

The Catholic Register.

PUBLISHED EVERY THURSDAY AT THE OFFICE 40 LOMBARD STREET TORONTO.

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

Subscription \$2.00 PER ANNUM.

Advertising rates must be in advance. We advise those who wish to make remittance by post office money order, bank check, draft, or express money order, when a bill is rendered, to send the money in a separate bill. All postmasters are requested to forward the bills to the office to which they are addressed.

The Catholic Register Co., 40 Lombard Street, Toronto.

Matters intended for the Editor should be sent to the office, and must arrive not later than Monday of each week to insure publication. The Editor is not responsible for the loss of letters or for the return of articles unless they are accompanied by the name and address of the author. All articles must be paid for.

AGENTS: J. B. McEwen and W. J. ...

THURSDAY, JUNE 11, 1896.

Calendar for the Week.

- June 11—Obituary of Corpus Christi. 12—Sacred Heart of Jesus. 13—S. Anthony of Padua. 14—S. Basil, Bp. of Ancyra. 15—S. John of S. Evangelist. 16—S. John Francis Regis. 17—Mary Help of Christians.

The Universe (London) has made the shortest summary of our political situation on record. It is: "Conscience against Party tactics."

The observations of a Viennese professor enable him to declare that smoking tends to check the development of bacteria and kill them. An interesting fact is this, that it has been found necessary to forbid smoking in bacteriological laboratories. It follows from this that certain throat diseases are checked or prevented by smoking.

It appears that Prof. Burwash, not Chancellor Burwash, is the Methodist authority who has come out for the restoration of Catholic education in Manitoba. So much the better; the man of theology ought to have the advantage over the man of cash when Methodist opinion is courted on the subject of religion and education.

In last week's REGISTER we referred to the intimation given by the chairman of the Parliamentary Committee on the Belfast Corporation Bill to the representatives of the Corporation that they had better arrange a compromise with the Catholic minority, whom they have long been depriving of citizenship rights. Sir Samuel Black, Town Clerk, testily opposed the idea of a compromise, saying it would be better to drop the Bill altogether. The Corporation have, however, thought better of it, and have sent an official intimation to the Catholics that an arrangement for Catholic representation is desired.

On Friday next, at a convocation to be held in the Pavilion of the Horticultural Gardens, the University of Toronto will confer the degree of LL.D. on Rev. J. R. Teefy, M.A., C.S.B., Superior of St. Michael's College. One or two other distinguished citizens are to be similarly honored. Father Teefy has been for many years a good friend and an esteemed friend of Toronto University. He has been a member of the Senate of the University since shortly after his return to Canada from Europe. His scholarship, his eloquence and the esteem in which he is held by all classes of citizens in Toronto render the honor now to be conferred upon him a matter for general congratulation. Father Teefy is the son of Mr. M. Teefy, J. P., Richmond Hill.

Severe libel laws are eminently just, and even the heaviest damages some times may have a touch of dry humor. For instance a case which has just been decided in France against a Republican newspaper. Having published a defamatory libel concerning Catholic priests of a religious community eleven monasteries took up proceedings against the paper. Whosoever damages were awarded in due time; but that was not all. The court ordered that the defendant must pay for the insertion of the judgment in each arrondissement within the jurisdiction where the order is established. Nor was that all. It must have been the judge's day, for he spun out the judgment into columns of salutary reading for the public. And the defendant paid for all. He was an eminently just judge.

Mr. Lawrence Baldwin and Mr. Allan Dymond have given notice of a significant resolution to be moved at the present Anglican Synod, meeting in Toronto. We have read the text of the resolution over carefully, and the scheme it outlines seems to correspond pretty closely to the English system. That system may be described in a sentence as giving the right to maintain efficient voluntary schools in which doctrinal instruction is a feature, side by side with the schools known in England as Board schools, in which some religious instruction also is given. The resolution of our Anglican friends

seems to anticipate the logical conclusion of the effort that is now being made to force all children into one set of schools. We have the difficulty between the Anglicans and our other separated brethren, wishing them mutual forbearance in the settlement of it.

The Globe repeats that the Nonconformists of England are aggrieved by the vote of the Irish and Scotch members, "a system of education which is objectionable to them is thrust upon them." The inference is that by the votes of members from other provinces a system of education objectionable to Manitobans is sought to be forced upon them. The Globe is merely pre-empting its statements are entirely fictitious. All that the Irish and Scotch members have voted for in Westminster is fair play for voluntary schools; nothing is thrust upon the Nonconformists who declare they are not more than satisfied with the Board schools. All that the members from other Provinces than Manitoba can vote for in supporting a remedial bill is fair play for Catholic schools; nothing is thrust upon the majority of the Manitobans who are perfectly satisfied with the Public Schools and who are not asked to attend or contribute one cent to the support of the Catholic schools. Both in England and in Canada the vote of the central Parliament in educational matters can do no more than protect the conscientious right of religious minorities.

We recommend to the notice of Sir Oliver Mowat the following resolution which has just been passed by the prelates of Ireland with regard to the Irish Education Bill now before parliament: "Amongst other grounds of objection we have to state that in accordance with the terms of the letter addressed in our name by His Eminence Cardinal Logue to the Lord Lieutenant before this Bill was introduced, and in pursuance of the settled policy of the Catholic Church in Ireland as expressed in a letter addressed by the Archbishop and Bishops of Ireland to the Right Hon. Sir George Grey, Bart., in the year 1866, that no public funds should be voted for primary education in Ireland to schools open to children of different religious denominations without giving these children the protection of a conscience clause."

We further think it our duty to express the opinion that it is highly objectionable to attempt to deal in Parliament with a question of this kind, involving principles of great importance and affecting large interests under a kind of penal arrangement which refuses to redress serious grievances unless we forego our right to effectual Parliamentary discussion of them."

THE GLOBE KNOWS NOTHING OF THE KIND.—Toronto Globe.

Certain it is that we have often seen such advertisements in the public press as that referred to by THE CATHOLIC REGISTER. We further know that in London West (a suburb of this city) a young lady named Marshall was engaged as school-teacher, and that on it becoming known that she was a Catholic the school trustees were very much incensed and requested her to resign. We still further know that some years ago a school trustee in this city, named Wilson, on the occasion of a Catholic, amongst others, making application for a position in a Public School, declared that the Catholic should not get it—that he would rather engage the services of a Hottentot than one professing that faith. Such examples of senseless— we might say brutal—bigotry are very common in Ontario.—Catholic Record, London.

If we would add anything to the comment of The Record it would be in the shape of evidence directly to the point. The following advertisements clipped from The Globe are fair examples of the advertisements that are constantly appearing for teachers in Public Schools: A MALE TEACHER—HOLDING SECOND or third-class certificate, with experience, for School Section No. 8 Perry; stating salary wanted, and forward testimonials; all applications to be in not later than December 16, 1895; presentment. Address G. M. FREELAND, Secretary S. B. E. Edinboro.

Sir Oliver Mowat on the Political Situation. Sir Oliver Mowat made his first campaign deliverance at Oakwood on the 22nd of the month. He addressed himself mainly to the question of religion and education, with special references to the Letter of the Quebec Bishops. Sir Oliver said a great deal; and if we do not re-publish the full

text of his speech, we have no other desire than to comment fairly upon the clear sense of his address, taking it altogether.

Sir Oliver is no stranger to the Catholic view of education. It is impossible to imagine him pleading lack of information concerning that view as it has been brought to bear upon public discussion in Canada at any time before or since Confederation. If, then, we find him presenting a partial and one-sided case to a gathering of Liberal electors, there is no other conclusion open than that he deliberately chose to put the matter in a prejudicial light. At Oakwood we find him declaring that:

Reasonably or unreasonably the peace of the country has certainly been greatly disturbed by the events of 1895, and in 1896 with reference to the Manitoba acts, and the increased and increasing excitement is doubtless largely owing to the mandement of the Bishops, to the sermon of Bishop Lafèche.

Catholic teaching is here directly blamed for disturbing the peace of the country. It was certainly in the power of the Catholics to have precipitated all the excitement in 1890, when the religious peace of the country was wantonly disturbed by Mr. Joseph Martin and the Liberals of Manitoba, and the school law enacted. Had Catholics raised the excitement then the disturbance of the public peace would have been indubitably laid at the door of the Liberal party in Manitoba. But, solicitous for the religious and social peace of the Dominion, the Catholics proceeded, legally and peacefully, about securing the redress of their grievances. From court to court they carried their case, and finally, after six years of patient endurance, after the remedy should have been applied by the Parliament of Canada in the last session, after the matter has been thrown into the excitement of the general election by Mr. Laurier's motion of the six month's hoist, and when their claim to justice is submitted to electors that have been worked into excitement by patriots of the McCarthy, Wallace, Martin stripe, Catholics are to be told by the oldest Liberal politician in Canada that the "increased and increasing excitement is doubtless largely owing to the mandement of the bishops, to the sermon of Bishop Lafèche."

This is Sir Oliver Mowat's recognition of peaceful, legal action upon a question that had there been free questions like McCarthy and Martin amongst the Catholics, might have shaken Confederation six years ago.

Sir Oliver took great pains to impress upon the electors that he was presenting the non-Catholic view of the matter, that he was speaking as "a citizen" and "a friend of Canada," and in that view he quoted with approval a Methodist resolution "calling for the most determined opposition on the part of every Canadian who desires to retain that freedom from tyranny that has been secured to us by the heroic sacrifices of our fathers." He told the public he sympathized with that cry; and one of the reasons he advanced was that remedial legislation would add success to the P. P. A. Without pausing to ask why the restoration of Catholic schools should have to wait upon P. P. A. prejudice, we would meet Sir Oliver Mowat on his own chosen ground of Canadian citizenship, and ask, apart from every consideration and feeling of religion, has he presented the case impartially? He quoted Bishop Lafèche; but he neglected to quote Archbishop O'Brien. If he desired to be entirely impartial why did he ignore the latter altogether? If Sir Oliver had really desired to speak as a Canadian, and keeping wide of the religious bearings of the question, we think he might have gone so far as to read the letter of Archbishop O'Brien, of Halifax, published the other day, omitting nine-tenths of what he had to say on his own account. Or, if Sir Oliver should have considered Archbishop O'Brien's appeal to the patriotism of Canadian citizens as necessarily presenting the Conservative policy of remedial legislation in favorable contrast with the Liberal policy of suspending the Federal safeguard of minority rights, could he not at least have endeavored to be impartial as between Protestant and Catholic? The Catholic Bishops are creating all the excitement; the Methodists, Presbyterians, etc., none why were Bishop Carman and Dr. McVicar overlooked? Ham's the former rose much further than the

Quebec Catholic Bishops collectively or any individual Catholic Bishop? Speaking before the Manitoba conference on a candidly partisan resolution Bishop Cairn is thus reported: "Brethren, it is not merely a matter of politics. It is also a matter of religion. When an attempt is made to coerce a man or a people against the freedom of a citizen or of Britain, that is religion."

Here is Methodist religion and partisan politics identified by the mandement of the Bishop of Canadian Methodism; and why is it not "subversive of the principles of civil and religious liberty?" Is the reason that the respect of Catholics for their Bishops is a fact whilst the respect of Methodists for their Bishop is merely a theory? We hardly think that would be the reason Sir Oliver would offer if he were to consult his political experience and intelligence upon the subject. We need not shut our eyes to the fact that the Liberals in Ontario are just now disputing with the McCarthy-Wallace party the privilege of riding the Protestant horse to the polls on June 23; and can it be that Sir Oliver Mowat does not consider himself too aged or too venerable to try a canter upon the redoubtable steed?

Ringling Words from Hon. Edward Blake.

There appear to be Catholic electors in Ontario who, while whispering to themselves that they will never consent to the pandering of party politicians to sectarian prejudice, are in reality consenting to and supporting it. They extend to party candidates pledged against remedial legislation the influence of their presence on the platform, where they listen to irritating allusions to the spirit of Catholic education, as if religious equality in Canada were a principle that can be retained only by the subservience of Catholics wherever they are in the minority, by grovelling in the dust for party advantage and by closing their eyes and ears to everything outside the "game" of politics. Such Catholic electors are not better party men for allowing themselves to be used in this way. Their leaders are forgetful of the principle of religious equality when they adopt the false cry "hands of Manitoba"; and Liberals who echo that cry certainly forget the true principles of Liberalism. The greatest Liberal statesman Canada ever had is Hon. Edward Blake, and we attach the greatest possible significance to his ringing declaration of Catholic rights in regard to education which appears on our front page to-day.

The speech was delivered at Malboro, county Cork, on the 24th of last month. It has a stronger and more direct bearing upon the battle for Catholic rights now being waged in Canada than upon the subject of Catholic education in England; and for this reason, that whilst the Catholics in England are only claiming a fuller measure of protection for their primary schools, we, Canadian Catholics, are fighting for the restoration of Catholic primary schools that have been swept out of existence by the tyrannous stroke of a hostile majority; or perhaps it would be more correct to say a hostile political party. Mr. Laurier says the way to remedy that grievance is by conciliation. What says Hon. Edward Blake regarding the principle which Mr. Laurier places at stake by his timidity?

We believed in the spirit of Roman Catholic emancipation, and we decline to stand by the letter and not keep the spirit living. We protest against the ostracism of any citizen of whatever faith on account of his creed, and we believe that his only passport to public employment and public trust should be his integrity, his efficiency and his patriotism. We abhor the word toleration in religion because toleration means privilege and subservience. We believe not in toleration but in absolute religious freedom and equality. We do not believe in doing injustice to the Roman Catholic minority.

That is the manly, dignified declaration by which Mr. Blake justifies his vote, and the votes of his confederates of the Irish party, on the English Education Bill. Their votes were given for the Conservatives and against the Liberals. That is true Liberalism in politics. Let Catholic Liberals not forget it. Bearing it in mind then put the principle of Liberalism above the game of partisanship. Subservience gains no lasting victory even when it is euphemistically called "conciliation."

Roman Catholic emancipation has always been a fact in Canada; it is the cement of Confederation, and Mr. Blake—proud of his Liberalism—voices Canadian feeling, we believe, when he says: "We decline to stand by the letter and not keep the spirit living."

The Barcelona Bomb.

The Government of Spain has always refused the yoke of Atheism which has left its evil blight upon other European countries. Irreligious secret societies have never been able to eat their way into and destroy the Spanish constitution, and as a result religion flourishes among the people. In France we have long seen religious processions prohibited by the secret fiat of the Atheists who shake the Government; in Spain religious processions constitute one of the great visible moral influences of the national religion. The apostles of Atheism realize how hopeless must attempts be made to gain control of any of the agencies of government prove as long as so much evidence of the religious earnestness of the people is kept in view of all classes of public men, politicians, journalists and others. Naturally then the devilish hate of Atheism goes out against religious processions. Could these be stopped by any means an initial victory in the war against God would be gained. If they cannot be stopped by the unseen force of powerful secret organizations, like the Freemasons, they may be stopped by intimidation. The world has enjoyed so long a spell of peace that some have grown to love peace for the laziness of it. Without discerning the indifference that prompts the wish they are inclined to say of religious processions that if they stir up hatred, even in an anarchist or an Atheist, and incite him to outrage, it is better that they should be discontinued than that precious human lives should be lost. This is not the spirit of Christianity in the Catholic Church. In all the ages of the Church men and women laid down their lives for the faith and did not deem they were doing more than the soldier's duty. Not in the early history of the Church, nor at any period of her history, has the Church been confronted by a foe more savage and cunning than the Anarchy or Atheism she is fighting to-day in Europe. Every religious procession that makes its passage through the public streets of a European city is a holy crusade against the forces of Satan as represented by Anarchy. And of all religious processions, considering them as armies in the cause of Christ, none can possibly be more glorious than the procession of the Blessed Sacrament on the feast of Corpus Christi. Our Blessed Lord, Himself, really, truly and substantially present, is the leader in the procession of the Blessed Sacrament. Several times have the wild beasts of Atheism in Spain cast their bombs into the Corpus Christi processions. Such abominable crimes now promise to become matters of annual occurrence, the Anarchists hoping to intimidate the clergy and people, and compel them to take a step backward.

On last Sunday the hellish outrage was repeated on the streets of Barcelona, as the Corpus Christi procession was entering one of the churches of the city. Eleven innocent persons were killed by the explosion of the bomb and forty were wounded. In other Spanish cities similar outrages were attempted with less daring, and happily unattended by any loss of life. In the panic that followed the throwing of the bomb in Barcelona the deed escaped identification. The authorities have made a hundred arrests of reputed Anarchists, and it is believed the actual bomb thrower is among the number. In order to vindicate the character of the law it became necessary to place the city under military authority so great was the popular excitement.

A year or two ago it was believed that an international code could be framed for the apprehension and indefinite imprisonment of declared Anarchists wherever found. That might have resulted in the suppression of the abominable doctrine that has already cost many lives in various parts of Europe. No more hellish crime can be imagined than the scientifically planned murder of young girls for no other cause than their love of the Saviour. This mode of

warfare against religion is now become a special characteristic of Anarchy. And, as we have said, its undoubted object is to decrease the influence of religion by intimidating the Church in Catholic countries into relinquishing outward demonstrations of Faith in the way of religious processions through the public streets. But Catholics are not cowards; and Anarchy and Atheism cannot by such methods force them from honoring their Saviour in the Blessed Sacrament.

Mr. Lount and The Register.

At the Liberal meeting in Centre Toronto on Friday evening the candidate, Mr. Lount, Q.C., paid his respects to THE REGISTER. We acknowledge the compliment; but fail entirely to see the attractive side of Mr. Lount's policy towards the Catholic minority in Manitoba. He pledged himself again to oppose any remedial bill introduced at Ottawa, even if Mr. Laurier should introduce it. And still he charged THE REGISTER with making a statement not inspired by truth when it said this policy means permitting the majority to choke the life out of the Catholic minority in Manitoba. Mr. Lount added:

The Protestants of Ontario had been just to the Catholics, and the Liberals especially had been fair to their Catholic fellow-citizens. If the Government at Ottawa would keep its hands off Manitoba the Protestants of that Province, descendants of men who had been just and fair to Catholics for centuries, would deal justly by the minority. He was equally sure that an attempt to force coercive legislation would not only bring no relief but stir up hatred and strife.

If we admit for the sake of argument that the Manitoba majority are descendants of the Protestants of Ontario "who have been just and fair to Catholics for centuries" they have a rather remarkable way of showing practical respect for the traditions of their ancestors. As long as they were in the minority they had no word to say against Catholic education; but just as soon as they get strong enough they put majority power into operation they stamp out Catholic schools. That is a novel way of dealing justly by the minority. But let us go half way to meet Mr. Lount in his argument, and take it for granted that he honestly believes in soft-soaping the people of Manitoba in order to win them back to the traditions of their ancestors once more. What then? We answer with Hon. Edward Blake that the idea of modern religious liberty is a very different thing from Mr. Lount's line of policy. Toleration, privilege and subservience in religion are abhorrent to modern British ideas of freedom and equality. These things are abhorrent to true Liberals like Hon. Edward Blake, who says: "We believe in the spirit of Catholic emancipation and we decline to stand by the letter and not keep the spirit living."

The Globe on Home Rule.

The Globe declares that the vote of the Irish members on the English Education Bill "will tend more than ever to place Home Rule in the background," and that "it is doubtful if the Liberal party would a second time allow itself to be rent in twain by its attachment to a cause which has proved so disastrous to it." The Globe thinks in this way because Irish Catholics refuse to see eye to eye in a matter of conscience with English Nonconformists, and because the Methodists in Ontario have taken up towards the Liberal party in this province a political position similar to that occupied by the English Nonconformists.

And to think that The Globe used to be such a good Home Ruler! Hon. Edward Blake, who has excellent opportunities for observing the situation in England, does not take The Globe's view. Neither do those British Liberals who are not actually identified with the political movement of the Nonconformist body. They have no difficulty in realizing the impossibility of blinding the consciences of Catholics by the tactics of a political party.

North Waterloo.

A friend calls our attention to a mistake we made inadvertently in reference to Mr. Seagram's candidature for Parliament. Mr. Seagram is in the race for North Waterloo, not for South Waterloo as we stated, and coming out, as he does decidedly, for fair play to all in the matter of education, he deserves to win.