

ask for an amendment to the Constitution. We do not want any remodelling of the British North America Act. All we want is that what is law in Quebec should be custom here—fair representation for the minority."

An extract from a speech by Sir John Macdonald is also given, in which he said:

"Gentlemen, the principle of civil and religious liberty must be vindicated; the Catholic people of Ontario are entitled to the same rights and privileges as the Protestants of Quebec."

The Catholics certainly were "entitled" to the same rights, but such rights never were accorded to them. And the only way in which their rights could have been secured was by a guarantee such as Sir John saw was provided for the Protestants of Quebec. None knew this better than Sir John, and for the theory thus propounded none had greater opportunities for practical enforcement than he. But his practice certainly fell far short of his professions, as it was with extreme reluctance and only upon the greatest pressure he could be induced to appoint a Catholic to any position in Ontario, and when an appointment was conferred it was so grudgingly given that whatever merit there might have been in the gift was lost in the manner of its bestowal.

Our correspondent shows that in Quebec the Protestants have always had a far larger representation in the judiciary than they were entitled to in proportion to their numbers, amongst them being several chief justices, including Sir Charles Stuart, Sir William C. Meredith and Sir Francis Johnston. There are now on the Bench Judges Hall, Tait (acting chief justice), Lynch, Gill, Davidson, Andrews, Brooks and Archibald, eight in number; and this number the Protestants have always had on the Bench.

When there was not a Catholic on the Bench in Ontario, and James O'Reilly was promised the Judgeship at Kingston by Sir John Macdonald, the Orangemen of that district threatened that if Mr. O'Reilly were appointed they would oppose the Hon. Alex. Campbell at the next senatorial election for the Cataraqui Division. It is almost incredible that Sir John—after the party services of Mr. O'Reilly and the Catholics of Ontario—should have ignominiously surrendered to this intolerant demand that O'Reilly should be sacrificed because of his religious convictions. But Sir John surrendered, and asked Mr. O'Reilly to relinquish his claim to the appointment, and thus prevent the Government from being embarrassed. Mr. O'Reilly was compelled to forego his claim although his support of Sir John and the Conservative party had been life-long, and he had done yeoman service in many hotly contested campaigns, not only in Kingston and its vicinity, but also through the whole Ottawa District. Such, however, was the return for political fidelity which knew neither race nor creed, when advocating the return of candidates of the party to which he was allied.

Mr. O'Reilly's case is only one of the many instances in which a Catholic has helped to sow, but has been told in most unmistakable terms that he would not be allowed to reap.

No one ever heard of a Protestant in Quebec being asked to forego his right to a Government appointment: or to release a minister of the Crown from his promise, because, owing to the fanaticism of the Catholics, "the Government would be embarrassed" if its pledged faith were kept. In Quebec there are forty Judges including those of the Queen's Bench, Superior Court, Circuit Courts, General Sessions, and Recorders Courts, and of this number eight are Protestants. In Ontario there are in the Superior Courts fourteen Judges: of these one is a Catholic—Judge McMahon. Of the forty-four County Court Judges and twenty-two junior County Court Judges, there is one Catholic County Court Judge, Judge Lacourse, and four Catholic junior County Court Judges, viz.: Judges Doyle, McHugh, Klein, and Edward O'Connor, and Judge Valin of the District of Nipissing.

In the history of the Province from 1840 to the present time—a period of fifty-five years—only ten Catholics have been on the bench, which number includes the six already named and Judges Fitzgerald, Macarow, Olivier and Hon. John O'Connor.

In June, 1892, Mr. Sam Hughes, M. P., made the following detestably mendacious statement on the floor of the House of Commons when he was accused of leaving the Liberal party:

"When he saw a contract made with the Roman Catholic League of Ontario, whereby public offices and judicial positions were bartered away to the

Roman Catholics of the Province, he left the party. As a young Canadian he refused point blank to give his allegiance to such a party. When he saw the late Archbishop Lynch running the education of the country he resented such principles and left the party."

That statement was made twenty years after the Catholic League was formed; the Conservative party was in power in Ottawa at its formation, and can Bro. Sam Hughes point to any judicial or other positions that were bartered away to the Catholics of Ontario for their support? He cannot point to one. In the "Facts for Irish Electors" sent out by Sir John and Mr. Meredith in 1883 (twelve years after the League was formed) the Catholics were told as to their treatment by the Ontario Government:

"In the Department of Education, Toronto, there are fifty-eight employees who cost the country about \$48,000 a year, and there is only one Catholic in the Department, and he was appointed before Mr. Crooks took charge of his present office. In the Register General's office there never has been a Catholic permanently employed within its walls."

"In the Treasurer's Department, Toronto, there are \$15,100 a year spent in salaries, two getting \$2,000 each, one \$1,800, one \$1,400, one \$1,200, two \$1,100 and so on: all of them being Protestants! down to the messenger, the solitary Catholic employed in the Department, and he gets just \$900 per annum."

A series of facts, all pointing in the same direction, and showing that at the period in question Catholics were completely overlooked in the matter of appointments to office made by Mr. Mowat's Government. We pass them over, however, as we do not wish to refer to what belongs to the past, further than to show that the treatment of which we complain is of long standing, and that statements to the contrary, like those of Mr. Hughes, were as false at that period as they are to-day.

"Facts for Irish Electors" treats also of the relations of Catholics to the Mackenzie Government. It states that:

"It was mainly owing to the Catholic vote that the Reformers were returned to power in 1874. It was in a large measure because of the promises the Reformers made to the Catholics, that they sat on the Treasury Benches. Mr. Mackenzie threw the Catholics a few crumbs of office, while for all he cared, they might starve for the big loaf."

We do not acknowledge the truth of this statement, but we admit that, like other Canadians, Catholics were divided in regard to their political opinions, and perhaps a majority of Ontario Catholics supported the Mackenzie party on that occasion, and brought them into power.

There was no bargain or sale of the Catholic vote: but at all events the rights of Catholics to employment in Government offices were not recognized by the Mackenzie Government any more than they had been by that of Sir John Macdonald, which he succeeded. With a majority of nearly a hundred at his back, Mr. Mackenzie seems to have thought himself strong enough to ignore Catholic claims to official appointment, and we know that his actual ignoring of them contributed in some measure to his defeat at the next election, though the most potent factor in defeating his Government was not any defection of Catholics from supporting him, but the seduction of the "national policy," which, it was thought by many, would be the means of suddenly enriching the country.

During the last provincial elections, Conservative stumpers told the electors that Catholics are swarming in public offices in Toronto. The P. P. A. platform was built upon this and other assertions of an equally mendacious character, and upon the strength of them the propagandists of that order formulated an oath to be taken by its members, which as an incarnation of diabolic and malignant hate, Satan himself, with all his ingenuity, could not surpass. Mr. Marter and Dr. Ryerson appeared at the General Convention of the society in Hamilton, in 1894, giving countenance to its methods and asking its assistance in helping them to political power. From the depths of the deep Mr. Marter descended to a deeper gulf still when he appeared on the same platform in London with Mr. Essery, the associate and abettor of Margaret Shepherd, the defamer of everything which the Catholic religion holds sacred.

Catholics should be extremely careful in exercising their franchise, as the most unscrupulous and inveterate of their enemies will solicit their support, and, if they succeed, make merry over the deception they have been able to procure.

Catholics need not expect fair treatment in the forthcoming contests from candidates who, like these gentlemen, have identified themselves with the cause of fanaticism, and no such devices as those which have been resorted to in the past, such as the issuing of fly-sheets reminding them of George Brown's abuse of their religion, should be of weight in deciding them as to the course they should follow.

The issue with us is, not what George Brown did, or what Sir John Macdonald failed to do, but it is whether Catholics are to be shut out from employment on account of their religion, and it shall be our duty to point out any injustice done in this respect to the Catholic body, whether the injustice come from the Ottawa or the Toronto Government. This duty we shall not hesitate to fulfill.

Catholics need not expect fair treatment in the forthcoming contests from candidates who, like these gentlemen, have identified themselves with the cause of fanaticism, and no such devices as those which have been resorted to in the past, such as the issuing of fly-sheets reminding them of George Brown's abuse of their religion, should be of weight in deciding them as to the course they should follow.

The issue with us is, not what George Brown did, or what Sir John Macdonald failed to do, but it is whether Catholics are to be shut out from employment on account of their religion, and it shall be our duty to point out any injustice done in this respect to the Catholic body, whether the injustice come from the Ottawa or the Toronto Government. This duty we shall not hesitate to fulfill.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

"But who am I? An infant in the night; An infant crying for the light And with no language but a cry."

VERMERE infants are we when we should be men. Playing with fads and fancies and giving ear to every uttered word of worn-out platitudes when we should be intent on the serious business of life. We waste our time. Many an hour is spent uselessly and sinfully in inspecting this or that book because some eminent critic has dubbed it "great." This may sound harsh in the ears of those who acclaim each production of the age as a very marvel of genius, though it may be and is oftentimes but the harvesting of the tares and weeds of the fields of literature. Let us be true to ourselves and to our principles and become not poor imitations of polished ungodliness. We hear for example that "The Maunmann," by Hall Caine, is one of the most popular books of the century. Mr. Gladstone pronounces it a strong book, and the world runs to purchase it. Catholic fathers place it in the family library, and young ladies even in their teens become hysterical over it. Such people have our sincerest sympathy. They are in a bad way, mentally and morally. No one can read such a book and be better and purer for it. It is unclean, and should be shut up in the lazaretto of oblivion. It contains, indeed, many exquisite passages, but why should we go to a dunghill to hunt for diamonds? Catholic parents should endeavor to provide their children with pure and wholesome reading. It is their duty—nay, it is an awful and sacred responsibility.

In order to dispel any doubt that may exist in some minds with regard to the attitude of the Church towards Temperance, we may say that, according to her teaching,

"Temperance is a virtue which restrains the appetite and inclines to that which is agreeable to right reason in our human acts, moderating the love and use of pleasures."

Hence the use of liquor according to right reason is not bad in itself, and consequently is not forbidden. The Church has condemned as heretical the assertion that drink cannot be used without sin. She prescribes total abstinence for all those to whom drink is an occasion, proximate or remote, of evil, and she exhorts us to practice it for the sake of our weaker brethren.

The woman righters are still smarting under the castigation administered them by His Eminence of Baltimore. The wise and prudent prelate's utterances were timely, and voiced the sentiments of the majority of the men and women of the country:

"There is only one realm where women should reign, and that is in the domestic kingdom. Woman, through her influence in the home, rules the country."

The Rev. Heber Newton, pastor of All Saints' Episcopal church, New York city, has in the past gained much notoriety by preaching from his pulpit doctrines contrary to the most fundamental truths of Christianity. He has thus stripped Christianity of all that distinguishes it from mere Deism or Rationalism, yet he retains the pastorale of his church without question, and is allowed to go on in his course of sapping whatever faith may be left in the minds and hearts of his congregation. From time to time some zealous believing colleague in the ministry announces his intention to institute a heresy trial against the errant clergyman, but hitherto these threats have all amounted to nothing, and for the last couple of Sundays Mr. Newton has been preaching unbelief in the reality of our Lord's resurrection from the dead. He admits that his present teaching is contrary to the doctrine inculcated by his Church, but

he says: "I claim the right to interpret for myself the language of the creeds to which I yield my unfeigned assent." It is difficult to see how he can be convicted of heresy in the face of the known fact that the Church bases its claim to the right of existence on this very principle of individual liberty of interpretation. Nevertheless no Church can afford to carry out such a principle of disintegration to its consequences, and it may be presumed that Mr. Newton's last escapade will result in his being brought to trial—though it is quite possible that he may be allowed to go scot free on the present, as on former occasions. The Anglicans appear to have no means to ensure that their clergy shall teach the faith of Christendom, even when the most important truths are concerned, and so the most contradictory doctrines are inculcated with impunity from the various pulpits. It is only when ministers go to the last extreme, as in the present instance, that any attention is paid to their vagaries, or that the public are anyhow shocked by them.

The Rev. Robert Ker, the rector of the Church of England in St. Catharines, is one of those Protestant ministers who refuse to join in an anti-Catholic crusade because Catholics insist upon giving their children a religious education. Mr. Ker not only acknowledges that Catholics have a right to separate schools, but he also approves of the stand they take, and complines them upon the earnestness with which they fought the battle for educational liberty in Manitoba. He says:

"In truth, the treatment accorded to the minority in this instance is a striking illustration of the common interpretation of civil and religious liberty, namely, a liberty to do as I do, because my view of the matter must be right, while your view is unquestionably wrong. I honor the minority for their faithful adherence to the unassailable right of a parent to have his child taught religion as a prime necessity of all education, and it is nothing short of disgraceful to find professing Protestants quite prepared to barter away religion to secure a purely Godless system of education which is working untold misery on this continent at the present moment. Speaking candidly as a clergyman of the English Church, but only speaking for myself individually, I would gladly see a parochial school established in connection with every parish and mission of our Church."

LORD SALISBURY and Mr. Balfour hold similar views in regard to the necessity of religious education and of the inalienable right of parents to take steps to give such an education to their children. They maintain, as we do, that the State is not justified in throwing obstacles in the way to prevent this. Lord Salisbury said recently, in a speech delivered at Limehouse:

"When you adopted compulsory education in 1870—you adopted it then and developed it afterwards—when you adopted compulsory education, you then came across the great problem, how were you to maintain religious liberty when the State forced the children to be educated, unless they took abundant precaution that every child should be educated in the religion of its parents? It is not only inconsistent with religious liberty—it is a gross violation of religious liberty, if the State comes in with its compulsory powers and takes away a child from its parents and brings that child up in a religious belief which the parents do not acknowledge; and, although it may be difficult to work our way to the state of things in which that principle shall be perfectly fulfilled, no expediency, no educational necessity, will justify us in leaving that principle out of sight, or what is more important, will content the people of England by whom that principle is greatly valued."

The English system of education is based on these lines.

The Owl is as racy and entertaining as ever, and we have no hesitation in saying that it is *facile princeps* amidst the various papers and reviews that come from our collegiate institutions. Some of the articles, pregnant with thought and remarkable for a rare beauty of diction, reflect much credit upon their writers, and testify to the superiority of the Ottawa University. We were very sorry that the last issue was marred by the crude remarks of the gentleman who compiles the "Notes." He is a very young man, or perchance an old man with odds and ends of information floating through his brain. Judging, however, from the false logic and incoherent statements, we are inclined to believe that he has yet to take his first bath in the cold but invigorating waters of Philosophy, that will temper his hot blood and tone up his mental system to such a degree

that he will think twice ere he again make use of insult against the Catholic newspapers of Ontario.

We are pleased to note that Rev. Dr. Cronin, editor of the Buffalo *Union and Times*, has returned home from the South much improved in health. The Catholic press could not well afford to lose such a brilliant writer as Father Cronin, and we trust he may be given length of years to do in the future, as in the past, effective work in the cause of faith and fatherland.

We have much pleasure in reproducing in this issue, from the Montreal *True Witness*, two articles bearing on the question of Irish Catholic representation; and we hope that those in whose hands has been placed the power of filling vacancies such as those referred to, will give due consideration to the statements advanced. Irish Catholics, we might truly say, look for no special favors: all they desire is simple justice. That they have not been treated fairly in the past is a fact beyond question. Politicians too often imagine that the Irish Catholic vote is a quantity that can be cajoled or bamboozled into a political wigwag just prior to each election; but as soon as the smoke of battle clears away the conviction once again takes hold of them that hewing wood and drawing water and janitorships are good enough for the average Irish Catholic. It will be just as well for all concerned to take notice that this mode of procedure has gone quite far enough, and that in future the Irish Catholic element will make itself felt at the polling booths against any political party which appears to be unwilling to do it full justice in the matter of appointments.

The *True Witness* of Montreal comes to us this week in eight-page form and printed with new type. We congratulate our contemporary on its improved appearance. Since Dr. Foran assumed control of the paper there has been a remarkable improvement in every respect. It is cleverly edited and well managed. If the Irish Catholics of Quebec do not give it that support to which it is so richly entitled they ought to be ashamed of themselves.

The *Canadian Magazine* for May is as usual bright and newsy. Capt. Henry Fry writes on the part of shipbuilding in Quebec city, and advances a strong plea to make the old city a place for the manufacture of steel ships. The other articles are up to the high standard that marks each number of this valuable magazine.

THE LOURDES MIRACLES.

The critical attitude towards miracles may be based on a fair and reasonable caution; it may proceed, on the other hand, from a captious tone of mind which asks for extravagant evidence—it may proceed, and often does, from timidity, from undue deference to Protestant and infidel opinion. This last kind is hard to overcome, and indeed cannot usually be convinced except by actual sight and demonstration. Evidence that is sufficient, though brought through witnesses, will not satisfy such an inert state of mind.

The miracles of Lourdes have been lately attacked, and some seem inclined to say that no real and indubitable miracle has ever been proved there. Let us grant that for the present. It is nevertheless quite true that miracles may have taken place there all the same. Proof and fact are not correlative. Is it right and reasonable to think that miracles have taken place, though not proved? In other words, if hesitation of mind and suspense of judgment are reasonable, is it equally reasonable to expect miracles and believe in them without formal proof? Certainly it is. We are free to think that a miracle has taken place without waiting for the verdict of science. Our faith enjoins us to believe in miracles being possible. These prodigies of Divine Providence are scattered all along the highway of Christianity. They shine and sparkle in the Light. They are the consolation, the glory of the faithful. Innumerable miracles are believed which have never been formally proved. They are always possible—nay, probable in the sense that it is very improbable any age will be entirely without them. All theologians teach that the gift of miracles resides in the Church, and may at any time be manifested. It is clear, therefore, that a ready belief in miracles, an expectation, a love and wish for them, is reasonable, right and proper. This may be pushed too far. Granted. But perhaps not so easily or so dangerously as the critical and sceptical spirit. After all, superstition is more natural to man than scepticism. It is more man's part to believe too much than nothing. Unbelief has done nothing. It undermines and saps. It never constructs, nor will it ever raise any monument to itself save the graves of its deluded victims.

The greatness and power of God

make us expect to see His wonderful works. Miracles are a proof that God is personal—not bound by His own laws, able and willing, as a person must be, to dispense with an ordinary course of things, to change that course, to innovate, to grant dispensation and privileges. No doubt, miracles to be used as arguments require careful sifting, examination and proof. But it is not everybody who wants to argue—the multitude prefer to use and enjoy. Let the scientific school dissect, verify and prove; but let them not claim that their work is anything but what it is, a part of controversy. Faith believes that miracles are possible. It goes further, and thinks that they are probable. Faith has its own rights in this believing, and it does not by any means pause and ask leave of science before proceeding on its course.

What are we to say of Lourdes? That miracles are quite possible there. That if the faithful generally believe that miracles have taken place there, in all probability they have taken place. It is extremely unlikely, in such a case, that science should turn out right and the faithful wrong. Now what are the facts? For five and twenty years Lourdes has been before the Catholic world as a miracle-working place. The fact is notorious. It is extremely unlikely, therefore, that men of science should now be right if they deny that miracles have happened there. Faith has its own rights. The faithful have a free right to believe that the Lourdes miracles are genuine. They are not bound to wait for medical experts to speak first. So much for the rights of faith. Further, the fact is that scientific men and the ecclesiastical authorities have watched over Lourdes from the beginning. In no instances have the Bishops and priests refrained the faithful: quite the contrary. No medical man, therefore, has the right to begin at the beginning at this time of day. He must begin at the twenty-ninth year of Lourdes with all these facts behind him.

Let us suppose that medical men could disprove the Lourdes miracles. A greater wonder than any miracle would then stare them in the face. How could they explain a peasant child creating a town like Lourdes, and making it famous throughout the earth? If this thing can be done without a miracle, then there are wonders greater than miracles. The natural onus the supernatural. This fact has to be explained, and also likewise the unceasing pilgrims who believe, in spite of all that sceptical doctors can say, that Our Lady works miracles in Lourdes.

As regards the apparition, ecclesiastical authority in the person of the Bishop, has long ago pronounced in its favor after a rigorous examination and by a formal document. This approbation has been ratified by the concurrence of numberless pilgrims of all ranks. The apparition, then, is the source of some great favor. It is a cause. This is again reasonable to suppose that Our Lady appeared at Lourdes and enjoined pilgrimages for some purpose, and that the purpose is displayed in miraculous favors.

Few doctors are really capable of judging a miracle because perhaps they have never seen one. Their groove is a true one, but narrow, and in many cases they are incapable of rising to appreciate moral, ethical and historical facts. Their services are useful but their judgment has its limits; and we must not surrender the rights and privileges of simple faith to them for a moment.—Liverpool Catholic Times.

At a Papal Reception.

A curious episode is related as having taken place at a Papal reception, held in the spring of 1887. When the Pope approached the American group several Catholic women prostrated themselves before him and kissed his slipper. When he had given them his blessing he passed on to several others who were not Catholics and extended his hand. Two of the women kissed his ring, but a young girl who was with them, although kneeling, plainly manifested her determination not to do as the others had done, and, ignoring the outstretched hand, contended herself with inclining her head as the aged man stood before her.

There was something very like a smothered murmur of consternation throughout the hall. The Pope could not have helped noticing the girl's attitude. An amused smile passed over his face, and he said to the young woman in Italian: "You are one of my children just like the others even if you do not like me." When he had gone to the next group somebody translated to the rebellious young woman what the Pope had said. She knelt there for a minute or so looking at the aged man's face. Then she rose hastily and rushing over to where he was standing, threw herself impulsively on her knees before him and said: "I am ashamed, I am sorry. Please let me kiss your hand."

The Pope, of course, could not understand the words, but the girl's meaning was clear from her manner and the little, thin, trembling hand of the Pontiff was raised to bless her again, when the girl reverently bent over and kissed it. "Everything is well when the heart is right," said the Pope tenderly; and there was a suspicion of a tear in his eye as he moved on to the next kneeling figure.

Try to keep clear of prejudice, and be willing to alter any opinion you may hold when further light breaks upon your mind. He is clever beyond precedent, or weak beyond measure, who never sees reason to change his judgment of men and things.