

The Catholic Register.

PUBLISHED EVERY THURSDAY AT THE OFFICE, 40 LOMBARD ST. BY J. J. McLELLAN, Proprietor. Catholic Register Bldg. and Pub. Co. of Toronto, Limited.

Subscription per annum, \$2.00. Single copies, 10 cents.

Approved and recommended by the Archbishop, Bishop and Clergy.

ADVERTISING RATES: Transient advertisements 10 cents per line. Special rates for long term contracts.

Remittances should be made by Post Office Order, Express Money Order, or by Registered Letter. If by cheque, 25 cents must be added for discount.

Where changes address, the name of former Post Office should be given.

No paper delivered till arranged in place. Notices of Birth, Marriage and Death 50 cents each.

TRAVELLING AGENTS: Mr. Patrick McLELLAN, Proprietor, 40 Lombard St., Toronto. Mr. Lawrence O'Brien, 100 St. James St., Toronto.

THURSDAY, APRIL 21, 1898.

Calendar for the Week.

- April 21—S. Anselm. 22—SS. Peter and Paul. 23—S. George. 24—S. John the Baptist. 25—S. Mark, Evangelist. 26—Our Lady of Good Counsel. 27—S. Egbert.

The Register cordially unites in the congratulations to Chevalier John Honey, of Ottawa, upon the attainment of his 77th birthday, and wishes the warm-hearted and patriotic Delegate many happy returns.

Mr. Douglas Stewart, inspector of penitentiaries, declines to be made further use of as the plant tool of the partisan commissioners who conducted the recent investigations at Kingston and St. Vincent de Paul. It is high time for Mr. Stewart's protest. The commissioners were really giving the inspector very bad treatment all along. Their object was to demonstrate the utter incapacity and untrustworthiness of as many Conservative appointees as it was considered safe to dismiss.

It is to be hoped that the debate in the House of Commons upon Mr. Mulock's proposal to reduce the rate of interest on Post-Office Savings Bank deposits has been widely and carefully read. The chief facts brought to light are given elsewhere. It will be admitted, we think, that those facts leave Mr. Mulock and the supporters of his proposition without any excuse at all for their economy. Indeed we are reluctantly forced to the conclusion that the reduction is a "grab" by the capitalist class. This is not saying too much in face of all the facts. The business relations of government towards the industries working people through the Post Office Savings Bank must in the first place be rightly understood. The Antigonish Casket indicates the nature of those relations very accurately in the following paragraph: "There are a good many people who, quite irrespective of party leanings, will agree with the views expressed by THE CATHOLIC REGISTER of Toronto, on the subject of the reduction of the rate of interest on deposits in the Post Office Savings Bank, which is to be cut down from three to two and one-half per cent. The question is of course a large one and needs to be approached in a broad spirit. There is, at first sight, some force in the argument that the Government cannot afford to pay those depositors a higher rate of interest than that for which it can borrow money elsewhere; but it was never contemplated that the system should be a purely business one of borrowing the savings of the people at the lowest possible rate. The best evidence of this fact is that the amount allowed to be deposited has always been strictly limited. If the intention were only to borrow at the lowest market rate there would be no reason for confining each depositor to so small a sum. The evident intention was the encouragement of thrift among the people, wealthy investors being excluded by the limiting clause. If this is not effectual, some means could probably be found of making it so, and of confining the benefits of the system to the class for which it was intended."

Such being the intention with which the Post-Office Savings Bank was instituted, Mr. Mulock's argument that the Government is bound to borrow all its money on the lowest possible terms appears to be only a very poor sort of pretext indeed. Furthermore, it was clearly demonstrated on the floor of the House that the Government, for the next half century, will pay one and one-half more for its London loans than it proposes to allow the honest and thrifty workingman of Canada. Again, the most conservative of the loan companies allow three and one-half per cent. on all deposits, so that it is not permissible to doubt that the reduced rate in the Government Savings Bank is deliberately designed to check the increasing habit of the thrifty class of wage-earners of investing their "idle savings" with the Government. The results to be looked for are those: (1) that the people's savings will be withdrawn from the Post-Office Bank, and (2) that the disposition

towards thrift must be seriously checked. If the deposits be withdrawn to a large amount from the Government Savings Bank, and transferred, for the sake of better terms, to chartered banks and loan companies, the change will not be a desirable one, for one reason, if not for another, that in Canada speculation is, in great part, the life of banks and deposit seeking corporations. The entire question of government finance is bound, sooner or later, to force itself in an unpleasant manner upon the attention of the people. The politicians have so dulled public opinion in Canada that the great body of electors appear to concede to politicians in power permission to do as they please subject only to the criticism of politicians in opposition. There is little or no independent aid afforded to electors by outside public opinion, but of a certainty the two political parties do not control enough combined integrity, and means of impartial communication with the people, to make it safe for parliament to monopolize the right of deciding questions involving a conflict between the interests of classes. Take for instance the interests of the capitalists vs. the working class—this very question of the Savings Bank deposits. How many men in parliament and in the government have financial relations with banks and loan corporations, and would be personally benefitted by the transference of a large portion of the savings now in the Post-office bank? We make no allusion to Mr. Mulock whatever. But we say that until the meaning of the phrase, "the independence of Parliament," is as well understood in Canada as it is in England, there will be need for the greatest vigilance against the influences of capitalists and corporations working upon the government. This ill-starred shaving of the poor man's "savings," for the improvement of the rich man's "investments," does not look much better than several other recent transactions that have provoked a great and righteous outcry.

The Register has already to put itself on record as advocating the imposition of a reasonable rate of postage on all newspapers, American as well as Canadian, using the Dominion mail service. Publishers who affirm that they are running their presses for the honor and glory of God alone, or for the disinterested improvement of the public, and at a straight loss, should go into their chambers and thoroughly examine their consciences. The public should be wary of such entirely needless self-sacrifice. But what we most emphatically object to is the special treatment—the discrimination,—outlined by the Post-master-General. This discrimination under one head alone, still makes the common tax-payer responsible for the cost of carrying and delivering all political literature turned out of party printing offices at all times. This is the sole and certain object of the exemption clause in favor of country weeklies distributed within ten miles of the publication office. None of the party newspapers object to this exemption, because they stand to share some of the benefit of it all round. All the political literature that is not dumped into the mails directly from the Government offices, where it is "franked," is published in the shape of "supplements" to the big partisan sheets of Toronto, Montreal and other cities. These "supplements" are shipped to the offices of the country weeklies, where they are folded into the local prints and reach the household of the elector free through the mails. This is knavery and fraud that must be protested against. Are the honest, non-partisan tax payers of Canada to be saddled with the cost of party warfare in election times? Have honest men no rights in Canada; and are they to be robbed by politicians who, while casting of "good government," dip their arms deeper than ever into people's pockets? If newspapers are to be free from a legitimate postage rate, let there be no making fish of one and flesh of another; but if papers like THE REGISTER are to be made pay a levy for the lies and avoidances of future crops of "campaign literature," it will not, at least, be without protest. Mr. Mulock's post "reform" is a tax on truth and independence, and a bonus for falsehood and subservency.

The Canadian Baptist. The Canadian Baptist is not on our exchange list. Its recent reference to an article of ours has, however, been forwarded to us by a member of the Catholic Truth Society. The Baptist, we observe, has nothing at all to say on its own account; but it challenges the attention of THE REGISTER to a lecture delivered in London, England, by a Congregationalist named Dr. Horton. The Baptist takes the lecture in full from The Christian World Pulpit. Protestant readers are requested by our Toronto contemporary to go to the sources of history for themselves, not to take Dr. Horton's

statements on his "meo ipse dixit." We would infer from this remark that The Baptist is unable to give us any information whatever about this Dr. Horton; and we have never before heard or read of the reverend gentleman. The lecture, which occupies nearly two pages of The Baptist, we have read. From beginning to end we cannot find a name, a date, or a fact put forward openly, or in a way to give the opportunity of appealing to any authority other than Dr. Horton himself. We have, then, to deal solely with his argument, based upon his assertions—assertions made not in the language of vulgarly, although baldly and boldly enough. The only course left open to us, therefore, is to refute Dr. Horton out of his own mouth, a thing that happily is always possible with an untruthful witness. His opening statement is to the effect that England in the next generation will probably be a Catholic nation. We sincerely hope that this is good prophecy. His reasons for making it are: Every one must have observed that a great change is coming over the English character, and that a large portion of our aristocracy and social leaders in modern England have already become, and many more are daily becoming, Romanists. . . . about five hundred clergy in the Church of England, who believing that Anglican orders are not valid, have sought and obtained ordination through a papal channel. There are eight hundred nuncios with twenty thousand nuns established in England within the last comparatively few years. . . . In the year 1894 the present Pope, Leo XIII., addressed a letter to all the princes and peoples in the earth, and especially to the Protestant princes and peoples. In that letter he says, using the constant language of the Pope, that he has the viceregent of the Almighty God. . . . We are all one in Jesus Christ. The Pope desires that we should all be one in him. . . . If this claim is true, we must all recognize that we should bow before the Pope, and that he tells us so. But if that claim is false, it is not enough for us to repudiate it. We must battle strenuously against what becomes the most daring, blasphemy in history.

So far we have no call to take issue with Dr. Horton. It is in his method of "repudiating" the authority of the church that we desire to point out confusion and absurdity. This attempt at "repudiation" is divided under three heads. He begins with a comparison of the present state of so-called Protestant and Catholic countries. South America (Catholic) is compared with North America (Protestant). Spain (Catholic) is placed over against Italy. Austria (Catholic) is contrasted with Germany (Protestant). Ireland (Catholic) is taunted as the impoverished next-door neighbor of pure-proud England. "By their fruits ye shall know them," quotes the glub Dr. Horton, when he has drawn up his list of comparisons.

hold the imperial figure of the future New Zealander standing upon a broke arch of London Bridge, viewing the ruins of the modern world's metropolis? With regard to South America, it is evident that Dr. Horton is repeating stale stories. He, however, says in this regard nothing that can be taken hold of. To compare north and south America as if they should keep abreast of each other in the march of settlement and industry is even less reasonable, than to wonder why the great industrial cities of the United States are not in the southern instead of the northern States. Climate has more to do with those matters than Christianity. In the next place let us ask upon what authority Dr. Horton designates north America "Protestant"? Is it because the majority are Protestants? That is not enough, besides the Catholics are increasing so rapidly, and the movement towards the church in the centres of enlightenment is so rapid—more rapid even than in England—that the conditions may in due course be reversed. By what right does Dr. Horton call England "Protestant" when he himself declares, "It is quite within the range of possibility that another generation will see the country you love brought to the condition of Italy or Spain." And here we have another of his contradictions. In one sentence he holds Italy up as a "bogy" before Protestant eyes, and in the next boasts that "since Italy has achieved her unity" she has "become again a great nation." Alas! that is more than any of poor Italy's real friends can say for her. She has, on the contrary, been bankrupted by the most corrupt school of politicians on the face of the earth. Obviously it is to Dr. Horton confirmation of national greatness, strong as proof of Holy Writ, to have gone to war with the Pope.

It is at home in England, however, that Dr. Horton is most at sea in his logic. In fact he has got the English end of his argument almost indescribably tangled up. We have seen where he says the aristocracy, the social leaders, and the clergy of the Church of England—the educated and cultivated classes in short—are rushing for refuge to the bosom of the Catholic church, or, as he, with a lapse into vulgarity, puts it, are "daily becoming Romanists." Very well. In another place he declares to his audience: "I am bound to tell you the truth, because on every hand I find poor, ignorant Englishmen and women, (he is speaking to, and of, Protestants) absolutely without knowledge of the simple things that I have stated to-night." Very significant indeed. It is only before the "poor, ignorant," Protestants, who have no means of knowing whether they are hearing truth or falsehood that Dr. Horton dare make such statements; the educated and cultivated people, who have all the means of knowing better, are flocking for truth to the Church of God.

Perhaps it is when he derides Ireland for her poverty and faithfulness to the ancient faith that Dr. Horton makes the most astounding spectacle of himself. If Ireland is poor it is not the Catholic Church, but rather England, that made her so. Dr. Horton bemoans the modern decay of the "qualities which made the England of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries." We would add that those same "qualities" also made Ireland of that time the butcher-shop of England. England is alone responsible for Ireland's poverty and decay. The great Dr. Johnson, a loyal and honest Englishman, and a Protestant to boot, years before the Union, said to an Irish friend: "Do not unite with England; we would rob you." England carried the Union to rob Ireland and keep her poor. She has succeeded in both respects. What is the use of boasting of the worldly success of a religion that is responsible for the cruel treatment and condition of Ireland before the so-called "Reformation" was relatively a more powerful, and infinitely a happier, nation than she is to-day. That can be proved from history.

We have not space to dwell upon all the crowding contradictions and absurdities arising out of Dr. Horton's test of the Christianity of Protestantism on the basis of worldly prosperity. In the second branch of his argument he reiterates the familiar dicta of the "Protestant Alliance"; but steers clear of data, and so evades other refutation than to say he is either lying or ignorant. The third division of his

subject is devoted to a description of the "voices of the Peoples." Here again Dr. Horton is readily silenced out of his own mouth. In one part of his lecture he remarks: "And must also ask you to remember that I am as mindful as anyone of the many virtues and Christly lives of innumerable members of the Catholic fold. If I had to give you a lecture upon the charm and beauty, the authority and sweetness, of Catholicism, I think I could say as much as most Catholics." And Dr. Horton ever hear, or read, of the virtues and Christ-like lives of any Peoples? He can preach to "poor ignorant" men and women of the 13th century about the alleged vices of a Pope who lived one thousand years ago, but he can say no word for the scores upon scores of Pontiffs to whom all historians allow every attribute of saintliness and wisdom. Even to the "poor, ignorant" men and women who have listened to him it would have been useless for Dr. Horton to insinuate vice against living men; and perhaps he regarded it as a persuasive line of attack to frankly declare that had to be admitted, because the character of the Catholics of England, as a class, is to day beyond reproach. Go where you will through Britain and you will find them, from the Duke of Norfolk to the coal-heaver on the London quays, spoken of as citizens and subjects whose words are as good as their bonds, whose lives are clean, whose public spirit is at all times manifest to the nation. Furthermore, in every city in England, where the "eight hundred nuncios" that have frightened Dr. Horton so badly are situated, the blessed word is recognized and praised of those noble women who have given up home, family and friends the better to serve their dear Lord. O Dr. Horton, whoever you may be, you are not to be trusted when you go back a thousand years to bring the assertions of history against an occupant of the chair of Peter, even though you grant to the Catholics by whom you are surrounded "virtues and Christly lives"; and to their religion "beauty, authority and sweetness." If the Catholic Church is to be judged by its fruits let it not be judged by the bad ones. The fruits of the Catholic Church are before all men's eyes who wish to see; and she is not afraid to discuss her history before any impartial court of enquiring minds.

War and Its Possibilities.

Although the last possibility of peace between America and Spain has not disappeared, the events of this week have fully convinced the world that it is the desire of the United States Government to go to war for the Cuban prize. Both Houses of Congress, on Monday, came to an unexpected agreement on the war resolutions, thus leaving Mr. McKinley no alternative but to send an ultimatum to Madrid. The compromise declaration is framed in such a manner that the issue of a victorious war would leave Cuba on the hands of the Americans. Spain is given no chance of offering further concessions. She has already given Cuba a government on the Canadian plan, and has offered, immediately upon the restoration of order in the island, to withdraw every soldier and civil servant and leave behind only a governor-general as the representative of Spanish sovereignty. But the United States says "No; you must take your flag too, or our ships and armies will expel you. If war was ever forced upon a nation, it is forced upon Spain by the United States. From English organs of public opinion, and from prominent exponents of English policy in Parliament and the universities, we hear that the United States is warmly approved, on the ground that the Anglo-Saxon race alone should have the right to rule in the New World. An eminent professor of Oxford says the United States will recognize this great principle. That professor has much to learn; he should leave his books and his insular surroundings, and come to America to learn exactly what sort of an ass he claims to be. It is a new thing to hear England claiming part-proprietorship in the Monroe doctrine. If that doctrine applies to Cuba, it has equal force in Canada; and England may yet have to learn from experience that the Americans have much less respect for the position on this continent of their ancient enemy, Britain, than they have for the gradually withdrawing shadow of Spain, from whom their "boundless contentment" first received a name. The dominant idea in England seems to be that because Uncle Sam is in a bullying spirit it is better to humor him, as long as he confines his attentions to the Spaniard. There is no sincerity whatever in the English attitude. Canadians must consider the present independently and look to what the future holds from their own point of view. It may be that civilization has bestowed the "boundless contentment" for the benefit of republican institutions; but in the Cuban problem there are no pleasant ones for those of us who are still outside the republican fold.

War and Its Possibilities. Although the last possibility of peace between America and Spain has not disappeared, the events of this week have fully convinced the world that it is the desire of the United States Government to go to war for the Cuban prize. Both Houses of Congress, on Monday, came to an unexpected agreement on the war resolutions, thus leaving Mr. McKinley no alternative but to send an ultimatum to Madrid. The compromise declaration is framed in such a manner that the issue of a victorious war would leave Cuba on the hands of the Americans. Spain is given no chance of offering further concessions. She has already given Cuba a government on the Canadian plan, and has offered, immediately upon the restoration of order in the island, to withdraw every soldier and civil servant and leave behind only a governor-general as the representative of Spanish sovereignty. But the United States says "No; you must take your flag too, or our ships and armies will expel you. If war was ever forced upon a nation, it is forced upon Spain by the United States. From English organs of public opinion, and from prominent exponents of English policy in Parliament and the universities, we hear that the United States is warmly approved, on the ground that the Anglo-Saxon race alone should have the right to rule in the New World. An eminent professor of Oxford says the United States will recognize this great principle. That professor has much to learn; he should leave his books and his insular surroundings, and come to America to learn exactly what sort of an ass he claims to be. It is a new thing to hear England claiming part-proprietorship in the Monroe doctrine. If that doctrine applies to Cuba, it has equal force in Canada; and England may yet have to learn from experience that the Americans have much less respect for the position on this continent of their ancient enemy, Britain, than they have for the gradually withdrawing shadow of Spain, from whom their "boundless contentment" first received a name. The dominant idea in England seems to be that because Uncle Sam is in a bullying spirit it is better to humor him, as long as he confines his attentions to the Spaniard. There is no sincerity whatever in the English attitude. Canadians must consider the present independently and look to what the future holds from their own point of view. It may be that civilization has bestowed the "boundless contentment" for the benefit of republican institutions; but in the Cuban problem there are no pleasant ones for those of us who are still outside the republican fold.

War and Its Possibilities. Although the last possibility of peace between America and Spain has not disappeared, the events of this week have fully convinced the world that it is the desire of the United States Government to go to war for the Cuban prize. Both Houses of Congress, on Monday, came to an unexpected agreement on the war resolutions, thus leaving Mr. McKinley no alternative but to send an ultimatum to Madrid. The compromise declaration is framed in such a manner that the issue of a victorious war would leave Cuba on the hands of the Americans. Spain is given no chance of offering further concessions. She has already given Cuba a government on the Canadian plan, and has offered, immediately upon the restoration of order in the island, to withdraw every soldier and civil servant and leave behind only a governor-general as the representative of Spanish sovereignty. But the United States says "No; you must take your flag too, or our ships and armies will expel you. If war was ever forced upon a nation, it is forced upon Spain by the United States. From English organs of public opinion, and from prominent exponents of English policy in Parliament and the universities, we hear that the United States is warmly approved, on the ground that the Anglo-Saxon race alone should have the right to rule in the New World. An eminent professor of Oxford says the United States will recognize this great principle. That professor has much to learn; he should leave his books and his insular surroundings, and come to America to learn exactly what sort of an ass he claims to be. It is a new thing to hear England claiming part-proprietorship in the Monroe doctrine. If that doctrine applies to Cuba, it has equal force in Canada; and England may yet have to learn from experience that the Americans have much less respect for the position on this continent of their ancient enemy, Britain, than they have for the gradually withdrawing shadow of Spain, from whom their "boundless contentment" first received a name. The dominant idea in England seems to be that because Uncle Sam is in a bullying spirit it is better to humor him, as long as he confines his attentions to the Spaniard. There is no sincerity whatever in the English attitude. Canadians must consider the present independently and look to what the future holds from their own point of view. It may be that civilization has bestowed the "boundless contentment" for the benefit of republican institutions; but in the Cuban problem there are no pleasant ones for those of us who are still outside the republican fold.

War and Its Possibilities. Although the last possibility of peace between America and Spain has not disappeared, the events of this week have fully convinced the world that it is the desire of the United States Government to go to war for the Cuban prize. Both Houses of Congress, on Monday, came to an unexpected agreement on the war resolutions, thus leaving Mr. McKinley no alternative but to send an ultimatum to Madrid. The compromise declaration is framed in such a manner that the issue of a victorious war would leave Cuba on the hands of the Americans. Spain is given no chance of offering further concessions. She has already given Cuba a government on the Canadian plan, and has offered, immediately upon the restoration of order in the island, to withdraw every soldier and civil servant and leave behind only a governor-general as the representative of Spanish sovereignty. But the United States says "No; you must take your flag too, or our ships and armies will expel you. If war was ever forced upon a nation, it is forced upon Spain by the United States. From English organs of public opinion, and from prominent exponents of English policy in Parliament and the universities, we hear that the United States is warmly approved, on the ground that the Anglo-Saxon race alone should have the right to rule in the New World. An eminent professor of Oxford says the United States will recognize this great principle. That professor has much to learn; he should leave his books and his insular surroundings, and come to America to learn exactly what sort of an ass he claims to be. It is a new thing to hear England claiming part-proprietorship in the Monroe doctrine. If that doctrine applies to Cuba, it has equal force in Canada; and England may yet have to learn from experience that the Americans have much less respect for the position on this continent of their ancient enemy, Britain, than they have for the gradually withdrawing shadow of Spain, from whom their "boundless contentment" first received a name. The dominant idea in England seems to be that because Uncle Sam is in a bullying spirit it is better to humor him, as long as he confines his attentions to the Spaniard. There is no sincerity whatever in the English attitude. Canadians must consider the present independently and look to what the future holds from their own point of view. It may be that civilization has bestowed the "boundless contentment" for the benefit of republican institutions; but in the Cuban problem there are no pleasant ones for those of us who are still outside the republican fold.

War and Its Possibilities. Although the last possibility of peace between America and Spain has not disappeared, the events of this week have fully convinced the world that it is the desire of the United States Government to go to war for the Cuban prize. Both Houses of Congress, on Monday, came to an unexpected agreement on the war resolutions, thus leaving Mr. McKinley no alternative but to send an ultimatum to Madrid. The compromise declaration is framed in such a manner that the issue of a victorious war would leave Cuba on the hands of the Americans. Spain is given no chance of offering further concessions. She has already given Cuba a government on the Canadian plan, and has offered, immediately upon the restoration of order in the island, to withdraw every soldier and civil servant and leave behind only a governor-general as the representative of Spanish sovereignty. But the United States says "No; you must take your flag too, or our ships and armies will expel you. If war was ever forced upon a nation, it is forced upon Spain by the United States. From English organs of public opinion, and from prominent exponents of English policy in Parliament and the universities, we hear that the United States is warmly approved, on the ground that the Anglo-Saxon race alone should have the right to rule in the New World. An eminent professor of Oxford says the United States will recognize this great principle. That professor has much to learn; he should leave his books and his insular surroundings, and come to America to learn exactly what sort of an ass he claims to be. It is a new thing to hear England claiming part-proprietorship in the Monroe doctrine. If that doctrine applies to Cuba, it has equal force in Canada; and England may yet have to learn from experience that the Americans have much less respect for the position on this continent of their ancient enemy, Britain, than they have for the gradually withdrawing shadow of Spain, from whom their "boundless contentment" first received a name. The dominant idea in England seems to be that because Uncle Sam is in a bullying spirit it is better to humor him, as long as he confines his attentions to the Spaniard. There is no sincerity whatever in the English attitude. Canadians must consider the present independently and look to what the future holds from their own point of view. It may be that civilization has bestowed the "boundless contentment" for the benefit of republican institutions; but in the Cuban problem there are no pleasant ones for those of us who are still outside the republican fold.