

The Catholic Register.

PUBLISHED EVERY THURSDAY AT NO. 40 LOMBARD STREET TORONTO.

Approved and published by the Archbishop, Bishops and Clergy generally throughout the Dominion.

Advertisements made a month in advance. Advertisements are received for insertion in the Register.

THURSDAY, JANUARY 7, 1897.

Calendar for the Week.

- Jan. 7—S. Lucian, M. 8—S. Severinus, 9—SS. Julian and Basilissa, 10—St. Ag. Epiph. B. Agatha, 11—S. Hilary, 12—S. Arnoldus, 13—S. Veronika.

The Irish Tories to-day are glorying in disloyalty and are actually arguing with The London Times that disloyalty under certain circumstances is quite justifiable.

Ottawa has elected its first Irish Catholic mayor in twenty years. Mr. Samuel Bingham has conducted a manly, intelligent canvass, and his election shows that the public expect successful administration from him.

The soft weather which is causing potatoes to sprout and cabbages to rot in the cellars of citizens seems also to have had an effect upon the Toronto P. F. A. That dark cellar thing is struggling to new life it appears under the title of the Patriotic Vigilance Committee.

It is regrettable in the extreme that the remains of the sainted Archbishop of Montreal could not be laid at rest without the airing of political jealousy, or the sowing of political mischief. We read in The Globe that the members of the Ottawa government took a slight upon themselves the arrangements made for the seating of the visitors in St. James' Cathedral.

The London Times has been reading the law of loyalty to Lord Castle-town, the Irish Unionist Protestant who in the course of a recent speech at Cork expressed the hope that there might be no necessity for the history of the "Boston tea party" repeating itself in Ireland.

I must remind you that though an Irishman may be, as I am, unworshippingly loyal to his allegiance to the Crown, and a strong Unionist from sincere conviction, still when a question affecting every man in his native land (the taxation of his country) is brought to the front I consider it would be a disgrace to that country if he did not remember, as every Scotchman and Englishman would under similar circumstances in their respective countries, that in the first place he was a son of Ireland, and that when so grave a question arose his first duty is to Ireland.

Liberty of conscience was a principle dear to the heart of the late Archbishop Fabre. It is not a little remarkable that a Rabbi should come forward to testify to this. In the Temple Emmanuel-EI, Montreal, Rabbi Veld has made special allusion to the

death of the late Archbishop. He said: "It is true the late Metropolitan was not a Jew, but did he not believe in liberty of conscience and in toleration? On one occasion when I called on the late prelate with reference to some articles favoring anti-Semitism in the Province of Quebec, which had appeared in certain religious journals, His Grace assured me that he would see that nothing of the kind appeared again. With his characteristic good nature he said, 'Rabbi, don't fear, for as long as I live and have the power, no harm shall come to your people, for to the Jews the whole world owes a great debt.' Our sages teach us that the pious of all creeds shall share future bliss. May the soul of the late Archbishop receive that reward to which it is so eminently entitled."

Attorney-General Longley does not pretend that religion can be taught in Canadian public schools. He writes to that effect in The Presbyterian Witness, Halifax, and in the course of his letter speaks of a visit made by him to certain Church schools in rural England. "I visited," he says, "a great number of these schools and what I found was meant by teaching religion was that the little urchins were drilled by the hour in the catechism, exactly as one would be drilled in the multiplication table and with about as much sense of religious life and vitality in it."

The Established Church system did not fulfil any conception of religious teaching Mr. Longley had formed. But, of course, he must remember that his conceptions of religion have really nothing to do with the case of parents who send their children to an efficient school where religion is taught to their satisfaction. Governments or members of Governments have no business to make religious systems to suit the people. Mr. Longley further says:

"It seems to me that the greatest duty of those concerned in religious growth and propagation is to find other means and other avenues of developing the religious impulses of the people. Good schools do not necessarily mean a godless people. The school room would be a most convenient and far-reaching means of promoting religious growth with the right class of teachers, but I have the greatest difficulty in making myself believe that systematic religious instruction is practicable in our schools, and, therefore, it becomes necessary that it should be systematically taught by other means and through other agencies."

Mr. Longley is fully entitled to his private opinion; but when a government endeavors to carry any such opinion into effect liberty of conscience is at an end in the country where the hand of such a government controls the education of the children.

Mr. R. J. Fleming was re-elected Mayor of Toronto on Monday. By returning him to office the electors made the best of a bad matter. The people of Toronto are really left very little choice about the men by whom they are represented in the city Council, in the local Assembly, or at Ottawa. All these matters are attended to by the Orange organization. For example we gather from a laudatory article in The Globe of Saturday that McKinley L.O.L. has supplied almost all the mayors and parliamentary representatives, and all the aspiring mayors and ambitious members whose names are known to us. There are in this lodge E. F. Clarke, M.P., E. B. Oiler, M.P., Mayor Fleming, O. A. Howland, M.P.P., John Shaw, E. E. Sheppard, George McMurrich, Wm. Lount, M.P., and many more putative representatives of the people. To be sure men like Mr. Oiler and Mr. Howland shed the lustre of their names on McKinley L.O.L. only as a matter of expediency. But the motives of individuals we are not considering. What interests us is that when a particular local lodge of the Orange order demands that membership in its fold is indispensable for election the citizens who admit the demand do not carry the thing to its legitimate conclusion and place all the machinery of election inside that lodge. Why should people go to the expense and inconvenience of voting? The people of Toronto have no authoritative voice in their own affairs, and they know it. Yet Torontoians are the very people who never fail to ask themselves is this the eve of the 20th century? when they hear of a priest in Quebec meddling with politics. The slavery of the people of Toronto is about as remarkable a contrast with the popular freedom of age as one could find between Canada and Cathay.

The Late Archbishop Fabre.

Not often does the record of a single career show forth the call to and the power of the priesthood in so remarkable a manner as the life of the sainted Canadian prelate who was taken to his reward in the closing hour of last year. We are captivated when reading even a meagre account of the principal events in the life of the late Mgr. Fabre by the clearness of his summons to the ministry of the Lord. He heard the imperative inner voice with pleasure, and hastened to tell his mother about it. Treating her with the doubly dutiful consideration of a parent and confidante he writes to her: "My dear mother it is now that your heart of a mother will speak more than ever. I have ever loved the ecclesiastical state; my mind has preferred it to any other." These simple words are full of the promise that was fulfilled in every day of his subsequent labors for Christ. His last words were: "I have made my body a sacrifice unto the Lord every minute." And his devoted mother who sat by his peaceful death bed could surely bless the hour when she gave her sanction to the sacrifice made in the bright youth of her son's life.

Consider some of the fruits of Mgr. Fabre's episcopal career. He ordained 1,026 priests, six of whom became bishops and one an Archbishop; he received the vows of more than that number of nuns, and he confirmed nearly a quarter of a million of children. Churches, convents, colleges, hospitals and asylums have been raised to meet all the needs of his diocese.

In a word he lived the life of a modern saint, a life wise in action and in counsel, and more than all in piety and good deeds, for these give the most powerful example in days when speech is free and little-headed whilst actions make in durable impressions upon the public mind.

Mgr. Fabre was an example to all in the love he bore his country. As he told his mother in the letter already referred to, and which was written at the age of eighteen, one of his hopes was to be able "to offer up the holy sacrifice of the Mass for the prosperity of the country and for the union of all Canadians." God had decreed that this patriotic young man should guard his country upon more than one occasion of peril; and wisely and bravely did he meet those occasions. This was a man after God's own heart, and his fellow-countrymen, Protestant as well as Catholic, are better for having known his brave character as a man and his holiness and virtue in the sacred office to which the Divine Will had called him. May his soul rest in peace.

The Position of The Register.

The REGISTER has invariably treated with silence the conduct of partisan orators and journalists who have resorted to the justice of its reasoning on the question of Catholic education in Manitoba by imputing to it a political motive. The silly charge would never be made if there were anything better to be said for the policy which the Liberal party is to-day pursuing. But we must own that we were surprised into recognition of the call for a denial of the accusation when we read in last Thursday's papers that Mr. Laurier himself, at the Club National banquet, in Montreal the night before, had adopted this weak and worn method of argument so often used against this paper; and let us add, used not by one party but by both, when it suited the purpose of one set of politicians or another. Mr. Laurier is reported in The Montreal Star and other papers, when quoting from THE REGISTER, to have alluded to it thus:

"Another journal which gives itself out to-day as the organ of the Catholics of Ontario, but which is rather the organ of the Conservative party in Ontario, THE CATHOLIC REGISTER, which is now attacking us in every issue" etc.

Before we answer Mr. Laurier's allusion once for all, directly, emphatically and honestly, let us remind him that this is the same paper which in the Cape Breton election was denounced from the platforms of Sir Charles Tupper as a "violent Grit sheet," because at that time it dared to expose the fatal factional wrangling in the Conservative Cabinet, when this same cause of Catholic education depended upon the harmony and proper understanding of the Ministry. This is the same paper whose criticisms Mr. J. Israel Tarte insisted in the House of Commons should go upon the records

of Hansard. This is the same paper that has from first to last, to the best of its humble ability, endeavored to keep the principle of Catholic education and constitutional right before the public and the politicians, without the least regard to the feelings of any set of partisans. Mr. Laurier knows well that when the outspoken demand for Catholic rights in Manitoba made trouble in the Conservative political family, and comforted the Liberals watching the weakness of their opponents, the "attacks" of THE REGISTER were much adulated for skill and force by himself and by his lieutenants. But when insistence on respect for Catholic rights threatens danger to the Liberal party in office, the points of view of the Liberal generals is completely changed. Instead of hearing itself assailed as a "violent Grit sheet," THE REGISTER learns from no less elevated a source than the Premier of Canada himself, that it is "rather the organ of the Conservative party in Ontario." It also learns on very good authority that the reading of THE REGISTER by any official of the Dominion Government over whom Mr. J. Israel Tarte holds jurisdiction is evidence of "offensive partisanship" and is punishable with instant dismissal from the public service. So that instead of being a sort of a white-headed boy, we have come under the ban of Liberal authority in every way that that authority can be made to reach us. Surely the science of political partisanship must be but dimly understood by the editor of this paper. Other journalistic partisans grow lean when their friends are not in office, and all their ingenuity is employed helping the party out of the cold. THE REGISTER somehow manages to remain out of doors all the time, and the party in office has never a good word for it.

Mr. Laurier should not however find it hard to arrive at the true explanation of our position. Our only sin against both parties is consistency. If the peculiarity of his point of view cannot enable him to see this for himself, we would be greatly pleased if he would take our word for it. THE REGISTER owes nothing to any political party, nor does it expect anything from either of them. It is absolutely free from political partisanship, and is only political when Catholic interests, which are invariably smothered on all possible occasions by the political and secular press, demand that the Catholic press shall speak out. There is not now, and there never has been, the slightest vestige of political influence brought to bear upon the policy of THE REGISTER, and the readers of this paper can depend that anything of the kind shall never happen. This paper, as is the case with every paper, religious or secular, is in the hands of its readers, and the moment it is false to the cause in behalf of which it is published it injures itself irretrievably. If there were no other proof that THE REGISTER is pursuing the right and fearless policy on the school question, if our own readers were not what they are viz., our most intelligent critics, the fact that the whole Catholic press of Canada, of the United States and of the old country have argued as we have argued, and insisted as we have insisted from the beginning of this trouble to the present time, should be a sufficient defense against the imputation of political motive, a motive which no one but a partisan could conceive.

Two Premiers.

On New Year's Eve when Mr. Laurier, the guest of the evening, presented himself before the members of the Club National, where he met nearly all his colleagues in the Ministry and representatives of the various Liberal governments of his Dominion, he had in his pocket a letter from an old friend, Mr. H. Beaugrand, ex mayor of Montreal, tendering him some advice. Mr. Beaugrand is evidently not an adviser to be much depended upon, because he counsels when working under undue excitement and irritation. On New Year's Eve his indignation on account of the condemnation by the Bishops of the Catholic-Liberal paper L'Electeur was at the boiling point. In that frame of mind he wrote the following piece of advice to the Premier:

It appears that your school settlement has been condemned at Rome in the same manner as poor David's book. And what next? Will you bow the head and kiss the hand that strikes you, or will you act at once and squarely on

the defensive, by returning blow for blow, and in proclaiming the emancipation of our people from the double point of view of religious and civil liberty?

It is a fair presumption that many of the Club National men were in pretty much the same state of mind as Mr. Beaugrand, so that the occasion of the Premier's speech was in a sense provocative of defiant talk. We give Mr. Laurier credit under all the circumstances for the calm strain of his address. He no longer pretended that the so-called "settlement" was in reality a settlement or finality. He went so far as to admit that which a week or two ago he persistently proclaimed to be a Catholic triumph, is in very truth a sacrifice of Catholic convictions. But the sacrifice he tried to show has been made by way of concession, and concession may in the future widen out into a better state of things all round. Such was the tone of his argument. Perhaps the Premier knows best himself why he did not take the Club National into his entire confidence. He said:

"There are reasons which made me accept this first instalment, this legislation, these concessions, made to our compatriots rather than continue the state of war and animosity which paralyzed our national progress, and for having acted thus I have incurred disapproval at the hands of the Conservative press."

The reasons which influenced Mr. Laurier to settle the school question on the instalment plan are no doubt of a political nature, and are not entitled to more than political respect. And this is precisely where all Mr. Laurier's error arises. For instead of being a question of politics this principle of Catholic education is a matter of religion and conscience with the Catholic people of Manitoba; and Mr. Laurier has neither right nor warrant to "settle" it altogether or by instalments except the Catholics of Manitoba are consenting parties. If he had no power to "settle" except with the consent of Mr. Greenway, neither has he a particle more of power to "settle" without the consent of the Catholic minority, or of their representative, Archbishop Langevin. Surely it has been a ghastly mockery all this time to gaily call anything a "settlement" when Archbishop Langevin is appealing to the slender resources of his people and to the charity of Catholics outside of Manitoba for the means to keep the Catholic schools of the province open, while the Catholic taxpayers are compelled by law to support schools which their consciences forbid them to send their children to. We are glad at least that Mr. Laurier has at last thrown aside the pretence that politicians in Ottawa and in Winnipeg playing into each other's hands are capable of "settling" a question of Catholic education without any respect to the consciences of the Catholic parents affected. If the Government at Ottawa, or the Government at Winnipeg, had the power to arm with clubs a corps of policemen and drive Catholic children by force, whether the parents liked it or not, into Mr. Greenway's schools, then there might be some logic in the contention that Mr. Laurier and Mr. Greenway were competent to settle this matter between them. But as long as Catholic parents have consciences, as long as their consciences revolt against Mr. Greenway's notions of primary education, and as long as Mr. Greenway compels Catholic parents to contribute to the support of his educational system there is no political power in Canada that can invest the Government at Ottawa and Winnipeg with the authority to "settle" this long endured outrage of religious disability.

We fail to detect in Mr. Greenway's address any indication of departure from the policy adopted towards Catholics in Manitoba. He introduced the school question by saying:—

Shortly after we came in, we found a state of things existing which we thought was not to the interest of a new country. We were inviting people of all classes and creeds to join in helping to build up this new country and we thought that the least we could do was to provide them with a good school system. We undertook to do this, and the result has been that we have taken away the rates of some people.

This does not require much interpretation. It means that shortly after the Liberals came into power in Manitoba they invited people of "all creeds" to settle in the waste lands of the province, and if they reasoned that "all creeds" would not come to live in a province where Catholic school-

were free, a school system to suit "all creeds" must be provided. Therefore the Catholic schools were wiped out and the rates of "some people" (Catholics) were taken without any return for the money. It is all very candid; and it seems on the face of it to mean that when the Liberals came into power in Manitoba they served notice on Catholics that they were not wanted in the province. No Catholics need apply. If they would come uninvited they would find themselves taxed for schools for "all creeds" and they would find no schools for their own children unless they themselves were content to maintain such schools voluntarily. In a word Catholic immigrants would find the climate of Manitoba, cold as it is otherwise, too hot for them. But, as Mr. Greenway wound up his speech by saying, his government had made the climate of the prairie province "good to grow men." He evidently does not count Catholics as men. They are only good to be taxed without justice for the benefit of "all creeds."

The Conversion of England.

We are going to venture a prophecy. It is that our Anglican friends will presently have a fresh grievance against the Pope. Already there are signs of impending protest in England against the erection of a Catholic church at Slough to commemorate the baptism of King Ethelbert by Saint Augustine and the conversion of England to Christianity. Pope Leo has declared his intention of subscribing to the fund to commemorate the conversion of the ancient king of Kent; and thereby hangs a tale of contention. For in this as in all other matters of faith and history, every adherent of the Church of England has a theory of his own. The more reasonable of them follow the version of Professor Henry Morley, that the English owe their Christianity to the Celtic missionaries who were active in the north before the coming of St. Augustine. Which is treading upon the corns of more than one school of believers in an "ancient British church." For there actually are people, sane and intelligent in all other respects, who protest that there must have been a pre-historic Christian church in England, that its missionaries christianized Ireland, that Ireland sent missionaries to England, and that when St. Augustine landed the Anglican branch of the Catholic Church was already a flourishing institution. Of course only few go so far; but those who do not care to deny all history are still in a dilemma between the Celts and St. Augustine. Either road leads to Rome.

It was a true type of Briton who out of the knot of history by suggesting that both the Celts and St. Augustine may have been independent of the Pope. Quite a number of adherents cling to a theory even as absurd as this. However, here we are after 1800 years of Christianity, and the successor of Pope Gregory the Great offers to subscribe money to erect a memorial church to the first of the Saxon Christian kings. It was on Whit Sunday in 597 A.D. that Ethelbert was solemnly baptized by St. Augustine. Christian dissemination is such in the year of grace 1897 that the proposed commemoration of so important an event—an event of equal historical import with the baptism of Clovis, and shall we say of Constantine?—causes pain and irritation to some Englishmen.

To all impartial students of English history there is not the least mystery in the story of the country's conversion to Christianity. True it is, as Prof. Henry Morley writes, that the first tidings of the Gospel were borne to the British barbarians by Celtic missionaries. Their work was noble and its record will never die. But when St. Augustine came there were no actual traces of the Celtic teaching in the population. The conquered Britons like their Roman conquerors were sunk in the darkness of paganism. The wife of Ethelbert, who was not a Briton but a descendant of Clovis was a Christian, and it may have been through her influence that Ethelbert after considerable delay, during which the missionaries were restricted to the Isle of Thanet, was constrained to meet and speak with the representatives of the Pope.

From the baptism of Ethelbert the conversion of England truly dates, and its conversion united it as closely with Rome as a missionary country was