

## THE CATHOLIC RECORD

Published Weekly at 484 and 486 Richmond street, London, Ontario.  
Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

REV. GEORGE R. NORTHBROOK, Editor.  
REV. WILLIAM PLANNERY, Author of "Mysteries of Modern Infidelity."  
THOMAS COFFEY, Publisher and Proprietor.  
Messrs. LEWIS KING and JOHN NICH are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transmit all other business for the CATHOLIC RECORD.

Agent for Alexandria, Glenneville and Lochiel.—Mr. Donald A. McDonald.  
Rates of Advertising—Ten cents per line each insertion.  
Approved by the Bishop of London, and recommended by the Archbishop of St. Boniface, the Bishops of Ottawa, Hamilton, Kingston, and Peterboro, and leading Catholic Clergymen 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.

## Catholic Record.

London, Sat., May 25th, 1889.

## A SENSIBLE MODERATOR.

The Rev. W. T. Herridge, Moderator of the Presbytery of Ottawa, is not a man to allow himself to be borne away with the stream of senseless bigotry which is now passing through the Province of Ontario. The usual resolution to ask the Government to disallow the Jesuits' Estates Act was proposed in the Ottawa Presbytery session, but Mr. Herridge, convinced that the proposed action was merely an exhibition of fanaticism which would, besides being useless, stamp the Presbytery as an intolerant assembly, stated that if the resolution were carried, he would not sign it, as he deemed it unjust and intolerant. With this understanding he would put the motion to the meeting if required so to do. To take such a stand required no little courage, but Rev. Mr. Herridge was equal to the occasion. The other Presbyterial clergymen present were for a while disconcerted, but, rallying, they demanded that the Moderator should leave the chair, some going so far as to demand that he should resign the Moderatorship and give them the opportunity of electing another in his place. Mr. Herridge thereupon left the chair, and a chairman being appointed in his place the usual resolutions were passed, declaring, of course, that it is dangerous and unconstitutional for the Province of Quebec to attend to its own business.

But the Rev. Mr. Herridge has communicated to the Chicago Interior a paper in which he gives expression to his views on the existing agitation against the Jesuits' Estates.

"The fanatical Protestants have spoken out very loudly. Through the Jesuit Act they vent their hatred of the Roman Catholic religion, and seem to regard its extinction at any cost as a prelude to the millennium."

He adds that they abhor "everything and everybody who does not suit their shibboleth."

The Rev. Mr. Herridge is one of the most highly respected ministers of the Presbyterian Church, though he is well known to be above pandering to the intolerant spirit which manifests itself too often among members of his own denomination. That he has the courage to express his convictions openly, instead of going with the current, redounds to his credit for honesty. It certainly does not savor of his being a "court preacher," ready to sacrifice his principles for the sake of carrying favor with those who are around him, and having power over him. Yet a scurrilous Toronto daily takes occasion, from Mr. Herridge's straightforward honesty, to call him a "court preacher," and lest by any mishap this should be mistaken for an honorable epithet, it adds that a court preacher is one who, like Bourdaloue, "praised God for Louis XIV. and his mistresses." Is it necessary to tell the public what journal, thus in one breath, slanders the living and the dead? It is safer to slander Bourdaloue than the Jesuits. Bourdaloue has been too long in the grave to think of entering a libel suit against his maligner.

After the above specimen of the Mail's fairness and love for truth has been given to the public, that journal goes on to state that "the question is not now whether the habitants are to rule us, for the supremacy of their solid column has long been established, but whether we and they alike are to be subject to a foreign yoke." Such language as this has often been heard in the British House of Commons, but the Whalleys and the Newdigates who uttered it were so well listened to with derision. It appears that in Ontario it can command a larger share of attention, though we believe that they who pay attention to such talkers are more noisy than numerous. The people of Canada of French origin amounted to 1,298,929 according to the census of 1881, that is, to say 30 per cent. of the population. The Catholics of all origins number 42.6 per cent. It is not true that either the French Canadians or the Catholics of other origins form a solid political organization siding with either of the political parties of the Dominion. The Province of Quebec is strikingly like Ontario in this regard, as a majority of the members from each Province support the Conservative Government in the Dominion House, while in the Local Legislatures the Reform party have, in both cases, very decided majorities. There is therefore no truth in the Mail's reiterated assertion

concerning a solidarity of Catholics for aggression upon Protestants. However, we acknowledge that if the Mail's aggressive policy, backed up by fanatics, be very generally adopted, the result would likely be that Catholics would unite for defence. At present, however, there is no likelihood of this being called for.

Neither is it true, as the Mail again asserts, that the French Canadians have disturbed religious and racial equality. In fact proofs are numerous that whether it be in sending Protestants to represent them in Parliament, in treating Protestant schools with equity, or in yielding gracefully even to Protestant prejudices, the French-Canadians have ever shown a magnanimity which the people of Ontario might well imitate. Even in the matter of the Jesuits' Estates, though the Church might well claim compensation pure and simple to satisfy her moral claim, in our estimation, and in the estimation of all who do not look at the matter with the eyes of fanaticism, the grant of \$60,000 for Protestant education takes away the feature of compensation entirely. The Jesuits' Estates Act is rather the distribution of \$460,000 for higher education, to all denominations in fair proportion to population, than an act of compensation for a high-handed and arbitrary spoliation.

Let it be admitted that Catholics have political influence in Canada. It would be a strange thing if more than 42 per cent of the population should be deprived of political influence in a country which professes to maintain civil and religious equality. Not the smallest religious denomination in the country is without some political influence; and some of the smallest wish to exert far more than their share. There are none noisier than the Congregationalists at this very moment, though they are but little more than 6 per cent of the people; while the Methodist and Presbyterian clergy, who openly declare that they wish to drive the Jesuits out of the country, have in their congregations, all told, respectively 17.1 and 14.5 per cent. But the ministers who are leading on the intolerance of the country have not their congregations as followers: and from the stand taken by Rev. Mr. Herridge, Rev. Principal Grant and others, it is evident that not all the ministers even are prepared to encourage the present aggressive movement.

As far as Catholics are concerned, the whole matter has been regarded with great coolness and moderation. They have abstained from anything like bluster, though the provocation is great. Little developments are calculated to give confidence that the gas which has been generated in Ministerial association meetings, synods, and Orange lodges will all be lost in the immensity of the surrounding atmosphere. A sign of this is to be seen in the election which has just taken place in one of the few Protestant counties of Quebec, Compton. It was confidently asserted that Protestant indignation in Quebec at the course of the Government of the Dominion in sustaining the Jesuits' Estates Act, would result in a Government defeat in that constituency. Instead of this, the Government candidate, the son of a member of the Cabinet, has just been elected with the unexpectedly large majority of 539. The Ministerial Associations may not sustain Rev. Mr. Herridge and others like him, but the country will.

## THE IRISH IMMIGRANTS AT BUENOS AYRES.

It is consolatory to learn from a communication from Rev. M. Gauchon, O. M. I., to the editor of the Buenos Ayres Southern Cross, that the condition of the Irish immigrants who suffered so much on their arrival at that city has been since much ameliorated. We gave in the RECORD an account of those sufferings, derived from various sources, a few weeks ago. In Buenos Ayres their wants were supplied in a great measure by the Irish residents, who at once organized measures for their relief, and thus the inadequate assistance given by the Government was supplemented. The Government agent, however, did his best for the people with such means as were at his disposal. Private generosity did the rest.

The immigrants remained but a few days in the city, and were sent forward to their destination, the Irish colony at Naposta. The weather was very favorable and fine, otherwise they would have suffered much before being able to find shelter at the end of their journey. The country in which they have settled is believed to be exceedingly fertile; and the hopeful Irish temperament has so asserted itself that the sufferings of the past seem to have been already forgotten, and hopes of a prosperous future are entertained; nevertheless the evil effects of their first hardships have been severely felt, there being many cases of serious illness, and several deaths having resulted therefrom. It is expected that there are some more deaths to follow yet. However, their difficulties are rapidly being overcome, and as arrangements have been made to have provisions supplied to them until their first crops come in, there is no danger of starvation, though the food to be supplied is of simple character, consisting chiefly of fish meat, biscuits, tea,

sugar, salt and other necessities. Clothing is badly needed by the settlers, as the nights, especially, are getting cold, but it is hoped that they will be supplied by private charity.

## PROFESSOR HUXLEY ON AGNOSTICISM.

Professor Huxley has a cacothetic of attacking religion. In his own sphere of science his great ability cannot be denied, but it cannot be said that as a writer on religious subjects he is a success. A greater mind than Mr. Huxley's failed (gregotiously when it turned from scientific reasoning to the interpretation of Scripture, which was a new field even to the illustrious Sir Isaac Newton. Sir Isaac Newton, however, notwithstanding the errors into which he fell in Scriptural interpretation, was highly religious and respected God and his revealed word. With Professor Huxley the case is different. He is one of the principal upholders of Darwin's theories concerning the origin of man by development from less perfect creatures, directly from the chimpanzee, or some other ape, till we arrive at the modern, which are supposed to be the first and simplest form in which animal life appeared in the world. At the best this doctrine is acknowledged by its most earnest friends and advocates who are endowed with any learning, to be a mere theory which never has been, and in all probability never will be, proved. Professor Huxley himself acknowledges that there is an insuperable difficulty to prove that man has been developed from any other animal; for, comparing man and the ape, which most resemble man, he says: "the differences between man and the man-like apes certainly justify our regarding him as constituting a family apart from them." It seems to us that the Professor adheres to Darwinism as a mode of getting rid of the necessity for a Creator, in accounting how the universe with all its marvels has come into existence.

This is somewhat of a digression from the subject on which we propose to make some remarks here, nevertheless it illustrates how ready men of science are, sometimes, to accept very dubious theories which they esteem highly probable, though in matters of religion they prefer to say that it is impossible to attain to knowledge, and they therefore proclaim themselves "Agnostics;" that is to say, "Know Nothings" on all matters of doctrine. This is the case with Professor Huxley. There is in the last Nineteenth Century Magazine an article from his pen entitled "Agnosticism," in which, for the second time, he attacks the foundation of Christianity, maintaining that the first three gospels are comparatively late accounts of an older tradition concerning the life of our Lord Jesus Christ on earth. Thus he says:

"There is now no doubt that the three Synoptic Gospels, so far from being the work of three independent writers, are closely interdependent, and that in one of two ways. Either all three contain at their foundation, verities to a large extent verbally identical, of one and the same tradition; or two of them are thus closely dependent on the third; and the opinion of the majority of the best critics has, of late years, more and more converged toward the conviction that our canonical second gospel, the so-called Mark's Gospel, is that which most closely represents the primitive ground-work of the three. That I take to be one of the most valid results of New Testament criticism, of immeasurably greater importance than the discussion about dates and authorship."

It is worthy of remark that though the Professor's object is to destroy the credit of these Gospels, for authenticity, he altogether neglects to give any reason whatsoever why they should not be believed. Strangely enough he gives credit to the writers of these Gospels, and indeed of the whole New Testament, for sincerity. This he acknowledges in the following manner:

"It is the question whether the New Testament books, being, as I believe they were, written and compiled by people who, according to their lights, were perfectly sincere, will not, when properly studied as ordinary historical documents, afford us the means of self criticism."

If the writers of the New Testament were "perfectly sincere" why should they not be believed at least when they are relating public facts, which they have either witnessed with their own eyes, or the truth of which they have ascertained from eye witnesses innumerable who were thoroughly reliable? We do not speak here of their speculative opinions concerning doctrine, but of such facts as the time when Christ was born, when He commenced His missionary labors, when He was crucified, and how long He stayed on earth after His crucifixion; such marvellous facts also as the change of water into wine at Cana of Galilee, the curing of all manner of diseases, as related in St. Matt. xlii, xliii, St. Luke xiv, and elsewhere throughout the Gospels. Why should they not be believed when they tell how He raised Lazarus from the dead, or the son of the widow of Naim? or when they relate the history of Christ's sufferings, or of His resurrection and ascension? The writings of authors bordering on the very period when the Gospels were written have come down to us, some written before, and some after the Gospels; and we accept the works of Julius Cæsar,

Tacitus, Josephus, etc., almost as if they related Gospel truths; in fact with far more implicit confidence than agnostics or infidels accord to the writings of St. Matthew, Mark, Luke and John. The former are believed because they are known from characteristics of their writing to be sincere, and because the facts which they relate are facts which happened in great part within their personal knowledge, and partly because they had access to witnesses in plenty who were thoroughly cognizant of the facts related. The writers of the four Gospels had in a more eminent degree all these qualifications for narrating the truth. But if we had corroborative evidence of writers contemporaneous with Cæsar and the other non-Christian authors we have named, we would be ready to acknowledge the cumulative testimony of several such writers, as placing their testimony far beyond dispute. In regard to the Gospel we have this cumulative testimony. The Gospels themselves are four in number, the work of different writers; but besides these we have the Acts of the Apostles and the epistles of St. Paul, James, Peter, Jude, and John, which are all based upon the Gospel narrative, and presuppose its details. These details they frequently refer to as facts well known to those for whom they write, being evidently aware that the Christians to whom they are writing have by some means or other full knowledge of the facts. Surely it is not a sufficient refutation of the truth of the Gospels to say, as Mr. Huxley says in a footnote to his article: "I may perhaps return to the question of the authorship of the Gospels. For the present I must content myself with warning my readers against any reliance upon Dr. Wace's statements as to the results arrived at by modern criticism. They are as gravely as surprisingly erroneous."

Agnostics or Infidels of Professor Huxley's stamp seem to take it for granted that their bare assertion is a sufficient refutation of any array of sound reasoning on which Christians may rely. It is not our purpose here to enter upon a rehearsal of the evidence of the authenticity and truth of the Gospels. To do this would require a treatise, and the work is already done by many eminent scholars. But we will make a few reflections upon some statements made by the Professor, whereby he hopes, but signally fails, to undermine the authority of the Gospels. In a passage already quoted above, he speaks of the first three gospels, the "Synoptic gospels," as if it were a proved fact that they existed some primitive gospel on which these three gospels were based at a later period, each writer departing from the original in his own fashion, adding such circumstances as fancy dictated, or as had come to his knowledge through other sources, concerning Christ's life on earth. This theory, to which the infidels of to-day are very fond of holding, has no foundation whatsoever in fact. There is not a particle of evidence that this was the case. From the very earliest period of Christianity the four gospels have been referred to more or less directly, by the Christian writers of each period, but there is not the least reason for believing that there was ever a previous gospel, which as from a common written source the gospels we now have were drawn and fashioned. The closest criticism cannot draw any other inference than this: that the four gospels were written by different persons, having in view the same general purpose, to instruct the Christian Church in the knowledge of the life of Christ on earth, and in His doctrines, yet with certain differences of purpose in detail, which led them to follow a different method in their narrations. Thus, St. Matthew wrote his gospel for the Jews of Palestine who had become Christians. This gives a peculiar characteristic to his gospel, that he does not deem it necessary to explain the Jewish customs to which he alludes, nor to dilate upon geographical peculiarities, with which the Christianized Jews who were to read his writings were supposed to be already acquainted. He is, however, very particular in proving from the Old Testament that Jesus is the Messiah of whom the prophets spoke. St. Mark wrote in Rome, for the instruction of converts from the paganism of Rome. St. Luke, by personal investigation, made himself acquainted with the circumstances of Christ's life and teaching, and writing especially for Greeks, gives geographical notices of localities in Palestine of which he speaks: at the same time there is nothing of the Hebraistic peculiarities of St. Matthew in his Gospel. St. John's Gospel is of a supplementary character, and its object is to impress the spiritual character of Christ's teachings upon those who read it: and it treats with more speciality upon Christ's divinity than do the other gospels.

These differences of object explain certain differences between the Evangelists in style and in mode of narrating the same events. That they wrote independently of each other is clear. The resemblances which occur between the gospels arise from the fact that they relate the history and frequently record the very words of the same Christ, but

the differences are just such as would occur when different persons undertake to write on the same subject, though with different purposes in view. The whole testimony of history is to the effect that the same four gospels which we have to day are those which were read in the Christian Church from the very beginning.

Professor Huxley thinks that he has satisfactorily shown that there are remarkable discrepancies between the gospels when the same event is related. We will in a future issue have some remarks on this point. We will only add here that the discrepancies which he points out are but imaginary. The narratives are made from a different point of view, but there is no more difference between them than would at any time occur when different persons relate the same events.

## THE EX-NUN OF KENMARE.

Miss Cusack, formerly known as "the Nun of Kenmare," has been regaling a select audience of ministers and ladies with a rehearsal of old lies from former No-Popery lecturers, spiced with new ones of her own manufacture. In spite of her very recent protestations that the reports of her abandonment of the Catholic faith were false, she now declares that she has left the Church because she could not be a good Catholic and be honest at the same time. Fishing for opposition from the priesthood, which she might turn to pecuniary advantage, she declares that "Protestants need reliable information, and that I will give them in spite of all the opposition of the priests." It does not seem that she has angled very successfully, for the priests have let her severely alone, but she did find some simple people who purchased her book and tickets for the lecture which she was about to deliver on "the Jesuits," a popular subject now with those who like to hear that illustrious religious order maligned. The ex-nun stated also that Catholics are ignorant of the tenets of their religion, and that "most of the priests are out and out infidels." As it is well known that Protestantism throughout the United States, and all Europe, except Great Britain, has degenerated into infidelity, if Miss Cusack be telling the truth, Christianity must have come to a deplorable pass indeed. Our consolation is that we know that the newly-fledged No-Popery orator wishes to deceive her audience.

As yet, the ex-nun has not gone to the extent of stating, like other renegade No-Popery orators, that all nuns and priests are leading grossly immoral lives, and it is only the Jesuits that are accused in her lecture of the 14th inst. of gross violations of Christian ethics. As she is, however, well aware that the Jesuits are but a small portion of the priesthood, it may justly be inferred that she admits the virtuous lives led by priests in general, and thus virtually contradicts the favorite thesis which audiences like hers have been accustomed to listen to with great delight. Indeed, she stated that the Bishop of Brooklyn had banished the Jesuits from his diocese, leaving it to be inferred that they were so banished on account of their wickedness. If this be so, the Bishop must be himself a good Christian, and he must have great confidence in the superior morality of the secular priesthood, who form the great bulk of the priests of America. Out of about 10,000 priests in the United States and Canada, there are certainly not three hundred Jesuits. The ex-nun's statements thus afford food for reflection to the average Protestant audience who are fond of hearing the priesthood abused, and who encourage such lecturers as Widdows, Chislay and Falton.

We believe that as a matter of fact there are no Jesuits in the diocese of Brooklyn, but we know that the cause of this is not as the ex-nun wished her audience to believe. There are not so many Jesuits in the world as would supply a community to all the dioceses which would be glad to have them, and Brooklyn is not alone in not having them. It is very easy to conceive that there are existing circumstances which prevent them from being in the diocese of Brooklyn, but we do not think it worth while to suggest what these circumstances may be. It is certain that the reasons are not such as should be inferred from the malicious innuendoes of the ex-nun.

She further stated that the methods resorted to by Jesuits in influencing the public are most dangerous. She said: "The women are worked on through confession, and the young men are treated in the most lenient manner." The women worked on! For what purpose are the women worked on? The ex-nun knows, and so does every one who knows what it is to go to confession, that the sole object of the Jesuits, and of all priests, in hearing confessions, is to bring souls to Christ, and to induce them to lead Christian lives. Her insinuation, if she really means to insinuate it, that there is some dark and evil object in view, is simply cowardly and malicious. It is cowardly, because she has not yet mustered courage to assert positively what she insinuates; it is malicious, because it is intended to make people believe the false insinuation.

But what of the awful charge that the Jesuits are lenient to young men? We admit it; and we admit that they are lenient to young women too. Ought they to be in readiness, like tigers, to tear their penitents to pieces? Our Lord Jesus Christ, too, was lenient. He treated kindly the most grievous sinners. He was lenient to Z. Z. Z. and to Mary Magdalene, and His parable of the Pharisee and the Publican must for ever be a lesson to His true followers, such as the Jesuits are, to be lenient to penitents; nay, His death upon the cross for sinners is the most beautiful and touching proof of the leniency with which sinners are to be treated by the priests of Him who came on earth to call, not the just, but sinners to penance.

Of course, we are aware that the ex-nun means to insinuate more in the above extract than she is bold enough to say positively. She means to insinuate that Jesuits are wont easily to permit young men to continue in sinful courses. We are tired of following up their cowardly innuendoes. Let her make positive statements and we shall know how to deal with them. We shall only say now that such an insinuation is like the one with which we previously dealt, false also. It will be time enough to prove this at length when the maligner of the Jesuits will have the courage to say what she means. Her nonsectarian insinuation that the Jesuits poisoned Pope Clement XIV. because he issued the Bull suppressing their order we pass over with equal contempt. Such a charge should be positively made, and some plausible proof, at least, should be given, before a serious attempt be made at a refutation.

The ex-nun of Kenmare ought to take lessons in lying from her colleague in the lecturing field, Edith O'Gorman. Edith can make positive assertions.

Not satisfied with her success as a lecturer, the ex-nun has written a supplementary letter to that congenial paper, the Mail, and it appears in that journal of the 16th inst. She states in her letter that there has occurred in New York a family scandal in which the parties are apparently all Romanists. Her authority for the statement is the New York Herald of the 14th inst., and because a lady who is one of the family said that she is under the direction of the Jesuit Fathers of St. Francis Xavier's, New York, the ex-nun draws the inference that Jesuit influence in the family must be bad.

The whole story is too much of the cock-and-a-bull kind to deserve serious consideration. The parties "are all apparently Romanists." The literary lady is not sure whether they are or not. The New York Herald reports the story; yet it sometimes happens that the first reports of the news gatherers are grossly exaggerated. One of the parties named in the story was perhaps once or twice at confession to a Jesuit. Who knows but some one among them made a confession once to Bishop Potter, or publicly at a Methodist revival! Every one knows that confessions are made both in the P. E. Church and in the Methodist. Yet the ex-nun draws the rather premature conclusion that the Jesuits are responsible for the whole scandal. She may not be aware that there are sometimes family scandals in which no one concerned is a Catholic at all. This was the case with the scandal on account of which a Protestant minister was the other day turned out of the ministry in Orangeville, Ontario. The Jesuits had nothing to do with that scandal at all events.

But we do not pretend that all persons who have gone once or twice to confession are ever after secure from falling into evil ways. We do not consider it necessary to disprove that the Jesuits are the cause of every sin into which Catholics may unfortunately fall; neither do we hold every Protestant minister responsible for every evil deed which Protestants commit. But in the Orangeville case, we are sorry to say, a clergyman is the principal. This is worse than Miss Cusack's New York case, in which it is not even pretended that a Jesuit is at all involved. The ex-nun is simply a bungler, and will soon be as violent as the most violent No-Popery lecturer, for, in the depth of a fall like hers, there are always deeper depths.

## FRENCH IN ONTARIO SCHOOLS.

Mr. Craig, M. P. for Durham, who, with the view of abolishing French from the schools of Ontario, asked for the returns of the number of French teachers in Ontario who cannot teach in English, has gone to California to reside. He did not wait till the department had the returns ready, but they were published just about the time when Mr. Craig was started on the journey. It is a pity he did not wait for them. It appears by the returns that out of 5,549 schools which are in Ontario there is one school in 15 Gloucester, Carleton Co., where the assistant cannot teach English, though the head teacher can do so "fairly well." In 26 Gloucester, though the report states that the teachers cannot use English in teaching, the remark is appended: "Miss Schoffer can use the English language fairly well." In Stormont Co., in school No. 12, Township of Tench, one teacher is reported as

insufficient in English, and in No. Co. of Simcoe, the principal teacher is, and the assistant, French. E. taught by Olenford's method in schools of Prescott and Russell where instruction is in French, and the method is used in nearly all the schools of Essex. Truly the mountain in which caused so much excitement Ontario legislature, with Mr. Craig and Mr. Meredith following the lead, brought forth a ridiculous measure, whole Province has been trumped up, in order to tease one or two and a couple of dozen French Canadian children.

## A SPECIMEN CONVEYED.

The Cleveland Leader of the 25th announced with startling outbursts the election of a prominent priest for Catholic Church, and his adoption of the creed of the Free-Will Baptists, at Wood, Crawford Co., Pa. The priest was said to be Rev. Vanderborg, a Belgian, and a member of the Benedictine order. Many details of the supposed ex-priest's circumstances are added which give whole story an air of credibility. Other circumstances it was that he had been a Jesuit for many years, stationed six years in Erie, Pa., four or five years in St. Jerome's, near Pittsburgh. He was said to be a member of the Benedictine order, with three monasteries under his direction, and Bishop Vanderborg, O. M. I., was said to be his uncle, and that he was to be the superior of the monastery on Euclid Avenue, Cleveland.

The whole of the above story is fabrication. The Catholic Union of Cleveland, prints out how the circles which are added to embellish the tale are all false, and that there has been no Bishop nor priest of the name Vanderborg. There is no Jesuit, monasteries on Euclid Avenue, Cleveland, Jesuit superior named Vanderborg, besides, a letter from the General of Erie, Father Thomas, denying that any priest of the name ever officiated in the diocese either as a secular or in any community. The superior of the diocese in Erie also publishes a statement that no priest of the name lodged at any monastery of the name any part of the United States.

The Free Will Baptists of Gl. have, evidently, a sharper play on their credulity for business purposes.

## MORGANATIC MARRIAGE.

Those Protestants who speak marriage as a sacred rite savor of the frequency with which "morganatic marriages" are contracted in Europe, especially in Germany under German law. A morganatic marriage is a person of social position. This is allowed by law, but the wife in such a marriage does not obtain the husband's rank nor do the children begotten in such marriages inherit the husband's rank. The wife also has no claim to dowry than the presents which are given to her by her husband, may be specially provided for will.

Princes married in this way contract marriage with princely blood, in which case, of course, would have two wives. It is not said that before God such marriages are unlawful, as princes are not exempt from the universal law by which all are bound.

Prince Alexander of Battenberg was the Prince of Bulgaria who was driven from the Bulgarian throne by the pressure brought to bear by the Czar, not long since one of those morganatic marriages, an opera singer, Mlle. Loisinger, standing that it was believed was betrothed to a sister of the Emperor.

A Protestant periodical, the Companion, speaking of these marriages, says: "In our eyes the of double marriages is clearly of Christian precepts. It can be defended on the highest ground of religion and morality; but on the continent of Europe it is recognized churches as well as by the royal and it will probably be very long before the custom ceases to be practiced."

This periodical is mistaken in that it is recognized by the Church, which has always adhered to the inviolable sanctity of the marriage making no distinction in the law of the land between prince and peasant. It has occurred between them have violated the laws of the but in such cases the Church has hesitated to inflict the severest censures, and has brought even back again to penance when so transgressed the Divine half-hearted way in which Protestants against such transgressions proves the necessity of a living in the Church, which will not