

a disagreeable duty, but this may allay the misgivings of some who fear religious aggression. The list comprises the chief civic employees, classed as Roman Catholics and Protestants, with the aggregate salaries of each class. It has been carefully prepared, and we believe it to be substantially correct.

No	Protestants	Salaries	No Catholics	Salaries
4	Mayor and staff	\$ 5,410 00	0	
20	City Treasurer and staff	19,237 97	0	
6	City clerk	7,000 00	0	
2	City auditor	3,000 00	0	
11	City messenger	624 00	0	
11	Tax Collectors	9,625 00	2	Tax collectors \$ 1,760 00
4	Police Chief of Police	8,908 00	1	Police Chief clerk 830 33
29	Water works of fire	17,695 90	0	
9	Inspectors, roadway dept	5,692 50	0	
16	City Engineer and staff	13,162 10	0	
6	Sanitary department	4,471 50	0	
4	Street Cleaning dept	3,729 00	0	
6	City Surveyor & staff	4,281 00	0	
6	Plumbing Inspector	3,000 00	0	
3	City Assessor department	4,800 00	9	Assessors 1,112 98
13	Assessors	7,321 24	2	Assessment clerks tempory 464 34
30	Assessment temporary clerk	4,051 21	0	
27	Fire department officers & foremen	21,649 50	0	
119	Firemen	3,400 00	2	Firemen 500 00
1	Health department constable	9,000 00	0	
13	Gaol officials	2,776 00	1	Gaol official temporary 649 00
6	Gaol official temporary	11,200 00	0	
13	City Solicitor and staff	1,397 00	0	
6	Council employed	3,366 00	0	
31	Local Board of Health	15,878 56	3	Local Board of Health 1,708 44
16	Isolation Hospital	2,033 74	0	
1	Weightmaster, cattle market	600 00	0	
1	St. Andrew's market caretaker	600 00	0	
5	Caretaker public buildings	3,190 00	1	Caretaker Brockton 120 00
1	Weightmaster, St. Lawrence market	1,100 00	0	
1	Weightmaster, Church street	750 00	0	
1	St. Paul's hall caretaker	100 00	0	
1	Chief constable	24,353 50	1	Sergeant 900 00
26	Sergeants	400 00	0	
1	Physician, For men, assistants, & water works	1,600 00	0	

* Appointed annually. † Now held by a Protestant. ‡ Dr. McKenna, a Catholic, removed, salary \$800 02.

Transubstantiation.

We return to the article of Transubstantiation contained in the *Evangelical Churchman* under the heading of Rome's Chief Error. There is a distinction between Transubstantiation and Christ's real presence in the Blessed Eucharist which, if our contemporary had observed more carefully, he would not have led his readers to think that because the word Transubstantiation was not used for several centuries, that therefore the doctrine of the Real Presence was not taught by the Early Church. To explain fully the doctrine in question we have three points—(1) that Christ is really and substantially present in the Eucharist; (2) that in the Blessed Sacrament there is no longer the substance of bread and wine, but only their species; and (3) that this presence of the Body and Blood and ceasing of the substance of bread and wine is made by the conversion of the

whole substance of bread into the Body and of the whole substance of wine into the Blood of our Lord, or in other words, it takes place by Transubstantiation.

"The Church of Rome teaches that the whole substance of the bread in the communion is converted into the substance of the body of Christ, and the substance of the wine into the substance of His blood; so that the bread and wine no longer remain, but are changed into the body and blood of Christ. The Romanist argues from the words Christ, 'This is my body,' that therefore it is no longer bread. But a study of the context of the three gospels, and of 1 Cor. X. 24, shows that 'is' must be interpreted, not literally, but figuratively, as in many places in the Scripture."

This is the argument advanced by the *Churchman*, which is sound, he contends, because the words are not only "This is my body," but also "This cup is My blood of the New Testament which is shed for many; and 'This cup is the New Testament in My blood.'" If the Catholic interpretation is applied to both, and to be consistent it must be so applied, it proves too much. Therefore the literal interpretation will not do. "Is the cup," asks this great logician and theologian, "literally a New Testament?" No, nor is it the wine. It is the Precious Blood. That is the new covenant with which in Communion the soul is quickened, and of which if any man drink he shall not taste death forever. We proceed to reason it out more at length.

An examination of the 6th chapter of St. John proves most conclusively the care which our Lord took in clearing up any doubts or solving any difficulties which His disciples might have in accepting what the Jews called "a hard saying." As such examination would take too long we refer our contemporary to Cardinal Wiseman's most learned lectures on the subject. The words of the institution clearly and sufficiently prove our position. There are things which by their very nature are universally taken in their absolute meaning and are not regarded as signs: while there are others which, either from their nature (as pictures), or from some preceding and known institution (as the types of the old testament), or from the mode of speech (as parables), are understood as signs. Now bread and wine belong to the former class. Neither from themselves, nor from any received use, nor antecedent institution were they, nor could they be, regarded as signs. Nor did Christ in any way advise or hint that He established these things as signs. The Apostles accepted them in their absolute sense, as did century after century of Christians, without a dissenting voice. Yet we are coolly told by the *Evangelical Churchman* that our interpretation proves too much and must therefore be abandoned. How like the word of the Jews when our Lord promised the Blessed Eucharist: "If any man eat of this bread he shall live forever; and the bread that I will give is My flesh for the life of the world." The Jews, therefore, strove among themselves, saying: "How can this Man give us His flesh to eat? This saying is hard; who can hear it." The idea of a literal interpretation proving too much! Neither from the context nor from so-called parallel passages can it be proved that the literal interpretation is far fetched. Here we pause to examine in our next the figurative passages quoted by the *Churchman*

The "Mail's" Misstatements.

"An unmitigated misstatement," is a phrase that has been copyrighted by Rudyard Kipling and accepted by modern culture as a verbal equivalent for the much stronger and simpler saxon of our more plain-spoken forefathers. The *Toronto Mail* has long been famous for such "misstatements," but in a leading article of its issue of Saturday the 16th inst., the unmitigated misstatement surpassed itself. The article is headed "A GREAT SCHOOL WAR," and is a tissue of misstatements from beginning to end.

For the sake of brevity we shall condense and number these misstatements and refute them in order. We will give the words of the writer as far as possible, but always we hope his exact meaning. The *Mail* thinks it well then to tell its readers 1. That there is a great school war in the United States. 2. That this war is; "a movement against the integrity of the public school system skillfully directed by Mgr. Satolli." 3. That "previous to this war there had been serious difficulties within the Church on the school question." "The Bishops who come from abroad insisted on separation. The native Bishops seemed to be imbued with the American idea." 4. That Archbishop Ireland, as a native prelate, proceeded to Rome to defend the American idea. And that the result of his journey was "a formal approval of his attitude." 5. "Then came a friendly and liberal deliverance by Mgr. Satolli, favorable to the principle of education upon which the people of the United States have hitherto insisted." 6. But the ablegate paid an official visit to Buffalo. The venerable prelate here took part in an imposing demonstration conducted by certain politicians of the Tammany stamp, who converted the Delegate to Catholic parochial schools and captured the "solid" Catholic vote. 7. That following this conversion and capture are, "two remarkable occurrences. In the first place, his Eminence Cardinal Gibbons has issued a circular to the members of the various State Legislatures asking for a system of education such as that in existence in England, Ireland and Canada. In the second place, a bill has been prepared for presentation to the Legislature of New York providing for the division of the school grant and the school taxes between public and separate schools." Now, every single one of these assertions is false. And the writer in the *Mail* could and should have known his assertions are false, for they are made about matters of fact. No one expects the *Mail* to be correct or clear or honest when dealing with matters of Catholic truth or Catholic teaching. But really everyone has a right to expect that even the *Mail* should have some regard for truth in dealing with matters of fact. It is an easily ascertainable fact, 1. That the Catholics of the United States are not waging war on the public schools. They say with Mgr. Satolli; "That the Catholic Church neither condemns nor ignores public schools." 2. That therefore Mgr. Satolli does not lead a movement against public schools. 3. That all the Bishops of

the United States, "native born and foreignborn," assembled in the third Plenary Council of Baltimore, insisted on Catholic parochial schools, where possible and that the "native born prelates," Archbishop Corrigan of New York, and Bishop McQuaid of Rochester have been foremost in furthering this decree of the Council. 4. That Mgr. Ireland is a "foreign-born" Bishop, and that his "plan" was not formally approved in Rome, but merely tolerated as a local and temporary experiment. 5. That the only deliverance of Mgr. Satolli "favorable" to the principle of education without religious instruction, was, "neither to condemn nor ignore public schools." He never "approved" them. 6. The idea of the Delegate being converted by politicians of the Tammany stamp is as absurd and ridiculous as Dr. Coxo, in whose erratic brain the idea had birth. There is no "solid" Catholic vote in the United States. There are leading Catholic Bishops, priests, newspapers, and people in thousands, of both political parties. Though indeed Bishops and priests concern themselves very little about either political party. 7. His Eminence Cardinal Gibbons has asserted in public print over his own signature that he did not issue "a circular to the various state Legislatures," etc., and Archbishop Corrigan has asserted that he is not responsible for the bill prepared for presentation to the Legislature of New York. And finally Mgr. Satolli has publicly and emphatically stated in Washington that he was not converted to parochial schools by politicians of the Tammany stamp. That he needed no such conversion. "It has been inexplicably true," says the Delegate, "and never perhaps shall I find not what was the origin of the suspicion that my views were not favourable to Catholic schools. Those who at first or ever after have attributed to me such an absurd opinion ought to point to some word or action of mine to justify themselves. Had I spoken differently I should be unfaithful to my mission, ungrateful to the generous hospitality I have enjoyed and am enjoying in America; and moreover, I should have given the lie to my first and most unchangeable conviction. Every Catholic School is a safe guardian of youth, and this at the same time for the American youth, a place of training where they are brought up for the advantage of church and country." This then is the truth, attested by public facts, about Catholics and the School question in the United States. Catholics do not and will not wage war against the public schools. They simply assert and claim their rights as citizens of a free country to have their children educated according to the conscientious religious convictions of their parents. Where their right is unjustly denied them, as it is in the United States, Catholics establish and maintain their own schools, while paying the legal tax to the public schools: when they claim a share in public tax for their parochial schools, they simply assert their civil right to have something to say about the disposition of their own money. We believe the time will come when, this just and most reasonable demand will be heard and granted.