

The Catholic Record.

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

VOLUME XIV.

LONDON, ONTARIO, SATURDAY, DECEMBER 12, 1891.

NO. 686.

The Cry of the Dreamer.

I am tired of planning and toiling
In the crowded lives of men;
Heart weary of building and spelling,
And spoiling and building again,
And I long for the dear old river,
Where I dreamed my youth away;
For the dreamer lives forever,
And the toiler dies in a day.

I am sick of the showy seeming
Of a life that is half a lie,
Of the faces lined with scheming
In the throng that hurries by,
From the sleepless to the endeavor
And the hopeless to the child in play,
I would go where the children play,
For a dreamer lives forever,
And a toiler dies in a day.

I feel no pride but pity
For the birdies of the rich endure;
There is nothing sweet in the city
But the patient lives of the poor.
Oh, the little hands so skillful,
And the child's mind choiced with weeds,
The daughter's heart grows a will,
And the father's heart that bleeds.

No, no! from the street's rude bustle,
From trophies of mart and stage,
I would fly to the wood's low rustic
And the meadow's soft and sage,
Let me dream as of old by the river
And be content to dream away;
For a dreamer lives forever,
And a toiler dies in a day.

—John Boyle O'Reilly.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

We are now sending out statements of account to all our subscribers. We do not wish to make any boast as to the standing of the CATHOLIC RECORD. We have done our utmost—sparing neither time nor expense—to make it worthy the name it bears. How far we have succeeded we will allow our subscribers to judge. To enable us to further extend the usefulness of the paper we trust our patrons will be good enough to send us at their earliest convenience the amount of their indebtedness.

REFERENCE was made in last Saturday's Toronto Mail, the Orange organ, to the silver jubilee of Archbishop Kenrick, of St. Louis, and a quotation, as follows, made from the address of Archbishop Corrigan, of New York: "For the Church in America I would make a two-fold prayer: First, that it may ever, by God's mercy, enjoy the privilege of being untrammelled in its work, shielded alike from State patronage as from the fiery furnace of persecution, and then that it may ever keep up those relations already described by an eminence of filial devotion to the chair of truth."

The editor assumes that this statement was meant to apply to France, and also ventures the assertion that the sentiments of the Archbishop apply with still greater force to the Province of Quebec. What a world of interest Ontario Orangemen take in Quebec and its people! And all the while they are oblivious of the fact that they are intermeddlers, brimming over with impertinence born of a hatred of the Catholic religion.

The people of Quebec have their own way of paying their clergy. They appear to be quite satisfied, and if there is any hardship connected with the tithing system that is solely their own business. How would it appear were the habitants to initiate an agitation against the voluntary system in this end of the Dominion? Volumes of abuse would be poured on them hot and fast by the organs of Orangeism and bigoted Protestantism, and they would be told that no Popish interference would be permitted in this Protestant Province.

But are the people of the sister province ground to the earth with ecclesiastical burdens, as Ontario folk so often proclaim from the house-tops? Some time ago we published statistics which proved that the Protestants of Ontario are taxed far more heavily for the support of their different churches than are the Catholic people of Quebec. We might also draw the attention of our friend the enemy to the fact that the Protestant population of Quebec is not forced to support the Catholic Church, while the Established Church in England—the Church of the Equal Righters—draws from the public purse enormous sums for its sustenance. In Wales likewise the people are forced to pay large amounts for the support of the State Church, while but a mere moiety of the population, as in England, attends its services; and it is not long since the Catholic people of Ireland were compelled at the point of the bayonet to suffer a like injustice.

We cannot imagine what can influence the Mail management to stir up bad blood between the two Provinces, unless it be a scheme to break up confederation and promote annexation. It appears to be an organ that will embark in almost any scheme where the mighty dollar seems to loom up in the distance.

LAST week we made reference to a cablegram from Europe which stated that an emissary of the Vatican, a Jesuit, had been discovered in the residence of Lord Salisbury. A later despatch brings us the following information in reference to the matter: "Lord Salisbury's secretary, in the absence of the Prime Minister, was asked to-day whether there was any truth in the story circulated to the effect that an emissary of the Vatican, disguised as a butler, had been recognized by a lady visitor at Hatfield House, the residence of the British Prime Minister, and that the alleged spy fled as soon as the lady recognized him as having been her conductor through the Vatican. The secretary answered emphatically that the story was too foolish to be officially contradicted. From other sources also it is learned that there is not a word of truth in the tale."

Notwithstanding this denial, we venture to assert that the first despatch will for years to come be quoted at no Popery gatherings by so-called preachers of the gospel, and thousands will firmly believe that it is solid truth.

We are pleased to note the continued prosperity of the Toronto Globe. As to its standing as a party paper we do not wish to refer, as we take no sides either in Criticism or Toryism. As a newspaper it is a credit to the province, and the recent enlargement gives it the first place in Ontario journalism. Its circulation is over 24,000 daily, which is indeed a splendid showing. Its list, too, may be considered a bona-fide one, not built up on the coupon business. While granting that its rival printed a slightly larger number of papers during the past year, this by no means proves that its actual circulation is larger. Indeed a few moments consideration will show that it must be considerably less, as hundreds of thousands of papers were bought in quantities for the purpose of clipping the lottery coupons.

Quite likely during the coming year the pretentious Orange sheet will again embark in the gambling business which last season gave the preposterous and noisy theological thimble rigger, Dr. Wild, a free ticket across the ocean. We will now doubtless have contests for popularity between the letter-carriers, the Grand Masters of the Orange and Sons of England societies, the policemen, the firemen, the scavengers, the boot-blacks and the news boys; and at the end of the year the manager of the journal of the Pharisee and the bigot will exclaim: "Behold our circulation!"

DURING the past week each issue of the daily papers contained a long account of a divorce suit in the English courts, the wife of Earl Russell being the petitioner. The Earl is a sort of lily of the field, who would consider it an eternal disgrace were he compelled either to toil or spin for a living; and he went the way of many more before him, and still a greater number about him, developing into an out-and-out blackguard and a sort of general scoundrel, with a right to a seat in the House of Lords notwithstanding. The petitioner did not succeed in obtaining a divorce from her unlovely Lord and master.

It is lamentable to note what prominence is given to nasty proceedings of this kind by the widely-read secular dailies and weeklies of the country; and even the Montreal Witness, which has for nearly forty years constituted itself the Pharisee of Canadian journalism, has dropped into the muddy stream like the rest. No doubt there is a large demand for literature of this character amongst a certain class of our people, which proves the existence of a considerable thirst for that which is low, vulgar and immoral. True, it may be called news, and no doubt it is news, after a fashion.

Let us consider for a moment that the publisher or editor of a newspaper has a family of young and innocent boys and girls growing up about him. Will such a man ask these children to read the details of the Russell divorce suit, or matter of a similar character? If he be a good and thoughtful father he will take care that the innocent little ones of his household will not be permitted to take even a casual glance at such reading. Why, then, we may ask, will he persist in delivering such horrible nastiness day after day at the

firesides of his patrons? What other effect can it have than to sow the seeds of immorality, recklessness and all manner of villainy in the pure souls of innocent children? And for grown-up people as well it will undoubtedly be a hindrance to the development of everything that is noble and good in our poor human nature. We suppose this thing will continue on the principle of supply and demand, and so long as the public conscience is seared and disfigured by a longing for literature of the baser kind, the printing press will continue to glut the market. What are our Public schools doing?

In its last issue United Canada thus referred to the political situation in Ontario: "We are informed on very good authority that Mr. W. R. Meredith, M. P., the leader of the Opposition in the Ontario Legislature, is shortly to be taken into the Dominion Cabinet. He will no doubt be an improvement on some of those who are in the present Cabinet, but we fail to see that his presence will in any way strengthen the Government. Except by the professional politicians, he will be very unwelcome in any part of Quebec for many a day, and among the Irish Catholics of Ontario, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, regardless of party politics, his name can scarcely bare a mention. Personally Mr. Meredith is popular, but in the political crisis in June '90 he showed wretched generalship and was driven on the rocks by the Equal Rights fanatics, and like many other aspiring politicians, got wrecked."

THE BIBLE, THE CHURCH, AND THE REASON.

N. Y. Sun, Nov. 29th, 1891.

The New York *Presbyterian* threw out the case against Dr. Briggs with a mild admonition to him not to do so again. But he has not heeded the warning. On every subsequent occasion when he has spoken in public he has shown his determination to persist in the teachings for which he is indicted. He has neither recanted nor modified the doctrines and positions of his inaugural address, but has rather made them more pronounced and unmistakable; and it is fair to him to say that from the first he has adhered to them stubbornly, and in the face of the threatening opposition of the General Assembly itself.

In his latest public utterance at the Presbyterian Church of the Covenant last Sunday evening he reaffirmed the declaration of his inaugural address which was made one of the chief contents of the indictment against him. He repeated that "there are historically three great fountains of Divine authority, the Bible, the Church, and the Reason," though practically his argument reduced the three to one only. He contended that the authority of the Church came before the authority of the Bible, since "God established Israel as the holy nation before the proclamation of the Ten Commandments and before a single statute of the Pentateuch was framed," and "Jesus Christ planted the Church decades before a single one of the writings of the New Testament canon was written." If, then, the Church was a sufficient source of authority without the Bible at any time in history, when and why was that sufficiency lost? The Church was competent to determine the rule of faith and practice as a source of Divine authority before the Bible was written or collected from a mass of religious tradition and literature, why is it not equally competent now? If historically the Church preceded the Bible as an original fountain of authority, was not the authority of the Bible established by the Church, and did not the Bible come through the Church? Does not Dr. Briggs, therefore, make the authority of the Bible dependent on the authority of the Church?

He has said, however, that the Bible is a fallible book, marred by human imperfections and limitations, and that consequently the human reason must separate its truth from its error. Hence he denies to the Church the authority and capacity to determine infallibility. He passes that function over to the individual reason and conscience, declaring inferentially that the Church was incompetent for the task, since it mixed up error with truth in the canonical Scriptures. It is true that he says that "the Bible alone is the infallible rule of faith and practice," but in the same breath he denies its infallibility. He admits that the Church is a great fountain of Divine authority and the original fountain, but he destroys its authority by denying its ability to discriminate between the revelation of God and the production of the human intellect.

In other words, he has left for himself only one path to pursue, and it leads to the rejection of every source of Divine authority, except the Roman. After tending logically to the Roman

Catholic position, he turned away from it squarely and entered the broad path to agnosticism. For him neither the Church nor the Bible, but the reason, is the fountain of authority. To put it in a different way, there is no infallibility, according to Dr. Briggs, for the reason, of course, is fallible; and there is no religious certainty, but all is speculative and debatable. He does not acknowledge that this is his conclusion, and evidently he does not want to admit it, unless he turns about and takes the other course into Catholicism.

A MOST USEFUL WORK.

With pleasure we give place to the following letter copied from the Winnipeg *Daily Tribune* of Nov. 24. The Catholic Truth Society is doing a noble work, and we earnestly hope that ere long branches will be established in many sections of the Dominion. It is most desirable that our Protestant friends should be taught the truth in regard to the Catholic Church. Ministerial busy-bodies, such as the Rev. Alexander Grant, should be brought sharply to task in the most widely read secular journals whenever they are found bearing false witness against their Catholic neighbors, thus creating bitterness in a community, where all should be peace and good will.

"THE POWER OF ROMANISM."

To the Editor of the Tribune:

Sir—The above is the caption of a sermon delivered last week by Rev. Alex. Grant, Baptist minister, as reported in your issue of the 19th inst. In which, true to his instincts, he devotes the greater part to misrepresenting the Catholic Church. With what Mr. Grant preaches in his church when addressed to his congregation alone, outsiders are not much concerned, but when such utterances appear in the press they are intended to influence public opinion, and are, therefore, subject to criticism; and as the eminent divine on that occasion delivered himself of an effort to injure the Catholic Church, you will, it is presumed, give room in your columns for a short review of what he is reported to have said. The subject of the discourse was the recent decision of the Supreme Court on the Manitoba school case and its probable consequences. Mr. Grant says, "The judgments were given on the words 'or practice,' and if the Roman Catholics had schools by 'practice' so had the Episcopalians and Presbyterians, and the province could never collect taxes from any denomination who by 'practice' had separate schools prior to confederation." As the three denominations above named (and no other) had schools by "practice" at the time of confederation, and the right is continued to them (and to no other) they may establish denominational schools whenever they please, but so long as they do not take advantage of that right so long, and no longer, may they be taxed in common with the rest of the community, provided that the statute under which the tax is levied is a constitutional one. So long as the Episcopalians and Presbyterians are satisfied with a godless system of education, so long can they be taxed for its support, and any assertion to the contrary is made for political effect. The Catholics, on the other hand, cannot be taxed for an unchristian school system, because they have a right to their own, and must have it, whether compelled to support the other system or not.

Mr. Grant defines the civil government as "a compact entered into by society to allow certain men to get together and do certain things unitedly, and a part of the compact is that we shall surrender to the state our children for their education so many hours a day." Mr. Grant knows when he made that statement—and if he did not, he should have known—that the Catholic Church never made that compact of the compact at any time, in any age, or under any circumstance, and never will, for she upholds the parent's prerogative to educate his child according to his own views, but insists that he gives it the best secular, moral and Christian training that his means will allow, while the state is bound to render him every assistance to that end. The state, according to Mr. Grant, claims she cannot guard herself unless she has the children a certain time. What does the state want them for, if they are already receiving proper training in a Christian school, where all the elementary principles of good citizenship are taught them? His contention goes to prove that what the state wants the children for is to deprive them of the moral and religious training, and give them instead that which is secular and godless. It is one of the first principles of missionary work among the savages and heathen to establish schools for the children, where the elements of Christianity and good citizenship may be taught them. Every missionary, even the Baptist, begins his work by opening a school, and surely if a Christian and moral education is good for the savage and heathen, it ought to be equally good for the civilized British subject, who needs it in a much greater degree.

"The Roman Catholic says the individual is subject to the State, but the State is subject to the Church," says Mr. Grant again. True enough. There is a higher authority, the authority of God Himself, revealed and exercised through His Church, and to that authority the State as well as the individual is subject, because all must be subject to the laws of Divine Justice. Nothing can justify the committing of sin, or of any act contrary to God's revealed laws, either by an individual or by the State—hence the State is subject to the Church, which is the servant of the individual, not his master. We have a better opinion of Rev. Mr. Grant than to suppose that he could think a child would become a better citizen if it had no Christian training other than what it received once a week at Sunday school, and from its parents who, in too many cases, are deficient in it themselves. Truly, as Mr. Grant says, it is a light between God and the devil for the souls of men. The Catholic Church is fighting to place the children on the side of God, and teaching them their duties towards Him and their fellow beings, while it may be feared that the rev. divine of the First Baptist Church is enlisting them under the opposite banner.

The rev. gentleman professes to be no alarmist about the spread of the Catholic religion in this western country, but at the same time he gives all the alarm he can, and endeavors to fill his disciples with anything but feelings of love and charity for the adherents of that faith; in fact his co-laborers in the Baptist field have been noted for the notorious loudness of their anti-Catholic tocsin ever since the days of the Puritan Roger Williams. Yet the Church pursues the even tenor of her way notwithstanding all that; she goes on building temples to the glory of God, founding hospitals for the sick, establishing schools, colleges and seminaries of learning throughout the land; providing asylums for the poor, the fallen and the outcast; for the orphan and the aged; for the homeless and the afflicted; but we fail to discover the progress made by our Baptist friends in the same domain of charity.

The learned theologian said he loved Romanism, but he hated Romanism. We are pleased to hear on such good authority that he has so much charity, because our Divine Lord commanded us to love our neighbor as ourselves, and the Catholics, too, love the Romanists, presuming that he is a human being and not a myth; but they hate Romanism, whatever its composition may be. One would think that there were enough sects in the world without inventing another; but as the numerous Protestant denominations had no point of unity among them, they constructed Romanism, so that they would have a common fetich that could be held up to their credulous hearers as the effigy of the Catholic Church, who would thus be led to believe that because the visible head of the Christian Church lives in Rome, this nondescript agglomeration of absurdities which they call Romanism, must be the religion of Catholics. But our rev. friend is assured that this phantom production of fanaticism bears no more resemblance to the Catholic faith than his own form of religion; so that Catholicism, the proof of which is within his reach, and within the reach of all earnest seekers after truth, whenever he or they shall apply at the proper source; then they will see that Romanism is not Catholicism.

THE CATHOLIC TRUTH SOCIETY,
Winnipeg, Nov. 29, 1891.

FIFTY YEARS A BISHOP.

MOST REV. PETER RICHARD KENRICK'S GOLDEN GUILD.

St. Louis, Dec. 12th. The greatest sight in the way of a torchlight parade which perhaps ever been witnessed in the United States it was the privilege of St. Louisians to witness last night, when thirty thousand of the faithful Catholics turned out to do honor to Most Rev. Archbishop Kenrick, as a closing testimonial of the day's jubilee ceremonies. Hundreds of transparencies were borne by the marchers, bearing eulogistic praises. Each parish was accompanied by a band. At the Archbishop's residence, Lindel avenue, a stand had been erected by which the parade was viewed by many prominent people. At the head of the procession reached the stand, Governor Francis, in his carriage, raised his hat and bowed to the Archbishop and Cardinal Gibbons, who were witnessing the display from a window, the two latter returning the salute in a most gracious manner.

Next came Mayor Noonan, the city fathers and city officials, who performed the same courtesy and received like recognition. When the students from the Jesuit College reached the archiepiscopal residence they halted and gave three cheers for the venerable prelate at the window.

The Great Pantheistic Mass commemorative of the occasion began at 9 o'clock on Monday morning, in the historic old Cathedral on Walnut street. It was the most impressive ceremony ever seen in a Catholic church in St. Louis.

Cardinal Gibbons, who, in full vestments, occupied the throne, was supported on the right and left by Archbishop Kenrick, New York; Archbishop Salpointe, of Santa Fe; Archbishop Ryan, of Philadelphia; Archbishop Feehan, of Chicago; Archbishop Riordan, of San Francisco; Archbishop Ireland, of St. Paul; Archbishop Gross, of Portland; and Archbishop Elder, of Cincinnati. Bishop Keane, rector of the Catholic University at Washington; Bishop Magnien, of Washington University; Right Rev. Doctor Clappelle, of Santa Fe; Very Rev. Doctor

Markgross, of Charlotte, North Carolina; Very General Brady, Bishop Hennessy, and Father Cinnamon, of the Society of Jesus and Chief of the St. Louis University were also in the sanctuary.

ARCHBISHOP RYAN'S SERMON. Archbishop Ryan preached his sermon by reading an extract from the pastoral letter of Right Rev. Joseph Rosati, first Bishop of St. Louis, to his clergy and people on the occasion of the consecration of his coadjutor, the present Archbishop of St. Louis, dated Philadelphia, December 1, 1841. The letter announced the appointment of Father Kenrick to the office of Bishop of Droua, and the consequent rejoicing of the faithful.

Archbishop Ryan then said: "There are occasions in our lives so great and peculiar in their nature as to inspire the soul of the speaker with the eloquence of which they are suggestive rather than of their own greatness and he is tempted to cry out with the inspiring prophet, 'I cannot speak.' If ever one had reason to feel thus embarrassed, I certainly have on this occasion, in the presence of the venerable man to whom for nearly forty years I have looked up to."

Archbishop Kenrick reviewed the early life of Archbishop Ryan then said: "There are occasions in our lives so great and peculiar in their nature as to inspire the soul of the speaker with the eloquence of which they are suggestive rather than of their own greatness and he is tempted to cry out with the inspiring prophet, 'I cannot speak.' If ever one had reason to feel thus embarrassed, I certainly have on this occasion, in the presence of the venerable man to whom for nearly forty years I have looked up to."

Archbishop Kenrick reviewed the early life of Archbishop Ryan then said: "There are occasions in our lives so great and peculiar in their nature as to inspire the soul of the speaker with the eloquence of which they are suggestive rather than of their own greatness and he is tempted to cry out with the inspiring prophet, 'I cannot speak.' If ever one had reason to feel thus embarrassed, I certainly have on this occasion, in the presence of the venerable man to whom for nearly forty years I have looked up to."

Archbishop Kenrick reviewed the early life of Archbishop Ryan then said: "There are occasions in our lives so great and peculiar in their nature as to inspire the soul of the speaker with the eloquence of which they are suggestive rather than of their own greatness and he is tempted to cry out with the inspiring prophet, 'I cannot speak.' If ever one had reason to feel thus embarrassed, I certainly have on this occasion, in the presence of the venerable man to whom for nearly forty years I have looked up to."

Archbishop Kenrick reviewed the early life of Archbishop Ryan then said: "There are occasions in our lives so great and peculiar in their nature as to inspire the soul of the speaker with the eloquence of which they are suggestive rather than of their own greatness and he is tempted to cry out with the inspiring prophet, 'I cannot speak.' If ever one had reason to feel thus embarrassed, I certainly have on this occasion, in the presence of the venerable man to whom for nearly forty years I have looked up to."