

The Catholic Record.

VOL. 7. FOR THE WEEK ENDING SATURDAY, AUGUST 15, 1885. NO. 357.

CLERICAL.

We make a specialty of Clerical Suits, and turn out better fitting and better finished garments than any Western House.

N. Wilson & Co.,
136 DUNDAS STREET

CALENDAR.

Aug. 16.—Sunday, XII. after Pentecost, St. Joachim, Confessor.
Aug. 17.—Octave of St. Lawrence.
Aug. 18.—St. Hyacinth, Confessor.
Aug. 19.—Blessed Urban II., Pope and Confessor.
Aug. 20.—St. Bernard, Confessor and Doctor.
Aug. 21.—St. Joanna Frances, Chantilly, Widow.
Aug. 22.—Octave of Assumption B. V. M.

FOR THE CLERGY.

BAPTISM.

For the cases where one of the parents consents and the other refuses, the Church has issued several Decrees. The following are selected from the *Collectanea*:
No. 198: "Should the children of Christian mothers and a Turkish father be baptized, if the father or mother ask for it, though the father educate them afterwards in the Mahometan sect, and the children be afraid to profess that they are Christians?—Clement VIII. in S. C. S. Off. decided: *Baptizentur*. Monacur Episcopus ad deligenter curam educationis habebat, et exprimit si certum sit quod omnes effluantur Turce appetant a fide et labantur in Mahometanum: non ad aliam certitudinem apostatizant, baptizentur; si adit certitudo, iterum proponatur." (12 October, 1600.) Therefore, the Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office would not even in the supposition of certainty of subsequent apostasy decide that a child of a Christian mother and a Mahometan father should be deprived of baptism.

No. 199: Can the children of Turks be baptized when the father, a renegade, and the mother, a Christian, ask baptism for their child; but the father is entertained that the father intends to educate them in the religion of the Turks? (*Mais on doute que le pere ne veuille les elever dans la religion des Turcs*)
The S. Congr. S. Off. responded:
1. Can the children of a Turkish father and a Christian mother be baptized, if the mother wants the child to be baptized, although the father does not give his consent to it?
R. *Poss.* (17 Sept. 1671.)

No. 200: The S. Congregation de Prop. Fide declared that a pastor is allowed to baptize a child when one of the parents, the Catholic party, consents, even though the priest knows with certainty that the other parent will afterward take care to have the child baptized by a Protestant minister; but the Catholic party is bound to inform his—or her—heretical consort that the child has already been duly baptized. (17 Sept. 1672.)
No. 201: Missionaries from the Island of Ceylon asked the S. C. de Prop. Fide: 1. Whether they could indiscriminately baptize all the children of such Catholics as, living under a heretical government, would certainly take them afterwards for baptism to a Protestant minister, because from fear of persecution they would not acknowledge that their children had been baptized by Catholics.
R. *Afirmative.*
2. Whether they could permit such mode of acting, or at least omit the express prohibition of it, knowing that those people in good faith considered it lawful? R. *Negative.*

A remark of Benedict XIV. in his Const. *Inter amicos*, 2 Feb. 1744, throws great light on the decisions which incline so much in favor of giving baptism even to healthy children although it may be nearly certain that they will not be brought up in the true religion. It should be taken into due consideration, says this learned Pope, that about one-third of all men die before their tenth year. It may be safely added that in our large cities at least one-half of all children die before their tenth or rather their fifth year.

From all this it is evident that Father Severus, in our case, by refusing baptism, acted against the express law of the Church, or rather directly against the law of Christ. His error arose (1) from confounding probability of subsequent apostasy with certainty; and (2) from forgetting that it is the child and not the mother or father, who was to receive baptism. By baptizing the child he would no more be sanctioning or excusing their invalid marriage and neglect of other Christian duties than he would be excusing adultery or concubinage by baptizing an illegitimate child. If a Catholic father refuse to send his child to a good Catholic school and send him to a public school with profane danger to the child's faith or morals (and the pastor, not the indifferent father is the judge of such proximate danger), then the pastor is fully justified in refusing baptism to such a father; certainly if he be a "good shepherd" and not a mercenary, he will use all legitimate means, make even great personal sacrifices, to have a good Catholic school, and to gather into it all the children of his congregation; he will love and foster it as the dearest and most promising portion of his charge; but he will use legitimate means only; if he, from the nature of the case, must refuse baptism to the father, he cannot treat in like manner the mother if she cannot be blamed for the father's sin,

and is otherwise disposed. Much less can Father Severus refuse baptism to the innocent babe on account of the father's sins. And, although in our concrete case, that child is in danger of losing the faith and the grace of baptism in later years; still no man of "sound mind" will seriously maintain that he is in greater danger than the children of a Christian mother and a Turk or renegade in the above decisions, where the Holy See decided: *Baptizentur*.

It is not to be placed to note here the following little points in regard to Baptism:
The rubric: *Deinde ter osculetur leniter in faciem infantis et dicat: Evi ab eo etc.* means that the priest blows, not merely breathes, into the child's face in the same way as he would blow out a candle for instance. *Breathum enim, ferventis est non expellantis.*
Impostum manum super caput infantis. The priest need not touch the child's head.
Impostum extremam partem solas super infantem.—not the extremity hanging from the priest's right shoulder but that hanging from his left, and with his left hand.

The sponsors should touch the child physically during the Baptism. As the godmother generally holds the child the godfather should take the child by the hand or arm during the ceremony.
The water is poured not on the forehead but on the crown of the head. Consequently the child should be held face downward. If there be hair on the head the priest should part it with his left hand while pouring on the water with his right, so as to make sure that the water touches the child's skin.

In the baptism of a dying child at its home, water from the baptismal font should be used if convenient, if not, common water; and the ceremonies after pouring on of the water are all gone regularly through with in case the priest have the chrism with him.

about to be married, at least the sponsor. And I could not do such a thing even in confession. Still the venerable Council in the name of the Church insists: *gravisime obligatur conscientia; et expresso addit alio quorum interest.* And certainly the mother has an interest in this matter. It is then very plain; the consideration *animas a Christo redemptas illi vindicandas* outweighs every other. Such an instruction is certainly very difficult and unpleasant, but not impossible for a prudent priest, otherwise the venerable Irish Bishops would not enjoin it on their priests. It is certainly easier and answers the purpose just as well to give this instruction by reading it to the respective persons.

It may not be out of place to note here the following little points in regard to Baptism:
The rubric: *Deinde ter osculetur leniter in faciem infantis et dicat: Evi ab eo etc.* means that the priest blows, not merely breathes, into the child's face in the same way as he would blow out a candle for instance. *Breathum enim, ferventis est non expellantis.*
Impostum manum super caput infantis. The priest need not touch the child's head.
Impostum extremam partem solas super infantem.—not the extremity hanging from the priest's right shoulder but that hanging from his left, and with his left hand.

The sponsors should touch the child physically during the Baptism. As the godmother generally holds the child the godfather should take the child by the hand or arm during the ceremony.
The water is poured not on the forehead but on the crown of the head. Consequently the child should be held face downward. If there be hair on the head the priest should part it with his left hand while pouring on the water with his right, so as to make sure that the water touches the child's skin.

In the baptism of a dying child at its home, water from the baptismal font should be used if convenient, if not, common water; and the ceremonies after pouring on of the water are all gone regularly through with in case the priest have the chrism with him.

Correspondence of the Record.

FROM DEEMERTON.

July 31st being the feast of St. Ignatius, the patron saint of the church at Deemerton, the occasion was celebrated with great pomp. Solemn High Mass was sung by Rev. Father Laussier, Dean, from Walkerton, assisted by Rev. Father Wadel, deacon, from Gypso, Rev. Father Owens, sub-deacon, from Aytton, and Rev. Father Wey, Master of ceremonies, from Formosa. Rev. Father Hasseret, from Carleton Place, delivered a sermon suitable to the event; as is sometimes said "the touched the heartstrings of the people." The choir, assisted by Rev. Father Brohmann, enchanted the people with its melodious sounds, Schmidt's mass in F having been sung in excellent style. Although the latter part of July is always a busy time for the farmer, still he was so blended with enthusiasm and devotion, that field and hower were forgotten and one and all attended the holy sacrifice of Mass on that day.

After High Mass the clergy were entertained at dinner.
The church is about to be painted and its walls frescoed. A man from Bavaria, Germany, by the name of G. Stoebel, is the artist. About a month ago the roof of the church, as well as that of the priest's residence, was painted with a non-inflammatory mixture, which greatly aids to the beauty of the structures.

A sad accident happened while putting the scaffold in the church. A beam broke and a young man, M. Hoefling, aged 19, fell a distance of 25 feet and sustained a fracture of the thigh.
Crops about this section are very good. Fall wheat in some places might be better, but generally speaking they look well; there is quite a contrast between the fields of grain of this and of the preceding year.

"CATHOLIC CHRISTIANITY AND MODERN UNBELIEF."

LETTER FROM THE POPE TO BISHOP RICARDS.

VENERABLE BROTHER.—Health and apostolical benediction. Thy active spirit in the discharge of thy pastoral duties is the chief cause of our joy. And the Catholic Faith in those distant regions are known to us. Nevertheless, joyfully do we receive the new proof of the same which thou hast lately manifested to us, as well in thy remarkable devotion to the Apostolic See, as also in the copy of the Volume just published by thee, named, "Catholic Christianity and Modern Unbelief." We, in our turn, testify by this our letter our affectionate and grateful disposition towards thee, Venerable Brother, and pray that God may give fruit to thy writings and labors for the salvation of souls. And, as a token of this favor, we most lovingly bestow on thee, Venerable Brother, and on the faithful whom thou rules by thy Vicar's Apostolical authority, our Apostolical Benediction.
Given at Rome, at St. Peter's, 14th day of April, 1885, in the eighth year of our pontificate.
LEO. P. XIII.

This work may be obtained by addressing Thos. Coffey, London, Ont. Price 40 cents.
Bishop O'Connor, of Omaha, is strongly opposed to emigration from Ireland, but is highly in favor of directing the Irish, who are settled in the Eastern States, to the lands of the Great West. He says he cannot account for the fact that although nine-tenths of the emigrants from Ireland have been raised on farms at home, they are reluctant to be farmers in America.

HOW TO BUY PEACE

Sir Charles Gavan Duffy's Message to Carnarvon.

Scheme for the Pacification of Ireland.

The Opportunity of the Conservative Party.

One of the most remarkable documents recently issued to the Irish public is that which our cable news mentioned last week as having been addressed by Right Hon. Sir Charles Gavan Duffy, ex-premier of the colony of Victoria and ex-herald of the Earl of Carnarvon, the Conservative viceroy of Ireland. The substance of the message may be described as a plea for the government of Ireland exactly as that of the colonies is at present carried on. The Earl of Carnarvon has himself made a reputation by his judicious method of governing the Australian and other British colonies when he occupied the position of colonial secretary under Beaconsfield's administration. The substance of Duffy's letter, dated from the Shelburne Hotel, Dublin, is as follows: Addressing

AN EX-MINISTER OF THE COLONIES, I can confidently appeal to your own knowledge and experience on the significant lessons which colonial history furnishes to guide a statesman in dealing with the affairs of Ireland at present. Between forty and fifty years ago, when I came to this city a young student and journalist, the great colonies were more disturbed than Ireland in 1880. Lower Canada was organizing insurrection under Catholic gentlemen of French descent, and Upper Canada was in arms under a Scotch Presbyterian. Australia was then only a great pastoral settlement, but bitter discontent and angry passions were heard in all its centres of population, provoked by the shameful practice of discharging the criminals of England like a deluge of filth on that young country. A few years later the Cape Colony boycotted the governor and the local executive in the same quarrel more effectually than the device has been ever employed in Ireland. It was the same in the smaller settlements. There was confusion throughout the colonial possessions of the empire in both hemispheres. But Sir Robert Peel set the example of granting to the colonies the control of their own affairs, and now Melbourne or Montreal is more exuberantly loyal to the empire than London or Edinburgh. The New South Wales expedition to the Sudan the other day was received with a roar of exultation throughout England, but I fear that that remarkable transaction, however warmly it was applauded, was imperfectly understood. The true moral it teaches is this—that it is

SAFE AND WISE TO BE JUST.

The acting prime minister of the colony who dispatched that expedition is an Australian Catholic of Irish descent. If his native country were governed as Ireland has been governed, he has the right in him to be a leader of revolt. But it is permitted to govern itself, and we see the result. The policy of the expedition was sharply questioned in the colony; but it was successfully vindicated at a public meeting, where the chair was occupied by the chief justice of New South Wales, the son of an Irish Catholic, and where the principal speaker was himself a Catholic, born in this island. In Victoria, where the policy and conduct of the Sudanese expedition may perhaps have mitigated popular enthusiasm with that enterprise, the risk of war with Russia called out a demonstration as energetic as the one in the mother colony. A recent telegram announces that the Irish population of Victoria undertook to raise a regiment of a thousand men for the defence of the territory where they found liberty and prosperity. Their spokesman was a young Irish Catholic, who has been a minister of state at Melbourne at an age when his father was a prisoner of state in Dublin, for the crime of insisting that Ireland should possess the complete autonomy which his children now enjoy in the new country. These are some of the natural consequences of fair play in Australia. Is there any reason to doubt that a like cause here would produce like effects? Nothing that the blackest pessimist predicts on the danger of entrusting Ireland with the management of her own affairs is more offensive or alarming than the vaticinations of colonial officials half a century ago on the perils of entrusting colonists with political power. Human nature has

THE SAME SPIRITUAL WAR AND WOLF in the old world as in the new, and what has made Irish Catholics contented and loyal on the banks of the Parametta and the Yarra Yarra would make them contented and loyal on the banks of the Liffey or the Shannon. What was the subtle device, what was the mighty magic which wrought the change in their sentiments from the Atlantic and Pacific Air? I repeat—simply fair play. Experts affirm that a Conservative majority is unattainable in England *own* Wales, or in Scotland; if it comes it must come from Ireland. A Conservative leader who is now a cabinet minister made this admission in specific terms in a memorable article in the *Fortnightly Review*. Assuming him to be well informed on so cardinal a point, the question is simplified to its very elements. If the Conservative party will have the courage to be just to Ireland, they know the gain; if they refuse to be just, they know the penalty; or, rather, let me say, they may estimate

the penalty approximately, for none of us know what strange birth the new Parliament will bring forth, any more than Frenchmen a century ago knew the tremendous progeny destined to be born of the first assembly of the Tiers Etat. To your excellency, familiar with the open and occult history of political parties in Europe, I need not plead that the most popular and powerful of contemporary statesmen have often found it necessary

TO COME TO TERMS, not only with neutrals, but with adversaries. The typical representative of skill and force in our day, Prince Bismarck, after a fierce conflict with the Catholic Conservatives in Germany, and a vain attempt to beat them down by penal laws, frankly sought their assistance, and paid for it by large concessions. Thirty years ago, when the English Whigs under Lord John Russell, and the Neo-Whigs under Lord Palmerston, were baffled and beaten by the Peelites, they ended by making a truce and an alliance with them. An ordinary English Conservative is not separated from an ordinary Irish Nationalist by a divergence of opinion as wide or by a livelier distrust than separated Mr. Gladstone from Lord Palmerston; but political necessity prevailed, and they joined hands. Why should not we? If I may have recourse to colonial examples, no one knows better than your excellency that they are multitudinous. In all the great colonies conditions have sooner or later been formed, and have worked fairly well where wider differences and stronger antipathies had to be composed than exist in the present case. I feel almost ashamed to say that what I meditate is a settlement of the Irish question—accepted as well as offered in good faith, a plan capable of being worked for the common good of Irishmen, not for any special creed or class, but for all alike, and which would be defended against all enemies from within or from without, in the same spirit in which it was accepted. This, and nothing short of this, has been

THE DESIGN OF MY WHOLE PUBLIC LIFE, and I am as faithful to it now as when I shared the councils of O'Connell or O'Brien. I am not in the least afraid that the religious freedom of the minority would be endangered, but I would rejoice to see a risk which is improbable frankly rendered impossible. No one, as far as I know, desires to disturb the act of settlement, but the act of settlement ought to be put entirely beyond question. Your excellency knows that in colonial and Australian constitutions dangers of the same general character had to be guarded against, and have been guarded against successfully. The French Canadian Catholics, who are now a handful in the midst of a nation, would not enter into the Dominion without guarantees for their religious liberty and their hereditary position. The most serious difficulty undoubtedly resides in the recollection of the minority that their predecessors need their supremacy tyrannously, and in their fear that the past would necessarily provoke reprisals. We cannot ignore the fact that an atrocious land code, an offensive pulpit and a venomous press sowed the seeds of bitterness throughout the island—but let us remember that antagonism as bitter has been reconciled in Switzerland, and that a Catholic people long subjected to similar injustice in Belgium have set an example of generous oblivion of the past and wise liberality towards rival creeds which no other country in Europe can match. It is

NOT TO DESTROY, BUT TO REFORM

and restore them, is the design and duty of Irish Nationalists. In all the British dominions there is no considerable state except Ireland with a governor which has not always a Parliament. The one is the complement of the other; and we, who are determined to regain our Parliament, would be frantic to destroy the kindred and completing institution associated with it. European publicists have noted as a characteristic of English statesmen that they expect political results at an inadequate price and are constantly baffled and disappointed from this miscalculation. The permanent peace of Ireland is worth a large price, and it is to be had at no other than the one long specified. The wonder of Englishmen that we are not contented and delighted with this concession or that is quite inexcusable. If a sane man were put into a lunatic asylum and the administration of his estate given to strangers, it would be idle to offer him ameliorations of his condition as a remedy. A softer bed and more succulent fare are good things, doubtless, but what are they worth to a man who wants to get out of

the penalty approximately, for none of us know what strange birth the new Parliament will bring forth, any more than Frenchmen a century ago knew the tremendous progeny destined to be born of the first assembly of the Tiers Etat. To your excellency, familiar with the open and occult history of political parties in Europe, I need not plead that the most popular and powerful of contemporary statesmen have often found it necessary

TO COME TO TERMS, not only with neutrals, but with adversaries. The typical representative of skill and force in our day, Prince Bismarck, after a fierce conflict with the Catholic Conservatives in Germany, and a vain attempt to beat them down by penal laws, frankly sought their assistance, and paid for it by large concessions. Thirty years ago, when the English Whigs under Lord John Russell, and the Neo-Whigs under Lord Palmerston, were baffled and beaten by the Peelites, they ended by making a truce and an alliance with them. An ordinary English Conservative is not separated from an ordinary Irish Nationalist by a divergence of opinion as wide or by a livelier distrust than separated Mr. Gladstone from Lord Palmerston; but political necessity prevailed, and they joined hands. Why should not we? If I may have recourse to colonial examples, no one knows better than your excellency that they are multitudinous. In all the great colonies conditions have sooner or later been formed, and have worked fairly well where wider differences and stronger antipathies had to be composed than exist in the present case. I feel almost ashamed to say that what I meditate is a settlement of the Irish question—accepted as well as offered in good faith, a plan capable of being worked for the common good of Irishmen, not for any special creed or class, but for all alike, and which would be defended against all enemies from within or from without, in the same spirit in which it was accepted. This, and nothing short of this, has been

A Sad Accident.

To the Editor of the Catholic Record.
It is with deep regret I have to announce to you the very sad and painful accident which occurred in John Martin's flour mill, Ottawa, and which resulted in the death of one of the most prominent young men in Napanee, Mr. John Dabroy. He was engaged grinding mill-picks when the belt slipped off and in putting it on again he was twisted up to the pulley and was taken around each revolution of the pulley. His legs were broken in five places, his arms in two places. Notwithstanding all the injuries he received, he was conscious for four hours and ten minutes. During that time he made his will and received the last rites of the Church. He was attended by the Reverend Father Whelan and two Sisters of Charity. The deceased left a mother, five brothers and six sisters to mourn his loss. A grand requiem mass was sung by Rev. Father Simon.
It is with deep regret also I have to announce to you the death of a highly respected Irish gentleman in the person of Matthew Whelan. The deceased was noted for his honesty and good principle. He died after a long and painful sickness, on Thursday, July 10th, leaving a wife, six sons and four daughters to mourn his loss. The deceased was a resident of Bellingbridge, Gloucester, for upwards of forty years.

The *Rat Portage Progress* says: On Monday a very interesting event occurred at Macaulay's mill. Miss Macaulay, in a very neat little speech, broke the usual bottle of champagne and christened the mill "de Normann" mill, the name being that of Mr. Macaulay's son. The mill is owned by the Minnesota & Ontario Lumber Co., of which Mr. Denis Ryan, a St. Paul millionaire, is president, Mr. W. J. Macaulay, managing director, and Mr. A. McLaughlin, local manager. It has an engine of 500 horse power, and its capacity is 130,000 feet of lumber, 30,000 lath and 50,000 shingles per day. Among those present at the christening ceremonies were Denis Ryan, W. J. Macaulay, Mr. Cox and Mr. Hennessy, contractor for the Ryan Hotel, St. Paul; Judge Kelly and Mr. Morrison, of New York, and Messrs. Rowe and Agnew, Chicago.

It is stated that M. Jaganit, better known as Leo Taxil, has been reconciled to God's Church, having made a spiritual Retreat and a complete retraction of all the statements made in the pernicious and calumnious works of which he is the author, notably "Les Années de Pie IX." "Les Calotins," etc. Leo Taxil will long be remembered as one of the most virulent enemies of God and religion. He was also an intimate friend of Garibaldi. A terrible carriage accident which happened some time ago to his wife, and, it may be added, the little encouragement his works received was the primary cause of his change of sentiments. But English Catholics, least of all, will throw doubt on the motives of the conversion of this erring soul. Their prayers will be offered up that he may have the gift of final perseverance.—*Liverpool Catholic Times.*

FINE ARTS.—All kinds of art materials for oil and water color painting and crayon work, wholesale and retail, cheap at CHAS. CHAPMAN'S, 91 Dundas St., London.