# The Entholic Register,

PUBLISHED EVERY THURSDAY,

OFFICE, 40 LOMBARD STREET, TORONTO.

TRAMS OF SUBSCRIPTION:
TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM.

FOR ADVERTISING RATES APPLY AT OFFICE

THURSDAY, AUGUST 81, 1893.

#### Calendar for the Week.

Aug. 81-8t. Raymund Nonnatus, Con

fessor,
Sept. 1—St. Elizabeth of Portugal, Widow,
2—St. Stephen, King and Confessor,
8—Fifteenth Sunday after Pentecost. St Philomena, Virgin and

Martyr,
4-St. Rose of Viterbo, Virgin.
5-St. Laurence Justinian, Bishop

and Confessor.
6-St. Bernard, Confessor and Doctor (postponed from Aug. 20).

#### Philosophical Talks.

HAVE ARIMALS RIGHTS?

Among the many absurd arguments that seem to have influenced the majority vote of Saturday last, one was the "equal rights of the horse." So at least said a poster, thrust into our hands by a woman-anti, or an antiwoman, of Methodistical mien a few days before the vote was taken. At first sight we thought that "the equal rights of the horse " might mean that the rights of the horse are equal to those of the dog and the cat; but on reading further we found that the philosopher of the flaming document gave the poor working horse the same rights as the poor working man.

Really, when such things are said, and when we see cultured ladies lavish on pet dogs the affections they owe to their family, and when we read that, while hungry crowds clamored for bread in New York, Mrs. Vanderbilt was decorating her favorite poodle with a \$150 collar, it is time to hear what sound philosophy has to say about the so-called rights of animals.

Well, then, the only true philosophy has this to say: Animals have no rights. They have no rights because they are not persons, not self-conscious. not rational, not their own. Irrational animals are things, chattels, cattle; the property of man, to be used for Lis needs, profit, or pleasure. We can have no duties towards animals: not of religion, unless we worship them; nor A justice, unless we make them our equals; nor of charity, unless we make ourselves equal to them. Indeed there is a species of the grossest idolatry in the feminine fad of pet dogs and cats; and those who talk of the rights of the poor horse can justify themselves only on the Darwinian theory that men are monkeys. The poet of the poor man should sing now:

"Ill fares the land, to hastening ills a prey, where pets accumulate, and men decay."

3nt we seem to be rendering ourselves liable to condemnation, or even prosecution from the Humane Society. Do we mean to countenance cruelty to animals? What is cruelty? It is the wanton infliction of unnecessary and useless pain. The butcher is not cruel when he kills a sheep, nor is the biologist cruel when he practises vivisection on a rabbit in the interests of true medical science. The Humane Society is all right as long as it does not encourage hospitals for dis

eased poolles and homes for dilapidated cats. Such institutions exist in New York City. If Methodist old maids continue to preach the poor horse doctrine such institutions may be seen in Toronto before we have Sunday cars.

The wanton infliction of pain upon animals is of course to be condemned. Not because animals have rights, but because man has reason—has a mind, and a heart in which reason is to rule and passion is to be kept in check. We may not agree with Dr. Johnson that:

but we do say that a rider should have a care of his own temper when he mounts a mettlesome steed. Yet it is a mistake to think that those who are gentlest in the saddle, stable or dovecot, are always the meekest and kindliest in the home.

It is not wanton cruelty to inflict pain on animals in sport, when the pain is not the sport itself, but only an incidental concomitant of an otherwise legitimate recreation or pleasure. It is not the pain but the play of the salmon that the genial son of Isaak Walton enjoys. It is only a Nero who will torture a fly for the mere pleasure of it. There may be some modern Neros. If so, we hand them over unhesitatingly to the tender mercies of the Humane Society. The practice of cruelty towards poor dumb brutes has of course a brutalizing effect on him who inflicts it, and on those who willingly witness the infliction, and so becomes a social crime liable to public punishment.

But it is a mistake to make cruelty to animals the great social crime, or to think that men can be made perfect by making them humane. We may indeed learn industry from the ant, and trustfulness in Providence from the hirds of the air. But when the Master Himself would have us learn mercifulness He said: "Be you merciful as your heavenly Father is merciful."

### The Mail on Archbishop Corrigan.

What the Toronto Daily Mail does not know about the Catholic Church and French Canadians is not worth knowing. Wiser and more infallible than the Pope himself, it hurls anathemas with more authority, and dogmatizes with less fear of contradiction. In its issue of the 21st it comments upon Archbishop Satolli's visit to New York, and referring to Archbishop Corrigan's sermon, says:

The submission of Archbirhop Corrigan, of New York, to Monseigneur Satolli, and his speech the other day at St. Patrick's cathedral, in which he humbly and almost servilely disclaimed the possession of a wish or a thought that should not be laid at the feet of his spiritual superiors, mark an epoch in the history of the Church in the United States.

This is quite misleading. There was no unusual submission on the part of Archbishop Corrigan, for nothing had been done to call forth such a thing. Newspapers which ought to have known better—and in this respect they differ from the Mail—had used their columns for criticisms which were hurtful and for gossip which was without any foundation. The Archbishop of New York maintained a dignified silence, trusting that this course would do most good and and would vindicate his own honor

before the only legitimate court. That time arrived when Mgr. Satolli the other day paid him a visit of courtesy-not an official onenot one in which the Delegate was to condemn either Archbishop Corrigan or his critics, but a visit which, when made, would do away with many of the imaginary difficulties that outsiders had heaped sround the delicate relations and the various questions necessarily arising between a l'apal Delegate and the Ordinary of the most important See in the United States. Archbishop Corrigan availed himself of the eccasion to publicly vindicate his honor, not by entering upon any particular question - for the pulpit would have been the wrong place-but by calmly disclaiming the very thought of disloyalty. This he did with the same dignity he has maintained from the beginning. There was nothing servile about it: all was manly, upright and worthy of a good Archbishop. He said: "One who has enjoyed such advantages (those of studying at Rome) counts it no glory, but rather a humiliation, that it should ever become necessary for him to avow that the thought even of resisting the Holy Father's will, much more of disobeying his positive enactments, never found lodgment in his mind. More than this one cannot say. After the guilt of offending God a conscientious Bishop feels no wound more keenly than his faith be impugued or his oath called in question." What placing at the feet of Pope or Delegate of every wish and thought do shows words contain? What servility do they betoken? They are the high-minded words of a man who loves his Church and his own honor.

What ecclesiastical epoch do they mark? Unless they are the sign of silence on the part of a large number of the gossip-mongers who have done their little utmost to make trouble. we can read no other. They mark an epoch in the life of Archbishop Corrigan, for his hour of trial must be well nigh past. In the history of the great American Church epochs are not so essily marked as that any one man's sermon can turn the clergy or the people far from the path of duty traced by faith and religious discipline. The ship may bend to the passing wave, but it turns not from its course. The only epoch we hope these words, and the occasion upon which they were spoken, mark, is one of better understanding, closer union and more prudent silence. It goes without saying that neither the Delegate's visit nor the Archbishop's sermon marks an epoch of despotism on the one hand or servility on the other such as appears to the distorted judgment of the Toronto Mail.

## The Leakage of the Church.

The minutes of the annual general conference of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul in England are deeply interesting by reason of the different papers which were read and the discussions held upon them afterwards. Amongst the subjects treated was the very important question of the leakage of the Church by one of the delegates, Mr. Story of Cardiff, Wales. The first cause of this falling away was according to this writer, that

Catholics, in seeking employments, were often drawn into districts in which there were no priests or schools -no means of keeping alive the flame within the heart. But a greater source of loss is in intemperance and the evil results which it produces, where poverty dwells in its most repollant form and where rage and filth make Catholic life next to impossible. The cure for these two causes was to be found in the zeal of the St. Vincent de Paul Society, whose members could, to a great extent, ameliorate the miserable condition of the lower classes. In the discussion which took place upon the paper it was convidered that a great deal more good could be done by paying more attention to the young and less to the old. Young men's Societies and the League of the Cross found warm advocates, as best calculated to keep the young together. It was also considered very advantageous to place individual lads

in the keeping of Catholic families. The general question involved, as well as some of the solutions suggested, are not without their interest to this country. It is occasionally forced upon the most enthusiastic and hopeful that if the Church is increasing rapidly in America, undoubtedly large leakages have occurred, and are still occurring, to the serious loss of religion. How many families there are, some of whose relatives, father or mother, or perhaps both, were Catholic. In former generations this is so true that if all had been saved to the Church the Catholic population would be treble what it is. Has it, however, ceased? Is it not going on now? Not perhaps to the same extent; for the same causes do not exist. Priests are more numerous: Catholic schools have done a great deal, and a Catholic spirit has been cultivated, with increased instruction and a more intimate intercourse amongst the children of the Church. But there are causes, and very insidious causes, which still allure the young, the poor and the ignorant away from the faith. It must be so in communities in which society is non-catholic, in which the air we breathe is poisonous and the principles imbibed are unsound. What must be the effect upon the lower classes of our co-religionists whose early training did not fit them to stand up against the sneer of their fellow-workingman, or against the temptation which has its origin in an hereditary weakness? And then there is the evil of modern civilization in cities, against whose floods of intemperance and immorality all the barriers of religion are little better than heaps of sand against the incoming tide. The clergy do a great deal, and the school also; the zeal of the good religious produces its fruitmuch remains to be done. More system and well organized charity are needed—The laity have much to do, not in providing alms only, but in such societies as that of St. Vincent de Paul thei active co-operation will save many a soul which would otherwise perish. Prayer, temperance and Catholic education are the great weapons of defence for the protection of the young and the poor. They are in the hands of laymen as well as in those of the clergy. Both should work together, with the assumed confidence that if they cannot stop the leakage entirely they can do more to prevent that which is still producing sovere havec amongst souls in our