

The Catholic Journal.

VOL., II NO. 9.

ROCHESTER, N. Y., SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 29, 1890.

PRICE, 3 CENTS.

TWILIGHT.

Written for the CATHOLIC JOURNAL.
At the soft, calm hour of twilight,
When the shadows slowly fall,
And the last faint ray of sunlight
Smiles a bright adieu to all—

From the church tower, grandly pealing,
Sounds the angelus, loud and clear;
And its echo—softly stealing—
Answers back that prayer so dear.

All within the church is silent—
The twilight dim is deeper there—
And the heart grows warm and pliant
At this blessed hour for prayer.

There, before the great, high altar,
The worn heart, oppressed with grief,
Seeking strength that may not falter,
Finds a sure and sweet relief.

All is silent, hushed and dim,
And the light, so soft and clear,
Burning there steadfast for Him,
Draws the soul so wondrous near.

To the throne of peace and love
That the cares of earth depart;
While the soul soars up above,
There to rest with loving heart.

Ah, the soft, calm hour of twilight!
As the shadows slowly fall,
Then the last faint ray of sunlight,
Benediction smiles on all.

HELENA M. SELRAE.

DILLON AND SULLIVAN.

Large and Enthusiastic Gathering to Welcome Erin's Distinguished Sons.

Hon. John Dillon and Hon. T. D. Sullivan, two of the distinguished Irish patriots now making a tour of the United States, visited the Flower City last Saturday and met with a most enthusiastic reception.

The distinguished pair arrived at 2:40 p. m. over the Falls road. At Center park Dr. J. W. Casey and a JOURNAL representative boarded the train and were warmly welcomed by both gentlemen. Mr. Dillon was easily recognized by his dark, handsome face with its classical features, high forehead, thoughtful expression, and pointed black beard. Mr. Sullivan, the poet-politician, and twice Lord Mayor of Dublin, is an elderly man, with kindly countenance and closely cropped gray beard. In fact, he is more of the typical Irishman than Dillon.

On arrival at the Central depot, the distinguished Irishmen were met by a committee from the Monroe County League, headed by Mayor Carroll and Hon. Wm. Purcell. After greetings had been exchanged, the party went to Powers hotel, where they dined. From 6 to 8 o'clock Messrs. Dillon and Sullivan held an informal reception in the hotel parlors and met many of Rochester's most eminent citizens.

The meeting in the evening was held in City hall, which was filled to its utmost capacity. Mayor Carroll presided and on the platform were a number of distinguished men, including Hons. H. S. Greenleaf, Donald McNaughton, John F. Kinney, Chas. E. Fitch, A. B. Lambertson, John M. Davy, Alfred Ely, George Raines, James L. Angle, C. R. Parsons, Frederick Cook, James Hanlon, Medina, Rev. John L. Codyre, of Fairport, and many others. In the audience were delegations from many of the neighboring towns.

Mayor Carroll introduced the first speaker, John Dillon, in a few well-chosen words.

The famous Irishman, whose name is respected by every son of Erin, is not graceful in a appearance, neither is he an orator. But he is so thoroughly in earnest, and so sincere in his convictions that, at times, he becomes really eloquent. In opening he referred to the fact that ten years ago January 26th, he stood on the City hall platform to appeal to Rochesterians in aid of Ireland. To-night he

was here on the same mission. But the people of Ireland are in better circumstances now than they were then. Why did they need money? Because a famine was impending and because the English government was imposing so many burdens on the Irish people that their leaders wanted to close the struggle as soon as possible. Mr. Dillon said the money raised would go towards building homes and buying food and clothing for the evicted tenants. He admitted he had advised tenants to refrain from paying rents. Why? Because, under the land bill of 1881, the law recognized and asserted the fact that the tenant had an equal share in the land with the landlord; this law would, if equitably administered, have transferred half the property in Ireland from the landlord class to the tenant class. But the landlords had control of the Irish courts and appointed partisan judges, and when the poor tenant came before the land court, the value of his land was assessed so high as virtually to compel him to pay as much rent as before. Thereupon Mr. Dillon advised tenants not to permit themselves to be robbed. And who made the land valuable? Who but the tenants themselves? And as fast as they improved their land, their rent was raised, and when they could no longer pay it, they were evicted and the little cabins they had built themselves, without any help from the landlords, were leveled to the ground. This was the landlord's contribution to the distressed of Ireland. In conclusion Mr. Dillon said the Irish people were no longer afraid of the landlords, but the latter were afraid of them, and soon they would be driven clear out of Ireland. He was applauded to the echo.

A recess was then taken while the collectors went through the hall and received donations. Some \$100 was realized. Dr. J. W. Casey created much amusement by his witty remarks in announcing the contributions.

Mayor Carroll then introduced Mr. Sullivan as a man who had been twice "Lord Mayor of Dublin." Mr. Sullivan, who is a pleasing and fiery speaker, wittily remarked that the mayoralty was not an office in the gift of the British government but of the people, and that the British government thought so much of him that he administered affairs during the last six months of his mayoralty in Tullamore jail. (Laughter.) Continuing the speaker thanked the people of Rochester for the handsome reception and munificent donation they had made. He had often heard the taunt in the English House of Commons that the Irish agitators were supported by money wheeled out of the pockets of Irish-American working girls, and that he had replied "What good girls they must be!" The speaker went on to satirize the present position of the Irish landlords and expressed the conviction they were now so low they would never rise again. He also thought the land courts should have the power to remit arrears of rent. In closing, Mr. Sullivan said the love of freedom was implanted so deeply in the hearts of Irishmen that it could never be stifled by so small, insignificant and contemptible a creature as Arthur James Balfour, (hisses), and invoked Heaven's choicest blessings on all present.

DUBLIN, Nov. 20.—In the Judges' Court at Clonmel yesterday John Dillon and Wm. O'Brien were sentenced to two terms of imprisonment of six months each, for advising tenants not to pay rent. The sentences are to run concurrently. Several others received sentences at the same time.

A Protestant Answered. CRITICISMS ON THE CHURCH CLEVERLY REFUTED.

The Jesuits and Their Motto—The Slanderous Charge that They Teach "The End Justifies the Means."

(Contributed to the JOURNAL.)

[CONTINUED.]

Now the point in the Constitution of the Order from which Ranke and Reuchlin concluded that the Jesuits taught the detestable doctrine that the "end justifies the means" is a detachment from the context and reads as follows: "Viam est nobis in Domino. . . Nullas constitutiones, declarationes aut ordines ullum vivendi possi obligationem ad peccatum, mortale vel veniale inducere nisi superior ea in nomine Domini nostri Jesu Christi vel in virtute obedientiae jaberet." Which is translated thus literally: It appeareth to us in the Lord that . . . none of the consti-

tutions, declarations nor any rule of life can bind under pain of sin, either mortal or venial, unless the Superior commands in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ or in virtue of obedience." The point has reference to the so-called constitutions or regulations of the Order, and the declarations in reference to their daily life in the community, and simply states that the rules laid down for their readier advancement in perfection—such for example as the rule of order: "A time for everything and everything on time"—are a mere matter of counsel, and that these rules oblige in conscience and under pain of sin only when the members are called upon to observe them in virtue of obedience or in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ. They have no reference whatever to the Laws or Constitutions of States. And those who try to make it appear that they have such reference and then conclude—as naturally they might were their premises true—that the Jesuits hold themselves free to respect or not to respect the Constitution and Laws of his country, as the end might dictate, only betray their bad faith. The case is somewhat like that made out against the school-teacher, who after stating the Rules of the school to his American pupils, gives them certain so-called constitutions or directions to help them in their studies and concludes: "The constitutions cannot oblige in conscience, nor will they be enforced to that extent as to make their non-observance a misdemeanor, except in the case where obedience will require their observance." Now judge of the blindness or dishonesty of the man who would accuse that school-teacher of inculcating the justifiableness of disregard for the American Constitution and the laws of our country. The accuser would simply place himself on record as an imbecile or a slanderer, since the language of the teacher could only have reference to the certain particular constitutions or directions on which he was discoursing to his pupils.

The wording of the point in the Constitution of the Society detached from their context, would seem to declare the Jesuits independent of Constitutions in general, but you have probably heard of the minister whose ideas were not in harmony with a style of hair-dressing in which the "Top-knot" played a part. In one of his tirades against the fashion he armed himself with the text from Holy Scripture: "Top-knot come down." The ladies were greatly offended at his denunciation, and his audience generally were much surprised at the modernness of the text. The result was a committee waited upon the reverend

declaimer for proof of the correctness of his quotation; but he was equal to the emergency. Handing them a copy of the Protestant Bible: "Turn," said he, "to the 24th Chapter of St. Mathew's Gospel and read the 17th Verse of that Chapter." And behold the reading: "And let him that is on the house-top not come down to take any thing out of it." This satisfied his irate parishioners and, though dismissal was in order, they decided to retain him as their pastor, he having so cleverly placed his orthodoxy beyond the power of impeachment.

The excerpt from the Constitution of the Society of Jesus in the detached form in which Protestants read it or have read it, proves their point against the Jesuits as aptly as the minister's text proved the criminality of wearing the "Top-knot!" And so they glory in the honorableness of their achievements! I have told you that St. Ignatius' motto was "Ad Majorum Dei gloriam," which is also the motto of the Society he founded. Now, some of those who were determined to convict the Jesuit or some ground rejected this evidence that words shown of their context would give aided by a little construction of the imagination, and resolved to make out a case from the Jesuits' motto: "For the greater glory of God." They seized upon the fact that there have been a few bad men among the Jesuits, as there was a Judas among the twelve Apostles, and they reasoned thus: The Jesuits' motto is; "For the greater glory of God:

But some Jesuits did wrong, Therefore they did wrong for the greater glory of God; Therefore, again, they held that the end justifies the means, or that we can do evil that good may come.

This reasoning offends equally against common sense and the rule of the syllogism, which says: "No term must have greater extension in the conclusion than it has in the premises."

It is a compliment to the Jesuits that on this point they cannot be assailed, but on principles that undermine all truth. If you hold to the correctness of the above reasoning, you must admit the conclusion of the following as true, which of course is not so:

All mankind should be good; But some are bad, Therefore all are bad. Therefore, again, you are bad.

Violation of a law does not give it a special adverse meaning; and so the Commandments of God remain the same in sense and purpose, however often or by whomsoever violated. In like manner the Jesuits' motto stands unchanged and immutable to brand the evil-doer with his unfaithfulness. Criticism, then, should fall not upon the law, but upon the law-breaker. But the law breaker among the Jesuits is the Judas, "rare and far between," who finds no place in that noble society just so soon as his life fails to comport with right-doing. This fact, too, destroys the legitimacy of the conclusion of your Protestant syllogistic reasoning!

(TO BE CONTINUED.)

For Starving Ireland.

Archbishop Corrigan has ordered a collection to be taken in all the churches of his arch-diocese to-morrow for the benefit of the starving poor in Ireland. He says his own observation, during his recent visit to Ireland, enable him to realize the reality of the distress. The potato crop was even then blackened and blighted, and nothing but continuous sunshine could save it from failure.

JACK AND TOM.

(Written for the JOURNAL by NARRA.)

(Continued.)

CHAPTER II.

"As I was remarking when we were interrupted, 'Christ commissioned His Apostles, 'Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and behold I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world.'"

"That passage is found in St. Matt. xviii, 18, 19, 20, isn't it Tom? Well, what does that prove? Christ merely tells His disciples to preach the Bible, inasmuch as the Bible contains what Christ commanded."

"Jack there are times when you almost provoke me, you are so opaque and dull when you want to be. Think seriously a moment and you will see the absurdity of your remarks. How were the Apostles to preach the Written Word of Christ when, as yet, the Gospels had not been committed to parchment? As a matter of fact, the Saviour never commanded His Apostles to write His sayings, and you can nowhere find the command 'Write ye.' You find injunctions to 'teach,' 'baptize,' 'preach,' but nothing concerning writing. Christ was not a writer; He was a preacher. If He had intended the Bible to be the sole rule of faith, would He not have supervised its writing, and would it not have furnished so complete and thorough an encyclopaedia of the Divine intentions—that no recourse to 'private judgment' would have been needed. Even you must admit the New Testament is full of perplexing and knotty questions which admit of any number of solutions when worked by the rule of 'private interpretation.' Would this have been so if the Bible alone had been designed as a final and complete declaration of the Messiah's rule of life? If you read the New Testament carefully, you will find the different books have many incongruities; it is evident they were written hurriedly and never designed to be exhaustive treatises; they contain but a meager description of the acts and sayings of Christ during the three abnormally busy years of His active ministry; they were penned by different writers at different times; St. Paul, for instance, never saw Christ; and St. John wrote his Apocalypse or Revelations about 60 years after the death of our Blessed Lord.

Do you not suppose Christ would have personally superintended the writing of the Bible had he intended it as the only law and constitution of his followers in after ages? The contrary assumption is absurd; He intended His Apostles to impart their knowledge, gleaned from Him, to their successors; these in turn would transmit it to their successors, and so on until the end of time."

"Well, what authority have you for saying the Catholic Church is the only living exponent of Christ—His legally appointed representative on earth?"

"The words of Christ Himself. He says, according to St. Matthew xvi, 18, 'Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church, and the gates of HELL SHALL NOT PREVAIL AGAINST IT.' If Christ be not a liar, there must be a Church in existence, now in the world, founded by Christ and against which the gates of hell have not prevailed. What Church is there that can show such a record? Certainly none of the Protestant denominations. The oldest of them cannot date its existence further back than the time of Luther, who sprang into prominence about 1520.

[CONTINUED.]