

The Catholic Register.

"Truth is Catholic; proclaim it ever, and God will effect the rest."—BALMEZ.

VOL. V.—NO. 6.

TORONTO, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 1897.

PRICE FIVE CENTS.

The Jesuit Relations And Allied Documents.

The third volume of the invaluable work undertaken by the Burrows-Trotter Company of Cleveland is now before us. We have given much space although not a tenth part of what was due, to reviewing the preceding volumes. From the first we have regarded the plan and fidelity of this publication as probably the most meritorious historical or literary scheme ever undertaken by any American publishers. Our opinion is shared by the best scholars of the continent. For example Mr. John Fiske, the historian writes:

I regard the publication of "The Jesuit Relations and Allied Documents" as one of the most important historical enterprises ever undertaken in America. These documents are absolutely indispensable to the right understanding of American History. The name of the editor is a guarantee of the excellence of his work. I have examined the first volume with feelings of keen delight. Here is a treasure indeed.

Mr. Gold Thwaites, the editor of these translations and reprints, covers himself with honor. Such faultless execution of the gigantic task he has undertaken is beyond praise. The present volume contains not more than two documents: Biard's Epistola, written at Amiens in 1614, and his Relation de la Nouvelle France, written at Paris in 1616 and published at Lyons. The source of the Epistola is Father Martin's autograph in the archives of St. Mary's College, Montreal, of the original Latin M.S. in the archives of the Jesu at Rome. Biard's letter is directed to the General of the Society of Jesus, Father Claude Aquaviva. Its subject is the attack upon the Jesuits mission of St. Saureur by the English from Virginia, the captivity of the missionaries and their return to France. The attack was a bloody piece of business. Two of the French were killed, one wounded and one of the little missionary band, Gilbert de Thot, was wounded mortally. The affair was entirely accidental. The Jesuits were merely prowling along the coast ready to kill anything they might fall in with. When the king was done with the French remonstrance, the English left on foot a copy of holding fifteen persons. Father Masse and fourteen others took the boat, and Fathers Biard and Quentin begged their English captors to put them in the way of some fishing boat, and for the purpose were taken captive down to Virginia. "For the Governor there wished to hang us all, and especially the Jesuits." Fear of the French King, however, prevented the hanging. Another expedition was immediately organized in Virginia to burn the French settlements of St. Croix and Port Royal. Eight of the French captives were forced to accompany this expedition, Father Biard among the number. St. Croix was plundered and burned and Port Royal burned the same day. It was proposed to abandon Biard upon the ruins of Port Royal; but on second thought he was once more taken back to Virginia for a hanging. A storm separated the small fleet of marauders and the ship bearing Biard and being blown out of its course put into the Azores. The Portuguese inhabitants of the Azores being Catholics, the English were in a fix about landing. Biard, rather than be thrown overboard, agreed not to disclose the acts of his captors and for three weeks, while the vessel was at the Azores, he lay concealed in the hold. The faithful performance of the promise given so deeply impressed the English captain that upon his return to England he publicly extolled the character of the Jesuits. The vessel landed at Pombeiro where the captain, not without reason, was taken for a pirate and held in custody until the Jesuits were brought forth to testify to his character. Father Biard gives the following description of the impression created by himself and his friend Father Quentin:

The Jesuits are at once summoned and seized at by all, are led into the town. We are ordered to give our evidence. We of course attest what was perfectly true—that our captain was a royal officer and not a pirate, and that what he had done to us had been done in obedience to orders, rather than from his own free will.

INCOMPETENT CRITICS.

WRITTEN FOR THE REGISTER.

In the recent controversy in the columns of The Mail and Empire it has been said, more than once not exactly that we are idolaters, but that the elements of the awful sin are there in our system, and we can escape only by being better than our creed. Now, not to speak at all of the holy zeal those writers display for purity of worship in general, one can hardly fail to be struck by the care and anxiety they labor under—not for their own saintly selves of course—but for fear poor we might not be as good as they wish us. I suppose we ought to be grateful, and I am sure we would be if we thought either that they were in earnest in their fears or right in their judgment. But this we cannot believe.

If they were in earnest in a desire to see us better, they would not be so wretched, and given to abuse. Charity does not show itself after these fashions. And secondly, it is very plain they have no confidence in the soundness of the view they take of us, as I proceed to show.

It is observable, then, that in all which has been written, not one of them has ever said, or even hinted, that he had met a single person guilty of idolatry. One, just one, specimen of the real live articles would cut a bigger figure than columns of reasoning.

When the late Lord Momboddo had persuaded himself that man was a descendant of the monkey tribe, not content with the ratiocinative process, he gave large sums of money to ship captains trading to all parts of the world with the request that they would find and bring back the missing link. He was disappointed, of course, but at least he said that he was not a knave but believed what he said.

Our critics would raise their reputation for honesty, if they exhibited their enterprise, and made sacrifices of time and money in trying to find a live proof of the odious charges made against us. What right have we, who already believe in infallibility under one set of conditions, to refuse to accept their statements with a kind of faith. Well, it is an ugly thing, certainly, to have to call a man a knave, or even to do it, but never for our own sake. What right have we, who already believe in infallibility under one set of conditions, to refuse to accept their statements with a kind of faith. Well, it is an ugly thing, certainly, to have to call a man a knave, or even to do it, but never for our own sake.

And here, unlike them, we do not set up a view of our own, or their, for nobody likes to admit he is not as good as his neighbor. But we will give a specimen, a genuine specimen of their reasoning process, a pattern specimen, too, with feature corresponding to feature. It is a specimen of their inference, or conclusion, wanting to make the analogy complete. Observe, then, they don't say they ever saw an act of idolatry in a Catholic, or know much of the state of our mind, or what the meaning we put in many words, nor the way we comport ourselves towards religion. But still they are quite sure things must be as they say. They have read it in fifty places and everybody about has the same view of it. As there is no need of any argument, they are quite sure. Well, there is in my neighborhood a foreigner who has no love for England. He is illiterate, indeed, and untravelled, but by no means deficient in shrewdness and sense. In a conversation I had with him the other day, on the blessings of the British constitution, "bah," he said, "the British are all rogues and savages." "But," I replied, "isn't that very extreme? What! all of them? Did you ever know an Englishman?" "By many," he replied, "and I don't want to." "What I do know is enough for me." anxious to hear his grounds for so monstrous an opinion I pressed for an explanation, and here it is. "I heard it read out of a book that the English are a nation of shopkeepers, and shopkeepers are all rogues. And then they live chiefly on raw beef, and nobody but savages would do that."

HON. EDWARD BLAKE.

Alleged to have advised Mr. Fitzpatrick in the school question.

London, Feb. 5.—Mr. Charles Fitzpatrick, Solicitor-General of Canada, who has just returned here from a trip to the Continent, and will sail for home on Feb. 18, has taken the opinion of Hon. Edward Blake, M.P., in regard to the appeals of the Manitoba Government from the decision of the Privy Council in the matter of the Manitoba school dispute.

Mr. Blake expresses the opinion that it is a complete misapprehension to think that the Privy Council ordered the discontinued schools to be restored, and is further of the opinion that the Federal Government have no power to deal with the taxes of Manitoba or to allocate any money to Catholic or Separate schools.

An amicable arrangement on the lines of the proposal of the Manitoba Government might be made, but it would be more advantageous from every point of view to the Catholic minority than any remedial bill could possibly be.

Mr. J. Walton, Q.C., the legal adviser of the leading Catholic bodies in England, concurs in the opinion given by Mr. Blake.

WHAT THE TABLET SAYS. The Tablet, the chief Catholic organ of Great Britain, owned and managed by Cardinal Vaughan, publishes an article to-day upon the Manitoba school question, in which it says: "Hon. Edward Blake's opinion is a sad disappointment. It is not clear that the best course for the Catholics is to support Premier Laurier in trying to carry negotiations with Manitoba to a successful conclusion."

The Tablet advocates the appointment of an apostolic delegate to Canada, who might be able to force a Catholic opinion to formulate a Catholic united demand, and so effect a final settlement of the difficulty.

SCHOOL SETTLEMENT TO BE REVISED.

MONTREAL STAR SPECIAL.

Winnipeg, Man., February 8.—A Star correspondent learns on reliable authority that J. E. P. Prendergast, ex-M.P.P. for St. Boniface, will be taken into Greenway Cabinet as Minister of Education. It is a position about to be created. Further, Prendergast will soon return from Ottawa, and will bring with him a new settlement of the school question, which will be more satisfactory to Archbishop Langvin. Mr. Prendergast, it is said, will again contest St. Boniface, and is pledged to support the Archbishop. A few days before leaving East Mr. Prendergast, Mr. Greenway and Father Richot had an all-night session, at which a complete agreement was arrived at. Mr. Prendergast, it is said, is pledged to Mgr. Langvin to carry out the new arrangement. My authority for this statement is of such a character as to give the story authenticity. If the arrangement turns out as expected, the school question may be considered as finally settled.

The Late Mr. Henry A. McMahon.

We regret to announce the death of Mr. Henry A. McMahon on Wednesday, Feb. 10, at his residence 646 King St. West, Toronto. Mr. McMahon was in his 88th year. While he was a resident of Ayrton, Ontario, he served as councillor. He also was reeve in Normandy where he was a well to do farmer, holding a hundred acres. He was a pioneer in the erection of masonry brick farm houses, his own dwelling being a model structure. Some ten years ago he sold his farm and removed to Toronto. He was always well known for his kindness of manner and his charity towards the poor. He was the uncle of Fernagh. Mr. McMahon came to Canada in the early thirties. In his last illness he was of but a few days duration, he was attended by Vicar-General McCann of St. Mary's parish. He leaves a widow to mourn his loss. The funeral took place at 2 o'clock on Sunday last, at the church of St. Michael's cemetery. It was one of the largest seen in the west end of Toronto for many years. The pall bearers were: James T. Heffernan, John Rea, James McMahon, Patrick Dunphy, William O'Des and Edward L. Taylor. R.I.P.

Complimentary.

The Register gives place with pleasure to the following complimentary notice of an old and valued friend, who has lately taken up his residence amongst us. We quote from the Flora Express of Jan. 28: "At the last meeting of the Library Board the resignation of Mr. Halley as director was accepted and Mr. Black, Principal of the Salem school, appointed to fill the vacancy. The following resolution was also passed:—Resolved, that in accepting the resignation of Mr. Halley as a member of the Library Board—owing to his personal wants—required to assist in advancing the material interest of the library, they were always freely and willingly given. The members of the Board trust that in their new field of labor property will attend them, and that their usefulness will be fully appreciated as when resident in this village."

GETTING AFTER MR. FITZPATRICK.

The following letter appears in The Tablet of January 31, in reply to the contents of an apparently from Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick which appeared in the previous number:

Sir:—A Catholic Canadian speaks in a tone which gives him every right to be heard. But his special plea for the Canadian Government (The Tablet of January 24) will not hold its ground upon those who, like himself, "know all the facts," but who are in no way bound to defend everything that may be done or proposed by the Dominion Government. Let me say frankly for myself that I would not take the side of those opposed to any Tory or Conservative party, whether in or out of office. But, at the present moment, I cannot help being hostile to the Canadian Liberal party, although it is in power.

The "Catholic Canadian" does not give enough of all the facts. He speaks of a Prime Minister who is "a loyal son of the Church," and a "Ministry which contains four Catholic members." It seems to me a pity to go into a detail of that kind, because Catholic is the Catholic dose, and because the Government is acting as a whole, and as a Liberal Cabinet.

One of his three Catholic colleagues in Mr. Tarte, who lately told a Protestant audience in Winnipeg that he was a Catholic by accident, as they were Protestants by accident. He is only just to suppose that two members of the Ministry are Catholics by the grace of God and by conviction. But that gives no presumption that the "settlement" which the Ministry offers to the Catholics is a violation of their moral and legal rights, or even contains "the best terms likely to be got."

And here I would ask "Catholic Canadian" if he ought not to withdraw a phrase in his article. Who is it that has created Mr. Laurier as a foe instead of a friend, and kept him at arm's length? The accusation must be meant either for the Archbishop of St. Boniface or for the Bishops of Canada in general. Now we are not going to believe without proof that any Catholic Bishop keeps at arm's length the Catholic people in authority by the vote of his fellow countrymen. And what we know is that the Archbishop of Toronto, Halifax (who calls the so-called settlement a "cynical injustice"), and Kingston bear the blame of the hostility to the Liberal Premier, and that the French-Canadian Archbishops of Quebec, Montreal, Ottawa and St. Boniface are not likely to be hostile to a French-Canadian Premier.

The Catholics allow them to be friendly. Mr. Laurier's apologetic attitude is the wolf and lamb story. The Canadian Ministers have ostentatiously avoided all conference with the Archbishop of St. Boniface, or other representative of the Catholics. They have simply made a political deal with Mr. Greenway and his colleagues. They have admitted Mr. Sifton, one of these colleagues into the Cabinet of the Dominion. They have accepted certain terms from him and Mr. Greenway, and have thrown those terms upon the Catholics as a fait accompli, along with the option of "going out into the wilderness." The Catholics reject such terms, declaring them to be a mockery of their moral and legal rights. And immediately they are accused of keeping the friendly Mr. Greenway at arm's length, and treating him as a foe.

But let us come to the merits of the case, and come to the point. What are the merits of the "settlement," and what are the difficulties in the way of its true settlement, in which the Catholics demand a two-pointed, apostolic speaks of a "hostile and over-extended Protestant majority." Now we are obliged, of course, to take elected officials as representatives of their voters. And the provincial officials in Manitoba and the North-west are certainly hostile to the Catholics on the education question. Nevertheless it is worth while to remember that at the last general election (more recent than the provincial election) the people of Manitoba and the North-west were certainly in favour of the Remedial Bill which would have satisfied the Catholics. And why should the Protestants be exasperated? Is it because their Government has inflicted great hardships upon the Catholics by abolishing a system of education which the apostolic declares to have been "perfectly fair to all parties"? Or is it because the school taxes paid by Catholics have been, since 1890, used for the sole benefit of the non-Catholic schools? But suppose we consider the elected officials. How far is Mr. Greenway really "hostile" to any arrangement which will leave him in office? Here we come to a serious question, and the word is serious. I do not for a moment mean to say that Mr. Greenway is allowed to treat de puissance a puissance with the Dominion or the Imperial authorities. Still, if this Government be seriously hostile, if there be any bona fide prospect of coercion being needed, there cannot be too much caution and prudence. But we want a little more light. What is it that the "Catholic Canadian" tells us? He assures us that Mr. Greenway is in a mood for "conciliation," and "concessions." I conclude that, as concessions have not been obtained, they have not been asked for by Mr. Laurier, who had doubly and trebly pledged himself to obtain them. What further does the "Catholic Canadian" tell us? He says that if the total repeal of the School Law of 1890 had been demanded by the Imperial Privy Council, "it would have

FROM MR. LAURIER'S HIGHEST PLEASURE TO ENFORCE SUCH A DECREE.

What a policy of coercion and force! For his Liberal friends in Manitoba. Evidently Mr. Laurier understands as well as Mr. Greenway himself the real meaning of all the talk about provincial rights, which should not "enforce" the actual and less far-reaching decree of the highest tribunal in the Empire.

This question leads me to another passage of the "Catholic Canadian" apology. He says that other Catholics should not misunderstand the meaning of the decree given in their favour by the Privy Council. This is not perhaps a childish statement, but it must be meant for very childlike readers. The Archbishop of St. Boniface has had the legal assistance of the members of the distinguished firm, Mr. Blake, M. P. for Longford, and Mr. Ewart, Q.C. Winnipeg, presented the Catholic case in Whitehall. Besides it requires special training to understand the judgment, which is quoted at sufficient length by a "Catholic Canadian." In it we find that the Privy Council did not, it is true, declare, like the Supreme Court of Canada, that the School Act of 1890 was null and void. But it declared that the Act inflicted a grievance upon Catholics, for which the remedy was to be sought at the hands of the Government in Council. And it pointed out that this remedy would be found if the existing law were "supplemented" and "modified."

Where is the room for misunderstanding or exaggerating the meaning of this judgment? The Remedial Bill of the late Government would have done what was needed in supplementing and modifying. There was nothing "miserably vague" about it. Mr. Laurier obstructed it, saying he would do far better for the Catholics if placed in power. But he said the Dominion can provide no funds for education in Manitoba. This statement has been questioned in Canadian papers, but one may really let it pass after the other statement about the "greatest pleasure in totally nullifying the School Law of the Province. What sane man would try to set up the old system once more, if he did not know that funds would be available, whether from the old sources or from now?

It is also said that the terms proposed to the Manitoba Government by Ottawa in March, 1896, were less favorable to the Catholics than those now obtained by Mr. Laurier. Is this a fact? And if it be, is it to the point to publish it? "Catholic Canadian" must know that even in the late Government the Catholics agreed, the Catholics themselves and their Bishops did not agree, and could not agree, to terms less favorable than the Remedial Bill.

And now I would ask what is this difficulty in the way of the school system from Winnipeg and St. Boniface, the Catholics are few and scattered. They are not fewer or more scattered than before in 1890. Yet the school system then working was "perfectly fair to all parties." The "Catholic Canadian" is impracticable since 1897? I hope The Free Press is right in saying that the people will soon begin "to do their own thinking." If the Protestant people of Manitoba refuse to allow their thinking to be a longer done for them by certain professions, and certain classes, the School question will soon be settled. The Catholics are not seeking any "ideal system." They are contending for their legal rights, knowing that the recognition of them will involve nothing that is not perfectly fair to all parties. And their denial leaves the Catholics (as a "Catholic Canadian" also admit) in the position of an "oppressed" minority.

A PRIEST IN LONDON.

Stereopticon Views.

A brief reference was made in THE REGISTER last week to the entertainment to be given in St. Michael's College Hall on the evening of Monday next, Feb. 16. The views of celebrated names and places in relation to the various stages of the Coro Cork, Blarney Castle, Lakes of Killarney, Daniel O'Connell, the Rapids of the Shannon, Kilmore Castle, Enniskillen, the Giant's Causeway, the Cathedral of Armagh, St. Patrick's in his time, the ruins of the great Emancipator, St. Peter's, and the performance a selection of Irish songs and airs will be rendered by the following ladies and gentlemen: Mrs. Moore, Miss Malloy, Miss Johnston, Messrs. J. and M. Costello. Accompanied by Mr. Moore.

Vicar General McCann at St. Cecilia's.

Vicar General McCann preached in St. Cecilia's Church, West Toronto Junction, on Sunday evening on "Christ the priest, prophet and King." He took for his text cor. 3:17.—"All whatsoever you do in word or in work, all things do ye in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, giving thanks to God and the Father by Him." The sermon was marked by the characteristic impressiveness of Father McCann's discourses.

C. M. B. A.

Branch 15, C.M.B.A., held its most enjoyable meeting at their hall corner Yonge and Gerrard Streets, Monday evening, Feb. 7th, 1897. The President, J. O'Flaherty called the meeting; to order sharp at 8 o'clock. After the usual business had been disposed of, Bro. Miller of Branch 146, read a very instructive paper on his trip to Mexico, which was appreciated by all members present. A unanimous vote of thanks was tendered by the President in a few well chosen words on behalf of the Branch and neatly responded to by Bro. Miller. A cordial invitation is extended to all members of the C.M.B.A., to visit this pioneer Branch, which meets the 2nd and 4th, Monday in every month.

The Jesuit Relations and Allied Documents. Translations and reprints of the Jesuit Missions in New France, 1616-1791. The original French, Latin and Italian texts, with French and English translations; illustrated by portraits, maps and facsimile text. Edited by Herbert Gold Thwaites, Secretary of the Standard Historical Publishing Co., Ltd., 151-155, Cleveland. The Burrows & Co. Company, Publishers, 1897.