

Morning Star and Catholic Messenger
PUBLISHED WEEKLY BY
The New Orleans Catholic Publication Company at
No. 116 Poydras street, corner of Camp.
Directors of the Company are:
Most Rev. NAPOLEON JOSEPH PERCHÉ,
Archbishop of New Orleans,
President.
WM. J. CASTELL, Vice President.
Very Rev. G. RAYMOND,
Very Rev. C. MOYNIHAN,
Rev. T. J. KENNY,
Rev. T. J. SMITH, C. M.,
Rev. E. A. NEITHART, C. S. R.,
Rev. P. F. ALLEN,
JOHN T. GIBBONS,
JOHN McCAFFREY,
D. H. BUCKLEY.



Morning Star and Catholic Messenger
THE MORNING STAR has been started with the approval of the ecclesiastical authority of the Diocese, to supply an admitted want in New Orleans, and is mainly devoted to the interests of the Catholic Church. It will not interfere in politics except wherein they interfere with Catholic rights, but will expose iniquity in high places, without regard to persons or parties. Next to the spiritual rights of all men, it will especially champion the temporal rights of the poor.
Approval of the Most Rev. Archbishop
We approve of the aforesaid undertaking, and commend it to the Catholics of our Diocese.
J. M. ARCHBISHOP OF NEW ORLEANS.
December 12, 1867.

Catholic Messenger.

VOLUME IX. NEW ORLEANS, SUNDAY MORNING, AUGUST 27, 1876. NUMBER 30
"HOW BEAUTIFUL ARE THE FEET OF THEM THAT BRING GLAD TIDINGS OF GOOD THINGS!"
Terms—Single Copy, 8 Cents; By Mail, 93—in Advance

Morning Star and Catholic Messenger
NEW ORLEANS, SUNDAY, AUGUST 27, 1876.
TELEGRAPHIC SUMMARY.

FOREIGN
ROME—A dispatch to Renter's Telegram Company, from Rome, says: A convocation of Cardinals is now sitting to ascertain the feasibility of introducing certain modifications in the system of electing a Pope, so that the electors may exercise liberty when it becomes necessary to elect a successor to the present Pope. A dispatch to the Daily Telegraph from Paris says: News from Rome, received here yesterday, gives no hope of Cardinal Antonelli's recovery.
FRANCE—M. Tocqueville and M. Arbillen, Republican members of the French Senate, are dead. Camille Clauze, Republican member of the Chamber was killed by lightning on the 22nd. The election of Presidents of the Council General resulted in 5 Constitutionalists, 41 Monarchists, 39 Republicans. The Republicans gained seven seats. The Radicals of the Belleville District, Paris, are circulating petitions regarding M. Gambetta to resign the seat he holds in the Chamber of Deputies as their representative. A dispatch from Paris says: Gen. D. Clissey's resignation of the War Department was not voluntary, as President MacMahon requested it. This action is construed to mean that the President wishes his war ministry to be no longer subject to parliamentary vicissitudes and change during recess, and the selection of Gen. Durbant, who is not a member of Parliament, excites considerable comment, particularly among Republicans. The organization of the War Department, and a large extension of the powers of the Chief of General Staff are shortly expected, in consonance with the views of the Duke of Broglie, Faugier and M. Fugere, which Gen. Durbant shares. It is expected that Gen. D. Clissey will be assigned to one of the great military commands at the approaching periodical change of those posts.
ENGLAND—Mr. Disraeli has issued a farewell address to his constituents, by which he has been returned to the House of Commons since 1847. A close contest is expected at the election in Buckinghamshire to fill the vacancy caused by the elevation of Mr. Disraeli to the Peerage, between Mr. Tremantie, a Conservative, and Mr. Rupert Carrington, who has just issued an address to the Liberals.

of all parties who have pleaded guilty and not yet received sentence; also to demand of those who claim to have confessed, under promise of immunity, to show upon what authority they base their claim. All those who cannot show good authority will be prosecuted. Emory Storrs, of Chicago, has been retained as special counsel on the part of the Government to attend to these cases.
United States Marshals in Alabama have reported to the Attorney General that great frauds were committed in the recent election in that State, and United States district attorneys have been ordered to prosecute. The first cases will be tried in Mobile. Senator Spencer is urging the Administration to proceed to extreme measures from the South remain in Washington to consult with the Attorney General and Secretary of War relative to a plan of procedure under the recent order issued to Gen. Sherman. Sherman says no changes will be made in stations of troops South, unless there is trouble and troops are called for in accordance with law.

MISCELLANEOUS.
The Republicans of New York nominated Ex Gov. E. D. Morgan for Governor on the first ballot—Lyden, now Lieutenant Governor of Alabama has been nominated for Congress from the 5th District.—Gen. G. G. Walker has been nominated for Congress from the Richmond, Va. District.—The Atlantic mills, Laurens, S. C., will start again September 11th, giving employment to 1200 operatives.
Discussion in the Senate on the School Amendment to the Constitution.

Shortly before the adjournment of Congress there was an animated discussion, in the Senate, on the proposed amendment to the Constitution prohibiting States from appropriating money raised for the Public Schools to the support of sectarian schools. Morton, Edmunds and other Radical leaders distinguished themselves by their virulent attacks on the Catholic Church, Mr. Edmunds going so far as to have read the Pope's Syllabus of 1864. The discussion progressed thus:
Mr. Stevenson (Dem., Ky.) said, as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary he did not concur in this proposed Constitutional amendment. He saw no necessity for it. While he regards no man's motive, a discussion at the end of a long session of Congress was in bad taste, and did no good. He was not a Catholic, but a Protestant from head to foot. He then referred to the teachings of Mr. Jefferson in regard to religious liberty, and said if he could have heard the argument of the Senator from Vermont he would have told him that he knew nothing about free government. Kentucky did not send Vermont to tell her what her taxes should be, and that her politics should be, and least of all what her religion should be. No man could mistake the object of the debate. All saw where it came from, but he hoped the people in this nineteenth century would see through it. There was no necessity to go to the Pope of Rome to scare the people of these thirty-seven States into the belief that they could not manage their schools in their own way.
Mr. BOGGS (Dem., Mo.) said this discussion was a most singular one for the American Senate. He almost imagined that the Senate had been transferred into an Ecumenical Council (at Rome all the members were Cardinals) with the infallible Senator from Vermont (Mr. Edmunds) as Pope. That Senator was convinced of his own infallibility. He did as he pleased. He reported from the Judiciary Committee what he pleased, and kept back what he pleased. The African race had its part in this country. The "nigger" was dead. The bloody shirt no longer enraged the mad bull, and another animal was to be brought forward into the political arena. The Pope—the old Pope of Rome—was the bull which all were to attack in the coming campaign. [Laughter.] If his friend from Vermont (Mr. Edmunds) had been a Roman Catholic and rose to the Papal chair he would be the most tyrannical Pope that ever waved the sceptre of the Roman Catholic Church. It was in him—[great laughter]—tyranny and illiberality were apart and part of his nature. Who in this country was in favor of arraying Church against State? No one. The encyclical letter of the Pope, which the Senator from Vermont had read, was for the purpose of arousing feeling against the principles it contained. When the Pope of Rome spoke, he spoke as bishop of a church, and told all the people that human society was of God, that man himself was of God, and that all human Governments must understand that they moved and performed all of their functions under the Supreme Being; that there was a Divine Power to which Governments, like men, were responsible. To deny this was to go back to paganism. He commented on the length on the language of the Substitute passed by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, and said it must have been drawn by the clerk to the committee or by the Senator from Vermont (Mr. Edmunds) after he had his dinner. He took his pen to prepare this after he had taken something else. He spoke of the Constitutional power Congress, and argued that the whole question of education should be left to the States.
Mr. Morton read from the Encyclical of the Pope, and said he had no comment to make on such language as that.
Mr. Eaton (Dem., Conn.) argued that the whole school question should be left with the States. Connecticut could take care of her own schools. Let the Senator from Indiana (Mr. Morton) take care of his own State, and

he would do all he could do during the coming campaign. This whole amendment originated as an election dodge.
Mr. HARVEY (Rep., Kan.) asked if it did not originate in a Democratic House of Representatives.
Mr. Eaton—It originated with James G. Blaine. Did you ever hear of him? It was one of his dodges to get the nomination. I have been sorry ever since that he did not get it, and you have been glad. The whole was a partisan trick, put up on the Senate of the United States. It would not do to say the Catholic Church was to be stamped out of the country. He was not a Catholic; but he recognized the great good done by that Church.
Mr. Morton denied that any one had attacked the Catholic Church, and agreed that this subject originated in a Democratic House of Representatives. As it came from the House it was a sham gotten up for political purposes. It was to meet a popular demand of the people, but it was to meet it by a false pretense.
Mr. SAULSBURY (Dem., Del.) said the Senator from Indiana (Mr. Morton) knew full well that this subject was first brought here by the President of the United States in his annual message of December last. The President also opened the subject last fall with a speech in the House of Representatives. The Democratic party in the House did wisely to propose the amendment sent to the Senate, to eliminate from the Presidential campaign a question of such danger. As he listened to the debate on this subject in the Senate to-night he trembled for the future of his country. There was a disposition to drag down the Cross itself, and make it serve party ends. He prayed to heaven to defeat the purpose of any such party.

BRITISH AND AMERICAN COTTON MANUFACTURERS.

WHAT THE SOUTH CAN DO.
[N. Y. Sun, August 9.]
Till other manufacturing nations shall be on an equal footing with Great Britain in marine, in manufactures, in capital, and many other peculiar advantages which she possesses, it will be idle to endeavor to persuade them to adopt the principles of free trade. Under this system, which is admirable for her, Great Britain seeks to get a monopoly of all the markets of the world for her manufactures, and to prevent other peoples from becoming great manufacturing nations. The policy of France and the United States, pursued alike under all parties and different administrations, has been to encourage native manufacturers.
This policy of ours has been founded on the belief that if we here in America should freely admit British goods, we would speedily be reduced to the rank of a merely agricultural nation, and therefore a poor nation, as all must be had times, English manufacturers often voluntarily incur immense losses to destroy foreign competition, and to gain and keep possession of foreign markets. The large capitals of Great Britain are powerful weapons against the competing capitals of foreign countries. They form the most essential instruments now remaining by which England's manufacturing supremacy can be maintained; the other elements—cheap labor, abundance of raw materials, means of communication, and skilled labor—being rapidly in process of general equalization.
No other people possesses in so eminent a degree as these United States all the elements necessary to constitute, establish, and maintain a great manufacturing nation; and our doctrine has been that it is our duty, on the part of those who make our laws that they should so act as to favor the taking possession of all the branches of industry, whose acquisition is authorized by the nature of things. This policy has been so far successful that the time is evidently not distant when American manufactures of cotton goods will successfully compete with those of the British markets of the world. We furnish Great Britain with sixty per cent. in weight and more than sixty per cent. in value of all the cotton she imports. During the year 1875 the consumption of cotton was as follows:

	Pounds.
Great Britain.....	71,338,440
Continental Europe.....	17,130,000
The United States.....	576,000,000

We leave out other unimportant consumers. The total consumption by the factories of the world as roughly estimated amounts to 2,661,000,000 pounds. It will thus be seen that the United States ranks next to Great Britain as a cotton manufacturing nation, consuming nearly one-half the amount of cotton consumed in British factories, and considerably more than one-half of the quantity consumed by Continental Europe, while the United Kingdom, with a present population of 33,000,000, retains of late years about sixteen per cent. of her total production of cotton goods and yarns for home consumption. The 2,000,000 of people who dwell in these United States consume almost our whole production of cotton cloth, representing 576,000,000 pounds of raw material. So much for bringing producers and consumers together. As a market for cotton goods the United States is virtually gone from England. The total exports of British cotton goods and yarns in 1875 amounted to \$3,875,315, gold, of which only \$6,500,190 gold were sent to this country. Other countries received as follows:

	Gold.
India and Ceylon.....	\$2,632,450
Continental Europe.....	71,338,440
China, Hong Kong and Japan.....	1,738,000
Mexico, South America and West Indies.....	29,289,000
Turkey and Egypt.....	20,694,355
British Colonies.....	19,716,000
Other countries, exclusive of the United States.....	30,218,425

These markets are open to the world. It will thus be seen what a vast field is offered to the

American manufacturer of cotton goods. With cheaper production would come increased demand, the power of consumption being everywhere limited by reason of the enormous taxes to be paid on the raw wool in England, on our cotton-growing fields and Brazil, Mexico, the West Indies, or wherever the cottoner is found. Many of these markets are so much nearer to us than to Great Britain, that when we once get a footing we must surely command a fair share of the trade, if we do not ultimately drive out the British article.
We have at present here in the United States abundant labor at reasonable rates, cotton indigenous to the soil and close to the factory; unlimited water power, inexhaustible coal mines, sufficient capital, cheap and perfected machinery, and above all, great experience and a thorough knowledge of the industry. The country south of the Potomac, the Ohio, and the Missouri, contains, as we believe, more rich lands, more coal and more metallic ores, than the whole of Europe. It abounds in rivers, and is covered by a network of railways calculated to facilitate the passage of labor and its products from one point to another. Who pays for the carriage to market of the cotton which this wonderful territory contributes to the commerce of the world? The planter. Who pays the charges on the cotton until it reaches its final consumer? The planter, who shares two, three or five dollars a pound paid for his manufactured cotton in Brazil, Mexico or the West Indies, amounts to but a single dime.
We may safely say of all people, claiming to rank as civilized, that there have been none who have retained for themselves so small a portion of the ultimate prices of their products as have those who have been accustomed to supply raw cotton to Great Britain. If the men of the South unite with the capitalists and millionaires of the North, to improve and increase the manufacture of cotton goods throughout the cotton-growing region of this country, taking advantage of the magnificent water power, which abounds on the southern rivers and streams, we firmly believe that the low cost of the raw material, taken, so to say, from the field to the factory, combined with the immense saving of transportation, will enable us to lay down cotton cloths in the West Indies, Mexico and South America at such prices as will ultimately compel England to retire altogether from any attempt to supply these markets. The first of all taxes is that of transportation, preceding, as it does, even the demands of Government. The planter at present gives one-tenth of the ultimate prices of his products as his portion of this terrific tax. In exporting cotton cloth instead of raw cotton, we save, as far as Mexico, South America, and the West Indies are concerned, the expense of a costly transportation of 6000 miles. If we manufacture on the spot in Georgia or Carolina, and ship the manufactured goods direct to a market, we shall certainly be able to underbid British article to the extent of whatever saving may be effected by diminished cost of transportation and extra handling, besides having all the advantages which result from a close association between the planter and manufacturing interests. Another factor in our favor is the acknowledged superiority of American over British cotton cloths. Our fabrics are what they purport to be.

Four Thousand Miles in a Fifteen Foot Boat—The Oarsman's Story

Mr. James R. Gay, the Boston oarsman who undertook to row to Detroit by way of the Atlantic coast, the Gulf of St. Lawrence, the St. Lawrence River, the Lakes Ontario, Canadian and Detroit Rivers within one hundred and twenty days, arrived at Detroit last Tuesday, 105 days out from Boston. Mr. Gay says that he himself had no bet on the result, he was to obtain \$2,000 was wagered on the result, he was comparatively uneventful, with the exception of being once capsize in the Atlantic and once in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, but he managed to right his boat on both occasions. He was on his journey with no further damage than a thorough wetting. On his way up the Atlantic Ocean he met the Countess of Duferin, and was advised by Captain Cutbush to turn back, which, as the result proved, the gallant mariner declined to do. While landing at Portland, Me., a solemn looking man gazed for a while at his skiff and then addressed Captain Gay in solemn tones. "Sign who go down to sea in ships take their lives in their hands," he said; "but men who go down to sea in small boats are damn'd fools." A newspaper reporter once asked him if he wasn't afraid of running down a steamer or something, to which the reckless man only replied that "that was their own lookout."
Captain Gay's boat is a double-ender, fifteen feet long and, with its equipments, weighed about one hundred and sixty pounds. "I began business," he said, "with a coal-oil stove, frying-pan, four cans of meat, six of sardines, eight cans of fresh bread, four of condensed milk, two pounds of coffee, one of tea, five pounds of sugar, four pounds of corn meal, and cysters, lobsters and other fruits; a sextant, a chronometer, spirit compass, anchor, besides a trunk with some clothes, etc." His trunk was so damaged by the first capsize that he put it off at the next landing place, and his stock of provisions, of course, was frequently replenished. The boat is propelled with oars fastened with a pin in the gunwale of the boat. The oars are therefore rigid, and incapable of being feathered. Four pairs of oars were worn out on the voyage. When he landed in Detroit Mr. Gay had with him only a small valise, containing his toilet articles, a kedge anchor, boat cushions, a paddle and a pair of oars.

LACORDAIRE'S FAMOUS SERMON IN FAVOR OF CHRISTIAN SCHOOLS.

[Translated and Adapted from "L'Année Dominicaine" of March, 1876, for the Morning Star.]
This discourse was delivered on the 10th of February, 1863, in the Church of St. Roche, Paris, to an immense audience, who rightly expected to hear, on that occasion, a powerful lesson addressed to those high in authority.
The noble Lacordaire, knowing what was expected of him, took for his subject, "Greatness of Character," and so treated it as to disappoint at once the hopes of some and the fears of others, by avoiding all personalities and allowing each hearer to draw what lesson he pleased from his words of light and truth. The Archbishop of Paris remarked truly "that he had never before been so eloquent."
Thanks and congratulations reached the reverend preacher from all sides, as well as some expressions of fear as to the dangers he had incurred by uttering such a discourse in such times. He, however, remained calm and undisturbed, and when urged by the Rev. Superior of the Convent of Flavigny to publish the correct text of his discourse in order to counteract misrepresentations that were already afloat, he replied: "To publish it now in its present form would be bravado; to modify it would be base cowardice. I shall do neither; it will be time enough twenty years hence."
After the lapse of several years, at the solicitation of the Count de Montalembert, Father Lacordaire consented to the publication, and actually prepared the copy for the printer. But being still in doubt as to the propriety of its publication, he begged his own confessor to read the MSS, and give him a candid opinion thereon. After a careful reading, the latter declared he saw nothing at all objectionable.
Then the great preacher, sitting beside the fireplace in his own room, took the manuscript in his hand, ran his eye over the paper, gazed upon it pensively for a moment, then suddenly—touched either with a vivid sense of humility, or the fear of committing an indiscretion by a means of publication so apostolic—threw it into the fire!
Happily, however, M. Lequien, the stenographer of the *Conférences de Notre Dame*, had taken a very exact and complete report of the famous lecture, and as this copy has been recently published in *Le Contemporain*, we are enabled to gratify our readers by placing before them this magnificent discourse which, twenty three years ago, produced so deep and lasting an impression.
"ESTO VIR! BE A MAN!"
Most Rev. Archbishop—Gentlemen:
The old King David—the soldier who in his youth had fought so many successful battles—the prophet who had seen so great a distance the life and the death of the Son of God—the poet who had sung the combats and the triumphs of the Church—this King David was dying. At this solemn hour, when a man tries to express his inmost feelings with his last words, he called to him his son Solomon, the heir of his throne, and addressed him in the words you have just heard: "*Ego ingredior vitam universa terra, confortare esto vir!* I am going the way of all flesh; take thou courage and show thyself if a man." Undoubtedly, my dear brethren, it was hard to understand why such a man should say to his own son: "Be a man!" Is it not true that every man is a man? From the month of a believer like David there is no difference between the words "a man" and "a man according to the order of nature?" Truly, yes. David, in uttering these words, expressed not the faintest echo of human pride. Speaking with a God-inspired wisdom, it was not natural he should say to his successor, one with so grand a destiny before him: "*Esto vir! Be a man!*"
In all ages there has been a distinction between a man and a man.
The Romans, our forefathers, when speaking of any common man, used the word *homo* (man), derived from *homo*, the ground; but when they wished to designate a true man, they engraved beneath his statue a title which still moves mankind—they used the word *vir*, a sumptuous man—a man not entirely earthly, of the earth, but a man endowed with courage, with soul, with virtue.
Now, my brethren, what constitutes a man such as this? How can he be recognized? That which makes the true or real man, the Roman *vir*, is *Greatness of Character*. And since I propose to explain to you this word of the royal prophet, I lay down these two questions: In what consists greatness of character? Is greatness of character obligatory upon a Christian?
You may ask, perhaps, why I introduce such a subject on an occasion when you expect only an appeal to your charity in favor of the poor schools established in this great capital? There may be many reasons I might give, but I will not name them. After all, since there is question

of schools in which to mould men, and since we are soliciting your charity in behalf of these schools, it were well that both we who advocate and you, who propose to aid in this work, should understand what we mean by trying to make Christians—whether we intend forming real men, or only common men whose education may be left to any body.
"In the easiest thing in the world to make this latter sort of a man. You have only to take up a little common clay, no matter where, and you soon have a man of the common kind. But our design is to elevate man—to fashion the true vir while making Christians. Consequently, no matter what may be my private reasons, I affirm that these two questions are useful, appropriate and timely:
What is greatness of character?
Is greatness of character a duty obligatory upon a Christian?
May the Grace of God, during this discourse, assist both you and me; you to receive the truth, me to know how to announce it.

Now, my dear Christians, the first duty for me is to ascertain whereabouts within us resides the greatness which we call character and greatness of character. In the first place, it cannot be in what we call the mind, for the faculty of acquiring knowledge. A great mind may be coupled with an ignoble soul; a man may be able to enlighten his age by his intelligence at the same time that he degrades it by his soul; one may be great in mind and debased in his heart; the truth of all this is made only too clear by the history of all ages, including our own. Here mind, then, must be left out of consideration, as an utterly unworthy factor, while we are seeking what constitutes the true grandeur of a human soul.
Could it be that what we call character resides in the heart? It is true the heart is something better and deeper than the mind; for while the mind can only perceive, the heart attaches itself, and in every attachment there is an element of nobility that may lead us on to heroism. Still, the mere capability of affection does not suffice to form a grand character; for too often, alas! when these affections degenerate into mere passions, and even when these passions are not ignoble in themselves, they are sources of weakness. Thus, in alluding to majority of attachments, even the most serious and sincere, we habitually call them *weakness* of the heart. One may love tenderly, warmly and most loyally, and yet be only a common man—but at the same time a man infinitely preferable to the man of mere mind.

But the heart is also the citadel of the faculty of loving, it is the source of those impulses which direct our will and our actions. Viewed in this light, then, we do find, in the very heart of man, the source of his true greatness, whether of soul or of character. I spoke of impulses; for man stands as it were without some sort of impulse; he stands in the world as a man, and to act. Whatever urges us, we designate as the *motives* of our actions or impulses.
This motive power is the very action of God himself within the sanctuary of our free-will, or it may be called the nature we have inherited from our ancestors, or, in other words, it is the amount of virtue which we have amassed like an immense treasure within us, and which, combined with the action of God and with the action of our hereditary nature, forms that *something* appertaining to us which gives to our impulses, as well as to our will and action, their personal character. When a man's impulses are great, he is a great man; when they are little, he is little; when they are pitiful, he is pitiful.
A barbarian chieftain once visited the celebrated hermit Nil, and was so charmed by the old man's majesty and wisdom, that he exclaimed in his usual rough way: "Ask of me whatever you want, and I will give it to you." The hermit, gently stretching forth his hand, placed it upon the chieftain's breast, and replied: "Out of all the wealth of your empire, I ask only the salvation of your soul!" Here spoke not a noble heart, and you need only this one word to assure you that in heaven you may expect to meet again the hermit who pronounced it, shining there as one of those heroic hearts that occasionally dash athwart the skies to illuminate humanity.

From the earliest history of antiquity, down through all the Christian centuries, I could point out thousands of similar examples; for, thanks to a meretricious God, if the history of man is fruitful in iniquity, it is also abundant in generous deeds. But in reminding you of these generous hearts, I am only giving you a glimpse of the question, "What is greatness of character?" I have just given you one example, the example of a generous impulse, which manifested itself in a meretricious God, but what makes greatness of impulse? To decide this we must analyze greatness itself—find out what it is and what it can accomplish.
"GOD IS GREAT!"
These are the words of a famous orator: in God exists the type and the essence of all things, as also the type and the essence of all things. If only—as was said by our forefathers—if we could only see Almighty God, we would have an idea of greatness, and would no longer need a definition of it. But although we cannot see God, he has revealed himself to us through his works; in every part of the universe he has placed something to give us an idea of his nature or of his attributes; and when we look upon the immensity of the scene in which we act a little part, we have some external revelation of divine greatness. Space itself represents to us the greatness of God, and that is why, when we speak of it, we use the word *immensity*. God, stretching forth his hand over