowed on Sundays at every meal, and at one meal on Mondays, Tuesdays, Wednesdays and Saturdays, except the Saturday of Ember week and Holy Saturday.

3rd. The use of flesh and fish at the same time is not allowed in Lent.

The following persons are exempted from abstinence, viz., Children under seven years; and from fasting, persons under twenty-one; and from either or both, those who, on account of ill health, advanced age, hard labor, or some other legitimate cause, cannot observe the law. In case of doubt the pastor should be consulted.

Lard may be used in preparing fasting food during the season of Lent, except on Good Friday, as also on all days of abstinence throughout the year by those who cannot easily procure butter.

Pastors are required to hold in their respective churches, at least twice in the week during Lent, devotions and instructions suited to the holy season, and they should earnestly exhort their people to attend these public devotions. They are hereby authorized to give on these occasions Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament. Besides the public devotions, family prayers, especially the holy Rosary of the Blessed Virgin, should be recited in every Catholic household of the diocese.

M. J. TIERNAN, Sec.

"TRILBY."

Du Maurier's work, "Trilby," has occasioned much discussion, and the reason of it puzzles us greatly. It is written well, but surely a book should have some other quality. "Trilby," however, is nothing but phrasing and phrasing to the end of the chapter. He speaks eloquently of the free and easy life of the Quartier Latin of Paris. It is of course decidedly unconventional, but hardly in accordance with the moral code. His remarks on virtue, and on the future life are flippantly careless and may do much harm to individuals who derive their culture and education from the *fin de siècle* literature.

"Trilby" is a book that can do no good. It will not quicken the intelligence or be a source of uplifting thoughts. It bears as much resemblance to good literature as gymnastics bear to walking. This will seem rather narrow and harsh to those who look upon it as a revelation, as an exquisite literary mosaic. Du Maurier must not be taken seriously. He is a charming man of the world, an artist to his finger tips, but he is not the one to teach this generation aught inspiring or enabling. He must think so himself, and chuckles doubtless as the money from "Trilby's" sale pours into his pocket.

"Trilby" will be read, and the pity is that so many impressionable ladies, and even men, will indulge in nonsensical rhapsodies about it. But every such book is a barrier between them and the mental culture that means anything. You might as well ask a young person who thinks "Annie Rooney" a musical gem to interpret Chopin or Bach.

The most exquisite harmony would be incomprehensible, discordant to ears attuned to the music of the non-descript ballad, and, in like manner, the devourer of novels, the sucker of magazines (to quote Harrison) would be bored with Newman and would find the world-writers flat and insipid.

They will never realize the infinite art, hidden under the polished lines of the classics. They build the wall that shuts them out from the great realm of true literature, and though they long to return whence their foolish feet have strayed they will find the way beset by obstacles. They will have to be educated again, to forget—an art but seldom learned—and few are there who have courage for such a task.

And if, as some strong-minded people assert, such books do no harm,

what shall we say of their rashness in rushing into danger, for danger lurks in every page of the ordinary novel. They would not expose a delicate piece of mechanism to the air and dust, and they have no hesitation in introducing a human soul—the most beautiful instrument—to the morbid imaginings and superficial thoughts of the *fin de siècle* novelist. They may indeed experience no hurt to their moral nature, but the freshness and the bloom have departed, never to return.

If we have wounded the tender susceptibilities of those who regard "Trilby" as the *ne plus ultra* of literature, we are sorry, but we cannot take the resolution of not doing so again.

A NEW VAGARY.

An article by Mr. Walter Walsh appears in the *Contemporary Review* for January, under the title "The New Secularism," describing the proposed new church which has been recently championed by Mr. Stead, and which has been really established for three years in London, England, under the name of "the Labor Church."

This organization is still in a state of infancy, and will, undoubtedly, just like the Theophilanthropy of France, and several other organizations which have had a similar object in view, continue in an infantile state until it shall be consigned finally to the tomb.

This Church is to be a purely secular affair, thinking of nothing but of this world. It is, therefore, the materialization of the aspiration of Col. Bob Ingersoll and other secularists whose wish is to abolish the reign of God on earth, and to substitute the worship, not merely of humanity, but of the human body.

Modern infidelity allows no belief in the human soul, and still less in the existence of God, so God and the human soul are to be laid aside in this new church as unworthy of thought, and the only problem to which men are invited to pay attention, is what he is to eat and drink, and wherewith he shall be clothed.

The total number of members of this so-called new church, Mr. Walsh says, amounts to a few hundred persons, a very small and insignificant proportion of the nearly five millions of persons who make up the population of the great metropolis; but it is at present very aggressive, seeking to build itself up into a numerous body by encouraging discontent with their present condition among the working classes.

Mr. Walsh says, in effect:

"Without actually denying the existence of the spiritual, it gives to the spiritual a decidedly inferior place. Religion has always concerned itself with all that has been summed up in the word 'soul': the Labor Church occupies itself chiefly with circumstance. Christianity has recognized the influence of historic forces and ideals, as well as the inspiration of a future immortal life: the Labor Church breaks with the past, belittles the future, and casts its vote for the present."

The learned writer sees clearly the dangerous tendencies of these ideas, and utters his note of warning against their adoption, thus:

"This secularizing of the idea of life is, at the lowest, a doubtful and dangerous experiment . . . to put ethics before religion, and conduct before worship, to weaken the union of the human deed and the divine motive, to seek to realize the fatherhood of God through the brotherhood of man, is to reverse all tried and tested ways of promoting human virtue and happiness. It is to plant the tree with its roots in the air, or to cause the stream to flow backward in its channel."

It needs but little reasoning power to see that a so-called religious system which is based upon the fancies of every human theorist, instead of divine revelation, must be a disastrous failure, even for the betterment of the physical condition of mankind, and much more so in regard to the improvement of human morals, because the foundation of the building is but sand.

The exploded ethical systems of heathendom never succeeded in ameliorating either the temporal condition or the moral regeneration of the human race, because they were but human.

The vagaries of the human mind must make all such systems as this one which Mr. Stead so vigorously advocates, a delusion and a snare. Human systems of ethics must, from man's uncertainty of mind, result in the gross contradictions, as they have always done in the past; and this fact will ever operate in making them void of good results. But it is not chiefly for this reason that they will fail in

producing any good result, but because they are set before us with only the authority of a human device. Nothing less than a law known to come from God will suffice to restrain human passions, and keep them within the bounds of right reason.

The plan of the proposed Labor Church must be a failure, because it is utterly opposed to the rule laid down by our Divine Saviour:

"You cannot serve God and mammon. Therefore I say to you, be not solicitous for your life, what you shall eat, nor for your body, what you shall put on. . . . Be ye neither sow, nor do they reap, nor gather into barns; and your heavenly Father feedeth them. Are you not of much more value than they? Be not solicitous, therefore, saying, what shall we eat, or what shall we drink, or wherewith shall we be clothed? For all these things do the heathens seek. For your Father knoweth that you have need of all these things. Seek ye therefore first the kingdom of God and His justice: and all these things shall be added unto you."

This does not mean that we are to lay aside all thought of earthly cares and needs, as modern infidels pretend, in order to discover a flaw in the wisdom of Bible teaching, but its significance is that our first duty is the one thing necessary that we serve God, and that we regard as a second object of care the needs of the body. This completely reverses the plan of the so-called Labor church, which is indeed not a Church at all, but a godless union or club against whose plausible promises all should be on their guard.

We do not, of course, agree with all things said by Mr. Walsh in his article, and especially do we take issue with him in his spiteful description of the Catholic Church as a "dotard mumbler and impotent," while Protestantism is said to be "young, alert, and progressive." Young indeed, is Protestantism, but we have yet to learn that a youth, dating back only three centuries, is a recommendation to a Church which should be nearly nine centuries old, if it is what it claims to be—the Church instituted by Christ on earth.

Never was the Catholic Church more vigorous, alert and progressive than she is to-day, and never was Protestantism more crippled by its divided condition than it is now, and the efforts now being made toward some kind of unity of action, or some corporate union, are a proof that Protestants are themselves aware of this.

Nevertheless we fully agree with Mr. Walsh's conclusion that the only remedy which will raise up bleeding and helpless humanity is the Church of Christ, possessing the divine powers to bring the light and love of the gospel to bear upon present ills. But it is only the Catholic Church which possesses the authority to bring this about.

THE TESTIMONY OF ANTIQUITY.

It is one of the numerous evidences of the antiquity and perpetuity of the Catholic faith, that Venice is about to celebrate, by a succession of religious festivals, the 900th anniversary of the consecration of St. Mark's church. The church was first built in 828, when St. Mark's body was transferred from Alexandria to Venice. It was partly destroyed by fire in 976, and afterwards restored, the restoration being completed one hundred years later. Its altars, and other evidences of the identity of the ancient and the present faith of Catholics, have come down to us from that period, though it is usual with Protestant polemists to assert that Transubstantiation and the sacrifice of the Mass were not believed in until about the year 1049. But St. Mark's church is far from being the most ancient of Catholic churches. The Ara Coeli church in Rome was built in the reign of Constantine the Great, the first Christian Emperor, five hundred years before St. Mark's; and so was old St. Clement's Church, outside the walls of Rome. St. Clement's was destroyed by an earthquake about the year 900, but recent excavations, under the modern Basilica of the same name, have brought the old St. Clement's to the light of day, and, among the pictures found on its walls, one of the most remarkable is that of St. Clement saying Mass. The vestments he wears are almost identical with those worn by priests at the present day, and he is in the act of saying the words "Dominus vobiscum" (the Lord be with you). He is turned towards the congregation while repeating these words, and on the Mass-book, which is placed on the altar, the words "Dominus vobiscum" can be seen distinctly. It is recorded in history that the invocation "Dominus vobiscum" was introduced into the liturgy by St. Clement during his pontificate, which followed that of St. Peter, with SS. Linus and Cletus intervening. St. Clement was elevated to the episcopacy to assist St. Peter, during the life of the latter.

Another remarkable picture on the walls of St. Clement's church is one representing St. Clement as receiving from St. Peter the pallium or symbol of patriarchal jurisdiction. On this picture, SS. Linus and Cletus are represented as assisting at the ceremony. This, of course, cannot be supposed to represent an actual event, and it can have no other meaning than that this great Pope derived his office as Supreme Pontiff from St. Peter, the first Pope, and the presence of two intervening Popes shows the course of the succession from St. Peter, through Linus and Cletus, to Clement.

There is, in fact, such a multitude of monumental testimonies to the identity of the Primitive Church with the Catholic Church of to-day, that scarcely a rod of Roman soil can be delved without bringing them to light. We may profitably mention one other which has a peculiar interest from the fact that some Protestants are so fond of maintaining that St. Peter was never in Rome. This is an inscription in verse by Pope Damasus, declaring that during his Pontificate a deputation came from Antioch to request that the body of St. Peter, which is now in the crypt of St. Peter's church in Rome, should be given them to be deposited in Antioch, in which city St. Peter resided before coming to Rome; but the request was denied, because St. Peter was the founder of the Church in Rome, and was martyred there, on which account he is to be regarded as truly a Roman, and the Church in Rome is entitled to be the custodian of his body.

St. Damasus sat in St. Peter's chair from the year 366 to 367, and this inscription shows the constant belief of the Church in St. Peter's episcopate in Rome. It attests also that the Popes are his successors, and that the relics of the saints of God are to be kept with reverence. It also shows that the authority of the Pope was always recognized in the Church, and that it is not a modern invention, as the Anglicans, especially, are so fond of asserting.

This inscription was discovered by the learned Archeological Commission which explored the Catacombs under authority from the French Government, and is found in the descriptive work on the Catacombs issued by that Government under Napoleon III.

THE IMPERIAL PARLIAMENT.

The speech from the throne delivered at the opening of the British Parliament contained a clause declaring that during the past year offences against the law in Ireland have sunk to the lowest level hitherto reached in the official records.

Ireland is habitually peaceful and law-abiding, notwithstanding her impoverished condition arising out of oppressive land laws, and when it can be thus stated officially that there have been fewer offences against the law than for a long period before, it is an indication that the country is enjoying increased prosperity in consequence of the falling of the Coercion Acts of Lord Salisbury's regime into desuetude. These Acts made crimes of all political discussion, and it was no wonder that under such laws offences against the law became numerous, but this did not by any means indicate the prevalence of lawlessness.

The speech promises also legislation dealing with certain evicted tenants whose condition constitutes a peril to social order, and for remedying certain defects in the relations of landlord and tenant, and a bill to deal with the Church Establishment in Wales. There was no mention of the project by which the Government intend to reform the House of Lords, and they were twitted by Lord Salisbury for the omission.

Lord Rosebery answered that the Government intend to carry out its promised reform measure, as the relations between the two Houses constitute a grave danger to the future of the country; but he said that the first step to be taken will be the House of Commons to pass a resolution on the subject, the result of which will almost necessarily be the dissolution of the House and an appeal to the country. It is not necessary, he said, nor expedient to bring about this result at once; and hence it was not expedient to have introduced the matter into the Queen's speech.

The introduction of this matter into the speech would have precipitated a collision between the two Houses of Parliament, and thus the Government would be unwisely brought into collision with the Lords without a sufficiently recent special case showing the necessity of the proposed reform. When the Welsh disestablishment bill shall have been passed by the Commons, it is almost certain it will be vetoed by the Lords, and thus the strong antagonism between the two Houses where a striking reform is in question will be brought prominently before the electorate as the issue between them, and the time will be appropriate to pronounce upon the supremacy of the Commons in legislation, and then the contest will begin in earnest.

At the first vote taken on the address in reply to the Queen's speech, the Government majority was reduced to 12, no doubt owing to the accidental absence of some Liberal members. On subsequent divisions, the Government had a majority of 26, with the Parnellite section of the Irish Nationalists voting adversely. Thus it is evident that the Government cannot rely upon Parnellite support, but the Nationalist party proper, under Mr. Justin McCarthy, remains staunch and loyal, so that the Government is secure of a small majority, even though the nine Parnellites should continue to range their forces against it. It will require, however, constant vigilance on the part of the Government whips to keep their supporters together so that there may not be adverse catch votes against it during the session which, if repeated a few times, might necessitate a dissolution before the Government shall have had time to bring forward the measures on which it relies as an issue on which to appeal to the people.

This appeal cannot now be long delayed, and there is reason to believe that with the disestablishment of the Church in Wales, and reform of the Lords as issues, the Government will have a strong case on which to appeal. The Tories, however, profess to be very confident of securing a majority in the next House. It is not safe to predict too confidently what the actual result will be; but whatever the next election may bring forth, we are safe in saying that Home Rule, Welsh Church disestablishment, and restriction of the legislative power of the Lords will all become law at an early date, though not during the existence of the present Parliament.

MASQUERADING UNDER A NEW NAME.

A new society has been organized in the United States under the name of the Protestant Knights of America, or perhaps we should rather say, it is the virtually defunct A. P. A. under a new name.

The title of this new organization is framed on the pattern of the Catholic Knights of America, and it has been given out that the new society will be to Protestantism what the Catholic Knights are to Catholicism; but in the petition sent in demanding incorporation the object is declared to be "to protect our American Protestant institutions from the control of any ecclesiastical body whatsoever." This savors very much of the character of the old society, which also proclaimed itself in its title to be the protector of Protestantism. There is little doubt that the new organization is quite similar in character to the old one, but as criminals of every description when they become known as such try to hide themselves under a new name, so does the A. P. A., which even before now had several aliases, just as the similar society in Canada, which is known sometimes as the P. P. A., sometimes as the C. P. A., and anon as the Amoreans.

It is a false pretence that the Protestant Knights are to be similar in purpose with the Catholic Knights, which are in reality simply an insurance association for Catholics, without any political design, and not proposing to proscribe any class of citizens on account of their religious convictions.

The new Knights are organized by well known A. P. A. men, and it may be expected that they will aim at carrying out the principles on which Apapism is founded, proscribing Catholics just as the A. P. A. has been doing, and maligning them in every possible way through the circulation of an infamous and mendacious literature.

The A. P. A. has not succeeded in retaining respectable Protestants in its ranks. Some prominent Protestants did join it in the beginning, but they left it when they became aware of its true character; and the hope now is that by assuming a new name, some

Protestants of note may be induced to join the new association. There is no more to be feared, however, from this society than there was from its progenitor, as the honest American people are now fully on their guard against this and all kindred societies whose desire is to persecute citizens who are at least as strongly attached as themselves to American institutions.

But it is Protestant American institutions that the new Knights propose to protect. Well may it be asked what are these distinctively Protestant institutions? We presume these brave protectors mean the Public schools. But Catholics have always been as anxious for schools as Protestants, so that the only distinguishing feature which makes the Public schools Protestant is their godlessness. But we all know that the Protestants cling to this feature, not because they admire it, but because they are so divided into sects that the teaching of a particular religion is impossible; yet this is the special feature of the school system that they wish to force upon Catholics. It is the feature that Catholics will not adopt. Yet the Catholics of the United States do not wish to force their own views upon the Protestants. If the latter prefer the godless system, let them have it by all means; but they have no right to force this upon the Catholics, who wish to educate the moral as well as the physical and secular child. The Protestant institutions of America are quite safe, as far as Catholics are concerned, and there is no need of proscription of Catholics in order to preserve them.

Divorce is perhaps another Protestant institution which it is proposed to preserve. Well, even this the Protestants and Infidels of America, with six-sevenths of the total population, are able to preserve, if they wish. Catholics do not deem it a wise policy to preserve this institution, but if the majority insist upon the laxity of the marriage tie, let them preserve it for their own marriages by all means. They can do this too without any dark-lantern association; for they are numerous enough to do so; but we would remind those who are so attached to these curious Protestant institutions that there are plenty of Protestants who firmly believe that these things are a gigantic evil. If they are to be destroyed, their destruction will be brought about by Protestants themselves.

We do not know of anything else than these which can be called Protestant institutions, unless it be Mormonism, Spiritualism, and similar isms. Are these among the things the Knights propose to protect? They should enlighten us on this subject.

MR. JAS. G. MOYLAN'S SUPER-ANNUATION.

In another column will be found the address presented by Mr. Tel. Outimet, Warden of St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, and his staff, to Mr. Jas. G. Moylan, late Inspector of Penitentiaries for the Dominion, together with the reply.

Those who have known Mr. Moylan's genial disposition throughout his career, and his close attention to the duties of his position in every case, will not be surprised to learn from this address that the kindest of feelings exist between the officers of that institution and the late inspector, who has now retired from his position with a superannuation allowance.

Mr. Moylan says in his reply he had "sometimes to discharge duties of a disagreeable nature." It will be readily understood that an inspector's duties must be sometimes disagreeable, as it frequently happens that faults in the management of an institution of this kind need to be corrected with a vigorous, and even with a severe hand, yet the officers declare that Mr. Moylan was kindly and indulgent, even when his duties required the exercise of some severity.

An official who has discharged his sometimes disagreeable duties so efficiently as Mr. Moylan has done, deserves to be treated generously by the Government, and this is well expressed by the officers of the St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary when they say:

"We earnestly hope that such provision has been made for your declining years as a just and fair-dealing Government is wont to make for a meritorious and faithful public servant."

We are not prepared to say whether this hope has been realized in Mr. Moylan's case, but we have heard that there has been some chese-paring in the allowance of annuity which has been as yet apportioned to that gentleman, nothing having been allowed for