

The Catholic Weekly Review.

A JOURNAL DEVOTED TO THE INTERESTS OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN CANADA

Reddite quæ sunt Cæsaris, Cæsari; et quæ sunt Dei, Deo.—Matt 22: 21.

Vol. III

Toronto, Saturday, Mar. 23, 1889.

No. 6

CONTENTS.

NOTES.....	81
CONTRIBUTED ARTICLES.	
Father Drummond in Montreal.....	A. T. S. 81
The Church in Scotland.....	G. M. Ward 82
THE MODERN DRAM SHOP.....	Archbishop Ireland 85
THE ABLE'S FORGIVENESS.....	87
THE JESUIT QUESTION IN OTTAWA.....	87
ST. PATRICK'S DAY IN THE CHURCHES.....	83
EVENTS IN IRELAND.....	92
EDITORIAL.—	
The Irish Journalists' Dinner.....	88
The Gospel in New York.....	88
The Poor in Protestant Churches.....	88
The Jesuits.....	89
Anti-Catholic Fables and Fictions.....	89
Cardinal Newman on the Order.....	89
A Passage from Mr. W. S. Lilly.....	90
Catholic and Literary Notes.....	87
Correspondence.....	84

Notes.

The leader of the Government has now consented that Col. O'Brien shall be given an opportunity of bringing up his resolution against the Jesuits' Estates Act, in the House on Tuesday next. At the present writing, however, there does not seem to be any probability that the discussion will come to a division.

We fancy that it will be found that the *Globe*, in performing its recent "slop," on the question of the Jesuits' Estates Act, has been concerned rather more about compassing the overthrow of its political opponents, than of promoting Protestantism, or repudiating the recognition, which it professes to see, of the authority of the Pope in the settlement of a civil question. No other conclusion can, we think, be found possible. For either its inconsistent and erratic course throughout the discussion points to that, or it argues very painful incapacity in its conductors to form, on a serious subject, an intelligent, or intelligible, opinion.

Our readers hardly need to be reminded that when the agitation against the Jesuits broke out in this Province, the *Globe* took, and maintained until Saturday last, a position on the question the very reverse of its present one. It argued, in its issue of the 7th February, that "the Liberals if they were in power could not consistently disallow the Jesuits' Bill," because the Bill was within the competence of the Quebec Legislature, and to interfere with provincial legislation was to run counter to every principle in the Liberal programme. Again it said on the 12th February: "If Ontarians wish to perpetuate the Confederation they will quietly accept Sir John's allowance of the Jesuits' Bill. If they can't stomach that allowance they may as well face the truth like honest men and acknowledge that they really do not think the Confederation worth preserving. The end can be nothing else than the destruction of the Confederation."

It claimed that no man who was not prepared to go that far could consistently call for Federal opposition to Quebec's will in the matter. It went so far even as to say that the man who would do so, "was foolish, if honest, and a dangerous

knave if insincere." It kept to this line up to its issue of the 13th.

It was therefore with some disgust that the public read in its issue of the 16th, that, on the strength of an article which had appeared in a law journal, it had suddenly become convinced of the unconstitutionality of the Act, and that it now urged "with the utmost emphasis," that the Jesuits Estates Act should be disallowed. "It must be," it said, "the duty of the Governor-General-in-Council to nullify the Jesuits Estates Act and it must equally be the duty of representatives of the people to make a straight demand upon the Governor-General-in-Council for the performance of that duty." It is, therefore, not strange that the *Globe* has earned for itself public contempt by its conduct; nor that a very pretty quarrel is in progress between that paper and the leaders of the party which it has purported to serve.

The *Globe's* present position, so far as one may hope to understand it, appears to be that the Jesuits Estates Act is at once *ultra vires* and *intra vires*; *intra vires*, in that the subject of the Act is one of Provincial competence; *ultra vires* in that it recognizes the right of the Pope to determine the disposition of the money granted by the Act in compensation for the confiscated estates. This attitude, to say the least, is a very peculiar one, and Catholics can afford to watch the upshot with interest. The politician, or party, that follows its lead in this instance, we venture to think will not stand to win in the issue. The right of the Quebec Legislature to disburse this money to the Jesuits for the purpose of education cannot be disputed, nor does the *Globe* attempt to dispute it. For it is certain that if the legislative acts of one province can, under our constitution, be assailed by the people of another province, the consequence must be the disruption of Confederation. And this is admitted. "It would be intolerable," says the *Montreal Gazette*, "under our system of Government, that the majority in one or more provinces should be allowed to impose its will in religious matters, and matters of purely provincial concern, upon the majority in another Province. The wisdom of the legislation in respect of the Jesuits' Estates, must be determined and pronounced upon by the people of Quebec and not by those of Ontario. Such a crusade as has been organized against that legislation can have but one inevitable consequence, namely, that of arraying in solid phalanx the entire Roman Catholic body of Canada in support of the Jesuit body, and in firm opposition to the attempt to subject the legislation of Quebec to the will of the Protestant provinces of the Dominion."

That, to all serious men, must be the pith and the principle of the question. In the meantime we venture to think that the anticipated discussion in Parliament, from which the *Globe* and *Maie* hope so much, will prove an inglorious frizzle, and that the discussion, as we have before said, will not reach a division.