

The Lords and the King's Declaration

Catholics Would Endure the Present Insulting Form Rather Than Accept Lord Salisbury's Humiliating Compromise.

London, Aug. 2.—In the House of Lords to-day, on the motion for going into Committee on the Royal Declaration Bill,

Lord Rosebery moved that the order of July 23rd last committing the bill to a Committee of the Whole House be discharged, and that the bill be referred to a Select Committee. He believed that if care were exercised, and the representatives of the Catholic Church were consulted so as to discover what form of words, though equally binding in the Protestant sense, was least offensive to their creed, a declaration might be drawn up without difficulty which would be better than the present form, and one which might live.

The Earl of Crewe opposed the motion of his noble relative.

The Archbishop of Canterbury said the wish for a declaration against the supremacy of the Pope was a very marked thing at this time. Since the Bill of Rights had been drawn up the doctrine of the supremacy of the Pope had become a very much more serious danger to our political and national life. He thought further time ought to be allowed, and that the noble Marquis ought to be a little merciful, and not hurry them as he was doing.

The Earl of Portsmouth said that unless the Roman Catholic Peers were willing to accept the declaration in the form in which it had been amended by the elimination of words which were personally offensive to their religion, they must be prepared to accept the declaration as it stood.

The Lord Chancellor said that while the Committee had a right to modify the language of the declaration, they had no right to invent a new one. If they were to enter into the discussion of the adoration of the Virgin Mary they were immediately within the region of religious controversy, and that was the very thing that it was desirable to avoid. He hoped the House would try, if possible, to avoid all expert exposition of the theological doctrines, which were quite irrelevant to the purpose in hand, that of disclaiming on the part of the Monarch that he belonged to the Roman Catholic Church.

Viscount Halifax said that if the declaration were a political necessity, let them have a political declaration, and not a theological one.

The Duke of Norfolk said that when they agreed that there should be no Catholic Lords placed on the Committee they had not known that all efforts would be availed to bring to their objections were the knowledge of the Committee what

After a few remarks by Lord Brayce, Their Lordships divided, and there voted—

For going into Committee 105
Against 29

Majority 76

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee on the Bill.

The Earl of Kilmorey moved to substitute for the declaration in the bill—*I, A B, by the Grace of God, King (or Queen) of Great Britain and Ireland, Defender of the Faith, do, in the Presence of Almighty God and before this Great Assembly of my people, solemnly and sincerely declare, without evasion, equivocation, or mental reservation whatsoever, that I ever have been, am, and ever will remain a steadfast member of the Reformed Church of England, established by law, and that as such I do and will continue to disbelieve in and dissent from and reject all such doctrines of religion as are at variance with those of the Protestant Faith, which I profess and swear to support and maintain; and, moreover, that I do and will repudiate all foreign claims, if any, to command allegiance and exercise authority in matters spiritual as well as temporal within my dominions, so help me God.*

Lord Tweedmouth hoped Their Lordships would not accept that amendment, or any of the other amendments, which would require the Sovereign to declare that he was a member of the Church of England as established by law. He believed that it would be found that not more than one-fourth of the Protestants of the empire belonged to that Church as by law established, and it must not be lost sight of that in Ireland and in the Colonies there was no established Church. A much more effective way of making themselves secure against having a Roman Catholic on the Throne would be to take two or three of the doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church, and require the Sovereign to declare that in those doctrines he did not believe.

The Marquis of Salisbury observed that the bill had been framed with the object of striking out from the declaration words which had given offence to Roman Catholic subjects of the King, and if they proceeded to introduce new formularies, considerable opposition would undoubtedly arise. The declaration under discussion would certainly give offence to a number of their fellow-countrymen, and he hoped Their Lordships would not accept it.

Lord Landaff strongly objected to putting into the mouth of the Sovereign controversial statements with regard to religion, and, rather than consent to the condemnation of a particular religion by a new enactment, he should prefer to retain the violent and offensive language of the present formula.

After further discussion the amendment was withdrawn.

Earl Grey proposed to omit the words declaring the belief that in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper there was not transubstantiation of the element of bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ at, or after, the consecration thereof, by any person whatsoever, and that the invocation of the Virgin Mary, or any other saint, and the Sacrifice of the Mass, as they are now used in the Church of Rome, are contrary to the Protestant religion, for the purpose of substituting the words: "I will to the utmost of my power maintain the laws of God, the true progression of the Gospel, and the Protestant reformed religion, as established by law." All they wanted was to guard against the possibility of the Sovereign of this country being a Roman Catholic, and that could be done without the use of words calculated to raise angry passions or give offence. The words he proposed were taken from the Coronation Oath, and he contended that with the Bill of Rights, they would afford every security that common-sense could require.

The Committee divided, and the amendment was rejected by 74 to 14.

Lord Halifax then moved to put into the place of the reference to transubstantiation, the invocation of the Virgin Mary, and the Sacrifice of the Mass, the words—"I, a member of the Church of England, as by law established, do solemnly believe and profess." He claimed for the amendment that it was temperate, and precise in its meaning, without offending any Christians in the country.

Lord Cross hoped Their Lordships would not accept the amendment, and on a division, it was defeated by 79 votes to 14. The Bishop of Salisbury then moved

Public Library
Dundas St. Branch

EDITORIAL

A DAY AT THE PAN-AMERICAN

A wonderful exhibition is under way in Buffalo. Its greatness, its system, its endless novelty, amaze and enchant the visitor. In every branch of human skill and knowledge, wherein inventive genius advances the marvelous side of our age, the Pan-American is an exposition in the fullest and truest sense of the word. The United States Government building is a place to spend days in, to learn the practical elements of a liberal education. The other beautiful structures in the summer city of harmonious color and happy crowds are equally perfect. Display, convenience, comfort, pleasure, are consulted in all the modes of getting around among the buildings, and about the spacious park. But the predominant fact noticeable to a stranger is the obliging courtesy of the employes. To get in or out of the exhibition gives as little fuss as entering and leaving one's own house. This perfect system is characteristic of the United States. If the Pan-American were intended for an exhibition of American personal capacity it would be a distinguished success. Every official knows his business and does it. It is a pity the Canadian pavilion is hidden behind some useless buildings. But that should not excuse the Canadian officials and employes from being on duty. They are paid and should be attending to business, even though little business is to be done. The one Canadian who understands the American official attitude thoroughly is Commissioner Steiner, representing Ontario. Painstaking courtesy, accurate information and personal kindness are encountered by those who meet Mr. Steiner. Our Toronto Exhibition officials should go over to Buffalo and study the respect which the Pan-American employes show to the public. A boy who was going into the grounds tendered the price of an adult's ticket. It was an astonishing thing to hear the man at the window say: "I think you can get in for half-fare; try it anyway." The boy tried and entered for half-fare. What we are accustomed to seeing in Toronto is a mob of barkers selling reserved seat tickets for the grand stand when there are no reserved seats left.

to insert in the room of the part of the clause proposed to be left out the following: "I do believe in the Gospel of Our Lord Jesus Christ, and assent to the Gospel of the Church, as by law established in this realm, and reject the doctrines of the Church of Rome on the Supremacy, infallibility, and dispensing power of the Pope, and on transubstantiation."

The Marquis of Salisbury agreed that the reference to transubstantiation was not so felicitous in its terms as it might be, but the Government making no change in the bill which was not necessary to remove anything calculated to give offence.

On a division, the amendment was rejected by 77 votes to 6.

The Bishop of Salisbury then moved that the declaration should omit reference to the Virgin Mary, and should read—"The invocation of saints."

Earl Spencer regarded this as one of the most dangerous amendments. The one thing of which Protestants were afraid was this question of invocation of saints, and he objected to any alteration of the form on that point.

The amendment was negatived without a division.

The Earl of Camperdown moved the omission of the words, "as they are now used in the Church of Rome." His object was to do away with anything that was offensive to the Roman Catholic Church.

The Marquis of Salisbury did not think the Church of Rome would feel themselves aggrieved or injured by the retention of the words.

The Duke of Norfolk thought it would be better if the words were omitted, but it was part and parcel of a declaration to which they objected.

The amendment was withdrawn.

The clause was then agreed to, and the Bill passed through Committee without amendment.

The Late Mr. Patrick Boyle.

The desire is very much in the minds of the late Mr. Patrick Boyle's friends that something should be done by way of a testimonial for the benefit of his daughter. It is not revealing any secret to say that the Irish Canadian last year dragged Mr. Boyle down into extreme embarrassment; and what this means need not be dilated on. There is no doubt that an influential committee could be appointed in Toronto to acknowledge and take care of a fund for the daughter, who was the only companion of her father's later years and who is left unprotected. An informal meeting of a few friends has already been held, and it has been decided to send out a circular in Toronto calling a representative meeting for Monday night next, the 19th inst., in St. Vincent's Hall. All who receive the circular should make it a point to be present, and give their counsel as to the best means of making the proposed testimonial a success.

Power of the Irish Party

The record of the Irish party in the present Parliamentary session has been a splendid one. It has fully asserted itself as the only disciplined, capable and undivided Opposition to the Government. It has placed Mr. Balfour in many an awkward place and extracted many alterations of the Ministerial policy from him. The latest victory which it has wrested from a hostile Parliament is described in the following despatch of Wednesday morning.

London, Aug. 14.—The House of Commons passed the factories bill to a third reading last night, after a heated debate, which arose out of the action of the Government in withdrawing a clause, including laundries within the scope of the bill, because the Nationalists strongly object to official inspections of the Catholic Conventual laundries, on the ground that such inspection would be subversive of the discipline it is necessary to maintain in reformatory laundries conducted by nuns for fallen women.

Mr. Ritchie, the Home Secretary, and Mr. Balfour frankly admitted that this concession was necessary, but many of the supporters of the Government hotly denounced it as a surrender to Irish obstruction.

The Conservative papers to-day are angry at what is described as a "cowardly surrender" and "melancholy weakness." They attribute the result to Mr. Balfour's mismanagement of the House, in driving important contentious business into the last days of the session.

The withdrawal of the obnoxious clause was keenly desired by English Catholics, but scarcely hoped for. In its latest issue The Catholic Times of London said:

"It is well known, and admitted indeed by all Parliamentarians, that the Irish members invariably give their support to legislation calculated to benefit the laboring classes. They did so consistently during the discussion on the Factory and Workshop Acts Amendment Bill, and by their vote aided the contentions of the Liberal party for reform. Through Mr. Redmond's instrumentality a clause was inserted exempting from inspection 'inmates of an institution conducted in good faith for religious or charitable purposes.' And now it is said that when the bill comes up for consideration at attempt will be made from the Opposition side of the House to erase Mr. Redmond's clause. We see no reason whatever why convents, to which laundries are attached, should be submitted to inspection. The good, gentle ladies who manage them may be trusted to look after the inmates; and to watch over their well being."

But Mr. Redmond has put the clause through in spite of Tory and Liberal.

Correspondence

A Reply to the Editor of the Evening News.

To the Editor of The Register:

In a previous communication regarding the unprincipled bigotry of The Toronto Evening News, I stated that this was a first instalment I am happy to say that the instalment in question must have produced a decided effect. The extermiator of vermin is highly pleased when he hears a vigorous squealing from the quarter in which his trap is set. And certainly no thieving old rodent set up a more villainous shrieking than that which took the form of a leading article in The Evening News of Saturday, Aug. 3rd. I did not deal with that article in your last issue for two reasons: First, because of absence from home; and, secondly, because I did not want to profane an issue devoted to the kindly personality of Patrick Boyle, with such a unadorned subject as The Evening News. I now proceed to the uncongenial task and make no apology for doing my work vigorously. It would be absurd to spray the coiling moth with rose water.

The article of The Evening News now under discussion may be divided into three heads—an attack on The Catholic Register, and attack on The Register's correspondent and a defence of itself against the charge of unprincipled bigotry. Each will be taken up in the order named.

The News heads its attack on The Register with the motto: "Politicians at work." Yes; politicians of the gutter-snipe variety—politicians who have been beating the drum of bigotry for years because their heads are too empty to formulate a decent policy, are at work in the office of The Evening News, and are evidently preparing for the coming fray. The Liberal politicians against which The News directs its snarling are of a different stamp from these, as the Liberal press of Toronto is careful to exclude from its columns the insults to Catholics which form the stock-in-trade of The News, and its worthy yoke-fellow, The Mail and Empire.

The News misrepresents in the most dishonest manner the charge made against it in The Register. "Our offence," the News says, "has been to publish news and letters which the editor of The Register would like to have censored. . . . One of the principal counts in the indictment against The News is that we published an illustrated history of the 'wretched July on that date.' No, sir; The Register did not attack you for publishing news, even dirty news—the frothings of pulpit bigotry, illustrated histories of the Orange Order. The Register knows that all this is the breath of life to you. But The Register attacked you for publishing grossly insulting misrepresentations of the most sacred of Catholic doctrines and refusing to insert a reply. Like the sneak you are, you evade the point at issue, and try to slink away under cover of abuse of the present management of The Register and praise of the same paper under the control of the late Patrick Boyle. You were evidently ignorant of the fact that on the last day of his life Patrick Boyle inserted in The Irish Canadian the very same communication you attack The Register for publishing. Truly, you are a widely read and accurate guide!

Next comes your attack on the writer to whom you attributed the communication in The Register. With your customary candor and good breeding you speak of the "long winded production of an obscure priest." The communication which appeared in The Register must have seemed unpleasantly long to the things crawling in the pestilent puddle of The News office that fear above all a keen and bracing breeze. With regard to obscurity it has always been sought by priests who have most zealously worked for their Master. Notoriety especially of the firebrand kind they supremely dread.

I come now to the most characteristic portion of The News' article—its attempt to refute the charge of bigotry. It brings forward with great parade, as a proof of its liberality, that it published on the 17th of March an article on St. Patrick from the pen of Rev. Dr. Teely. Now the 17th of March is Ireland's national holiday, and is celebrated as such by all denominations. Rev. Dr. Teely's article was written along these lines and had nothing in it distinctly Catholic. Just imagine the colossal impudence of the fellow who thinks that because

he published a sketch of St. Patrick's life, he has therefore carte blanche to vilify the most sacred Catholic doctrines and refuse to insert a line of defence? Suppose that The News grossly misrepresented Scotch Presbyterianism, in the same way, refusing a chance of reply, on the plea that it published an interesting article on St. Andrew last November, I do not think that the hard-headed Scotchmen would appreciate logic or liberality of that kind.

Lastly, The News seeks to escape on the plea that there must be a limit put to the latitude allowed to the crank portion of the population." To this I reply that even cranks have rights. When attacks of a grossly insulting and untruthful character are made against the religious convictions of even a crank, he has a right to space for a reply. The sneer of The News will be appreciated when I state that a communication The News refused to publish was written over his own name by a Catholic professor who is well known throughout the United States and Canada as the author of an excellent manual of philosophy. I have applied for this letter to the source to which it was returned, and hope by the next issue to submit it to your readers who can then judge of the charity and judgment of The News in refusing to publish it, in order "to hide the writer's infirmity."

The News challenges The Register "to quote a sentence from any expression of opinion on our part that will justify his charge." The Register did quote the infamous and malignantly false headings of an article which appeared in The News of July 3rd. It will quote others before long, for its correspondent intends to apply a few more doses of "Rough on Rats."

In conclusion I ask the readers of The Register of every political stripe to ponder these questions: Why is it that the Conservative sheets in Toronto, and these alone, make a specialty of vilifying Catholics in what they hold most sacred—their faith? Why has the Conservative party never repudiated such action on the part of these sheets? These questions are beyond all party manoeuvres; they concern the highest and holiest rights of Catholics of every party. Too long and tamely have they submitted to insults from the political riff-raff that unfortunately has been permitted to dominate the Conservative press in Toronto for years.

CATHOLIC TRUTH.

THE SALISBURY GOVERNMENT DEFEATED.

London, Aug. 13.—The Government sustained a defeat late last night in the House of Commons on the report stage of the factory bill. The question was whether women and children should stop work at noon or 1 o'clock on Saturdays, and the Home Secretary supported the present practice of working till 1 o'clock. The House, by 163 to 141, disagreed with him, and the Radicals and Nationalists went wild with delight.



Diamond Hall THE... "New Moon"

One of the great favorites in Ladies' Pins is the "New Moon."

It is considered somewhat more graceful in its lines than the old-time favorite "Crescent" pin.

We show it in pearls for \$5.00 to \$100.00, as well as in Diamonds and Sapphires, Diamonds and Rubies, etc.

Ryrie Bros., Corner Yonge and Adelaide Streets, Toronto.

DINEEN Fine Furs. We want to impress you with the advantage of buying furs to day—Summer prices are still in vogue. Our new selection for the Winter is now in, and you have a larger stock from which to select. Buying now means money saved and satisfaction in every way. Our show rooms, the finest of their kind on the continent, are now open and await your call. We have every garment of which you can think in every known fur. Remember, you can buy better furs in Canada at a lower price than in any other country in the world. Store open until 10 o'clock Saturday night. The W. & D. Dineen Co. Limited Cor. Yonge and Temperance St.