

The Catholic Register.

PUBLISHED EVERY THURSDAY THE CATHOLIC REGISTER PUBLISHING COMPANY

OFFICE, 3 JORDAN ST., TORONTO. Approved and recommended by the Archbishop, Bishops and Clergy.



THURSDAY, MAY 24, 1900.

CALENDAR FOR NEXT WEEK. SUNDAY, May 27th, Red. (Within the Octave Ascension) St. John I. Pope, Martyr. Double.

Catholic Laymen and Public Life.

The Catholic layman had never a better opportunity of improving the general status of his coreligionists and of rendering material aid to the Catholic cause than he has at the present time.

The authorities of the Church invite his cooperation in many ways and works intimately connected with public life and the salvation of souls.

Hence it is incumbent upon the leaders and advisers to point out that it is for the good of the Church, as well as of the State, to promote the full registration of Catholic voters.

In a country like Canada it does not do for the Catholic voter to ostracize himself from his fellow-countrymen merely because he is in the minority, and they in the majority.

The Catholic Church has so many undertakings in operation in which laymen can assist, the improvement of Catholic society, the education of the young, caring for the poor, the relief of the afflicted, etc.

But everywhere Catholic laymen should remember that they are Catholics, and as such, bound by a sense of honor, founded on their holy religion, to render the highest service to the State and religion, by advancing and spreading Christian principles, and counteracting the errors which destroy or injure society.

War and Famine.

It is astonishing how much money the British Government cheerfully spends in killing people and how little it is inclined to spend to save His Majesty's subjects from actual and unavoidable starvation.

into the cause of the Indian famine, and an Imperial grant to relieve the sufferings caused by it. The motion was seconded by Mr. S. Smith, who attributed the poverty of the masses in India to over taxation.

An amendment was moved by Sir L. Molver, that Parliament could safely trust the Indian Government with relief measures. This amendment was carried, little interest being shown in the matter.

The Daily News (London), however, questions the wisdom of this attitude on the part of the government and says,

"Private subscriptions are not a national act; a vote of the House of Commons is. Such a vote is a contribution from every taxpayer of the country. No doubt, as Lord George Hamilton said, this would be a somewhat startling precedent."

The Welland Canal Case.

According to a special despatch to The Globe from New York, Chief Inspector Murray, the head of the Ontario Detective Department, has said that the misguided men now under arrest, charged with attempting to wreck a Welland Canal lock, "committed the crime at the instigation of the Napper-Tandy Camp, an organization of New York City, more or less intimately connected with the Ancient Order of Hibernians," and, of course, his pronouncement is at once accepted as true, and paraded in the daily papers.

But, is it fair to the Irish people as a whole, and to the Irish people in Canada in particular, to lightly, and without due reason being shown, to besmirch the good name of the Irish race and insult good citizenship? It has become the custom in Canadian journalism, when anything aimed at the Dominion happens, to immediately connect it with the Irish Americans.

In this particular instance, according to current despatches, the good name of the Ancient Order of Hibernians, one of the most prominent and respected Irish societies in America and Canada, had also to be aspersed in the same reckless and ill-intentioned manner.

It may, or it may not, be proved eventually that the accused in the Welland Canal case were remotely or closely, by membership, connected with one or other of the many Irish-American societies flourishing in the United States—most Irishmen in the United States are members of some such society as, say, the A.O.H. But what then? Until the trial has shown that they were "instigated" by some Irish American Society, it would be prudent and fair for our Canadian papers to refrain from passing sentences, which, to their own confusion, the court of trial may have to reverse.

It is not wise to be too sure in cases of this kind, and there are other theories upon which to speculate. A special New York despatch to The Globe says:—

"A man prominently identified with Irish societies, and a close friend of John Devoy, characterized the story as a political plot. 'This is another of the many plots to besmirch the good name of the Irish race,' he said. 'When the Queen paid her visit to Ireland she received a cordial welcome. It was believed that some of the many wrongs and injuries to Ireland would be remedied. The Queen's welcome created sympathy for the Irish all over the world. On the top of this came Lord Salisbury's declaration that the Irish were not to be trusted. He re-

ferred to the Irish brigades enlisted in the cause of liberty, fighting for the Boer republics. Something," he said, "had to be done to arrest the growing sympathy for the Irish. So another Scotland Yard plot was fashioned and laid on the Irish organizations here. It will fail as did the plot to send Ivory to prison for life. There is no truth in it whatever. There is absolutely nothing to be gained by the destruction of the canal. The story is devised to cast a slur on the Irish people."

The Rescript on Reservation.

The following remarkable editorial criticism of the Church Times, the English organ of the Ritualists, of the Archbishop of Canterbury's Rescript on Reservation, will prove of interest to such of our readers—and they are many—as have watched the development in the English Church of the Ritualistic schism now so prominently before the religious world.

"We have always held the Archbishop of Canterbury to be among the boldest and most honest men of our time. His rescript on the practice of Reservation does not lead us to alter our judgment, but it leaves us in graver doubt than before his declaration. Boldness and honesty are shown by his frank abandonment of a certain ancient convention."

"When we commend the Archbishop's honesty and boldness, we have said all that we can say in favour of his rescript. Apart from its conclusion, which we deplore, it lacks both dignity and power. To our great disappointment, the Archbishop falls once more to rise to his opportunity. He has taken ample time for consideration; we might look for evidence of a profound study of the subject. We find nothing of the sort. For some cause, perhaps through weariness of the subject, he failed to produce anything valuable or even interesting. He shows no signs of understanding the arguments that were laid before him. Consequently he does not answer them, while they abide as an answer to what he now says. In particular, he has entirely misconceived the purport of the argument drawn from Escott v. Martin, as lawyers, with their usual zest for examining the work of amateurs, will not doubt explain. His language is, at times, inexcusably careless. In one place he implies that the Thirty-nine Articles are a part of 'the form prescribed in the Prayer Book.' He quotes, as if it were to the point, the statement of the Thirty-fourth Article that every particular Church has authority to ordain, change and abolish ceremonies or rites, forgetting apparently that the Reservation is neither a ceremony nor a rite. He remarks that overwhelming evidence is required 'to prove that Reservation, in any sense whatever, is part of the form prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer; and he continues, 'against this is urged the practice of the Early Church.' We are quite sure that no one has ever urged the practice of the Early Church, or the evidence of St. Justin Martyr, to prove that something is prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer. In thinking that he has to meet an argument so absurd as this, the Archbishop shows that he has not grasped the elements of the case.

"Indeed, the opinion hardly calls for serious examination. Otherwise we might defend the Twenty-eighth Article against the Archbishop. Its language, he says, 'cannot be taken otherwise than as condemning the practice altogether.' But good authorities have taken it in a sense entirely different from this, and have given their reasons. It is possible still to subscribe the Article, without condemning a practice of the Primitive Church, or one which is quite consistent with the Christian Faith. We prefer to say nothing about the Archbishop's remarks on adoration but this one word: That if any 'Pope Prelate or Priest' forbid Christian men to worship their Lord, Christian men are bound to worship him the more conspicuously. So long as the Lord's Supper is celebrated, they will not lack opportunities for Eucharistic Adoration. In sum, there is only one answer to the Archbishop which is needed. It is that which we recently gave to the Bishop of London's Charge. Both prelates alike seem to think that we are in some way bound by the opinions and objects of the men who, in the sixteenth century, wrought some good and some evil for the Church under the name of Reformation. We repudiate the idea. We are bound neither to their opinions, nor to their acts. We accept the good without much gratitude; we mean to undo the evil. The Reformation was merely an incident; and the men of the Reformation are no more to us than men of any other period. By what became the actual law of the Church at that time, and so remains, we are bound; by this, and by nothing more.

As we said last week, the rescript is practically nothing. The Archbishop has himself reduced it to its true insignificance. The only thing that practically concerns anyone is the action that may be taken by the Bishops after it or in consequence of it. Should any action be taken, it may be necessary for those affected to bear in mind the nature of the canonical obedience which they owe to their Bishops. 'Canonical obedience does not mean that a clergyman will obey all the commands of the Bishop, against which there is no law, but that he will obey all such commands as the Bishop is authorized to impose.' The maxim is true and true, and is not the less sound because it was enunciated by the Privy Council in one of the judgments levelled against the Bishop of Capetown. If, then, a Bishop forbids a priest to carry the Sacrament to the sick he should be met by a respectful but firm request to show the law, human or divine, which authorizes him to impose such a command. He will not easily find such a law, nor will the Archbishop's rescript aid him in the search. If the priest be reminded that he is bound to use the form prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer, and none other, let him reply that he communicates the sick with the form of words prescribed for Communion, and with none other, and let him be careful that his answer is true.

We lay stress on the last point. In refusing obedience to an unlawful command, a priest should be scrupulously careful to render all obedience that is due. And there is an obedience that is due in this matter. We quote from Mr. Lacy's letter to the Archbishop on Reservation:— 'The inception of a new rite or service, unprovided in the prescript order of the Church, which is for us the Book of Common Prayer, is confessedly reserved to the discretion of the Bishop. No rite or form of service therefore, in connexion with the reserved Sacrament, could lawfully be used without his approval. But carrying the Sacrament to the sick and communicating them therewith, involves no rite or form of service whatever.'

We would go further. The practice of Reservation needs careful regulation, and regulation falls naturally within the province of the Bishop. We urge all priests to make it plain that any regulation, however unpalatable or irksome, will be loyally accepted. They are not bound to scrutinize too carefully the authority by which the Bishop acts. They have no right to adhere stiffly to their own way of doing what is needed. A worse way, accepted with humility and submission to authority, is better than the best way chosen by self-will. It is their duty to prove their readiness to obey any command which does not frustrate the purpose of God in giving this Holy Sacrament.

Viewed from any reasonable standpoint, it is to the best interests of a great railway like the G.T.R., that the management should be such as appeals to the sympathy of the people of the country through which it runs, to the loyalty of its employees, and to the sense of security on the part of its passengers. For any deficiency in these respects, some one must be responsible, and naturally the eyes of the observant public will be turned on the General Superintendent of the line.

Railroad Despotism.

It would be worse than useless to attempt to depreciate the immense services done to the Dominion in opening up and settling new territory, by the two great railroads that now form the main arteries of traffic and trade through the country; but the necessity for yielding to every demand made by them, and of allowing them to have their own sweet way in, as well as through, the country, upon which they have fattened and prospered, has long since passed away.

Of the two chief Canadian railroads, the C.P.R. has come to be looked upon as a distinctly national concern; and if it has in the past milked the Canadian cow, it has likewise sold a fair share of the milk at a fair price to the Canadian people. It is still, however, too much the practice of both these railroads to make it their chief object to fill the pockets of their shareholders at the expense of the people whenever occasion arises. As a proof of this, we have only to instance the scandalous piece of business recently brought to the attention of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council at Ottawa, in connection with the private arrangements for discrimination in carrying rates effected in favor of the Standard Oil Company as against independent dealers.

The G.T.R. is, however, somewhat differently situated in the popular view. Under an almost exclusively American management, and with a General Superintendent whose sympathies seem to be just as exclusively American, the G.T.R. is looked upon as an American and foreign enterprise, being operated in Canada, not so much for the benefit of the Canadian people as a whole, but simply as a grinding and money-making concern for people not otherwise much interested in the affairs of the Dominion. Such a management, with the introduction of new methods applied despotically, does not appeal to the good will of the employed, and it is widely known that a great deal of dissatisfaction exists among the trackmen who have threatened to strike for higher pay, and not without reason, seeing that their present rate is below a dollar a day. Many of these men are Irish Catholics, and on that account, as well as for the common good, we venture to raise our voice against the oppressive treatment meted out to them by the G.T.R. management.

English shareholders in G.T.R. stock, we were informed some time ago by the Globe, complained of the frequent and extensive destruction of rolling stock on the G.T.R., and recent accidents, such as that which occurred this week at Niagara Falls, when a Wabash express collided with a G.T.R. freight, wrecking three engines and endangering the lives of a large number of passengers seem to lend color and strength to that complaint.

Viewed from any reasonable standpoint, it is to the best interests of a great railway like the G.T.R., that the management should be such as appeals to the sympathy of the people of the country through which it runs, to the loyalty of its employees, and to the sense of security on the part of its passengers. For any deficiency in these respects, some one must be responsible, and naturally the eyes of the observant public will be turned on the General Superintendent of the line.

Anti Irish Speeches.

The summing up of the situation regarding Ireland by the London correspondent of The New York World, comes pretty near the truth:

The Irish Parliamentary party leaders, John Redmond and John Dillon, regard the recent anti-Irish Home Rule speeches of Lord Salisbury, Balfour and Chamberlain as simply a political move to weaken, if possible, the position of the Irish party, which, in the next Parliament, will command a solid phalanx of from eighty to eighty-five votes. That party will not be committed to either the Liberals or the Tories, but in the natural course of events, its strength must mainly be thrown for the Liberals, and may be the deciding factor. These anti-Irish utterances are regarded by the Irish leaders as calculated to set on the Irish Nationalists, preventing them from expecting anything of the British Parliament except what can be extorted by the exigencies of the other parties.

Lord Roberts' successful advance, and his overwhelming force, it is thought, will now enable him to overcome any resistance the Boers can offer. The middle of June is the date now set down by the London war critics for the capture of Pretoria.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

The Forty-second Annual Convention of the Ancient Order of Hibernians opened in Faneuil Hall, Boston, on May 8th, and continued in session for four days. Delegates from every State in the Union were in attendance, and Canada was also represented by a big delegation. Not since 1879 had the national convention been held in Boston. Mayor Hart represented the city at the opening session, and extended an official welcome to the delegates.

Mr. John E. Redmond, session chairman of the United Irish Nationalist party, and Mr. John Dillon, former chairman of the then dominant wing of the Irish Parliamentarians, appeared on the same platform at Manchester, Eng. Mr. Redmond said the meeting celebrated the close of a disastrous chapter in Irish history, and alluded to Lord Salisbury's speech in the following terms: "At the very moment, after the obituary reception to the Queen in Ireland, when an opportunity presented itself to cement the feelings between the two countries, Lord Salisbury has misrepresented Irish claims with cynical and brutal frankness, offering an absolute non possumus to the reasonable demands of Ireland."

The Boer envoys made known to the Secretary of State of the United States the desire of the South African Republics that the United States should intervene in the interest of peace and use its influence to that end with the British Government. In reply, the Secretary of State cited the President's previous attempt to bring about a cessation of the war, when he was given to understand that her Majesty's Government could not accept the intervention of any power. Whilst sympathizing with the desire of the United States people for an end of the war, the President would maintain his attitude of strict neutrality, a departure from which would lead to consequences which neither he nor the people of the United States could regard with favor.

The New York Press thinks that the benefit to Great Britain, however, amply atones for this loss it has sustained in the beginning of the present campaign. It says: "The war, in spite of early disappointments, really has continued the national life of the British Empire by a century at least. It has recalled the obligations of nationality to colonies that were drifting far from the motherland. It has called the attention of her rulers to lax methods in army regulation and to an ancient armament, the continuance of which might have meant disaster in a contest with a foe numerically greater. It has cemented the empire, and in the accomplishment of that, the price paid sinks into insignificance."

At the Forty-Second Annual Convention of the Ancient Order of Hibernians, recently held in Boston, a most interesting letter from Bishop McFaul of Trenton, N.J., in which his Lordship urged the necessity of Catholic societies, while retaining their identity of aim and organization, establishing a bond of union enabling them, in given circumstances, to exert a united influence. What is good and desirable in this respect in the States would be equally effective in Canada. If Canadian Catholic societies in Canada could come together in some way of federation, so as to make their united influence felt, they would soon be in a position to maintain and protect their rights—civil, political and national. In another column of this issue may be found a timely article on this subject of the federation of Catholic societies, a question which at the present time is attracting much attention in the United States, and some consideration in Canada. God helps those who help themselves, and there is no more effective and commendable way of doing this than by carrying out in practice the truth of the true old saying, "In union is strength."

MR. GLADSTONE'S STATUE.

London, May 21.—In the presence of principal Liberals, including Lord Kimberley, the Marquis of Ripon, Lord Russell of Killowen, Mr. Henry Asquith, and Sir Edward Grey, in the Central Hall of the House of Commons, on Saturday, Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, the Liberal leader in the House, unveiled a statue of Mr. Gladstone, whom he entitled, "the greatest parliamentary figure of our time." The notable absentees from the ceremony were Lord Rosebery, Sir William Vernon Harcourt and Mr. John Morley.