

The Catholic Register

PUBLISHED EVERY THURSDAY BY
THE CATHOLIC REGISTER PUBLISHING CO.
PATRICK F. CRONIN,
Business Manager and Editor.

Subscription: 25 Cents per Annum in Advance.
Single Copies 5 Cents.
Office—JORDAN ST., TORONTO.

Approved and recommended by the Arch-
bishops, Bishops and Clergy.

ADVERTISING RATES.
Transient advertisements 10 cents a line.
A liberal discount on contracts.
Resolutions should be made by Post Office
Order, Postal Order, Express Money or by Regis-
tered Letter.
When changing address, the name of the
Post Office should be given.

Telephone, Main 489.

THURSDAY, OCT. 17, 1901.

THE ROYAL VISIT.

Toronto has reason to congratulate herself upon the complete success of the visit of Their Royal Highnesses the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York last week. Although the rain, which fell upon the first day would have spoiled any other occasion by clearing the streets of sightseers, it did not dampen in the least the enthusiasm of the popular welcome to the future King and Queen. The spectacle in front of the City Hall was the most impressively hearty civic demonstration ever witnessed in Toronto. The Reception Committee of the Council deserves credit for bringing together there the representatives of all classes of citizens. The illuminations at night and on the following night eclipsed everything north of the Pan-American electrical display, from which indeed they were copied. The Legislative Buildings in Queen's Park easily outshone the other features of the night scene, and the park consequently was the great centre of attraction. The Ontario Government, and in an especial way Provincial Secretary Stratton, should receive the best appreciation of the people of Toronto for the magnificent contribution made to the spectacular grandeur of the city during the royal visit. Osgoode Hall was a good second in the competition.

The glorious weather on the second day made up for the previous day's downpour. The people, who were arbitrarily shut out from Exhibition Park by the martial law-loving usurpers of the militia, were recompensed by the gay street scenes, as the Duke rode on a white horse to and from the review. The only dignified protest that under the circumstances, could have been made was to boycott the "second class" stand, and this was done with emphasis. Next year's Council should not pass one cent of the expenses incurred by the militia officers. If the Dominion Government have any jurisdiction in the matter, an audit of the grand stand receipts would also be of some public interest. It takes one's breath away to conjecture the wealth that might have been gathered in if the militia officers had taken control of the reception at the Legislative Buildings. The thirty thousand who struggled with each other for the touch of the royal hand would doubtless have paid as high as \$25 per shake for the distinction. But the Ontario Government, being imbued with democratic generosity, besides having a large surplus, made the function entirely free.

It would take long to tell all the detailed benefits bestowed right and left by the royal presence. W. F. Maclean, M. P., has made the gratifying discovery that he, "the plain man like yourself," and not Prof. Ramsay Wright, speaks English like the Duke, although he had taken it for granted heretofore that the Professor, along with Arnold Haultain, Byron E. Walker and a few others, had cornered all the aristocratic English accent going around loose in these latitudes. Alexander Muir, the venerable author of "The Maple Leaf," has not taken his lesson so gratefully. He thought the Duke would have been honored to see him planting a tree; and he considered himself grievously insulted when the heir-apparent planted the tree and he (Mr. Muir) merely looked on. If he could only regard the incident in its true light, he might have felt as pleased as Mr. W. F. Maclean at the opportunity of learning how to handle a spade like the Duke.

Not only do our leading citizens know how to speak and dig with royal grace, but their wives and

daughters, if they are wise, may with equal facility dress like royalty. The Duchess, wherever she was seen, was very simply dressed, and lost nothing of her wonderful grace and charm on that account. If the women of Toronto copy her in this matter, all the money expended on the royal welcome will soon come back.

These practical reflections on the influence of royalty upon people who come in contact with it only once in sixty years cannot be concluded without a word of honest praise for Major Maude, the Governor-General's secretary. He more than any other who accompanied the royal party filled the difficult position of manager between the public and the royal pair. It must be said for him that he has displayed the greatest tact and industry, and the entirely happy and harmonious record of the visit from one end of the Dominion to the other is in no small measure due to his personal capacity for arranging the difficult details of such work.

ARCHBISHOP IRELAND AND LABOR.

The Register last week noted, without any ardent expressions of satisfaction, an article written in the current number of The North American Review by Archbishop Ireland. We are accordingly not displeased at all to see the Archbishop's argument closely analyzed by as capable a Catholic lawyer as Dr. Dillon, editor of The New World, Chicago. We give space to the editor's view, which appears to us to be more logical than the Archbishop's. Dr. Dillon writes:

The Archbishop assumes all through his argument, and several times in effect asserts, that the right of a workman out of employment to take a job at any wage he may be willing to accept, under existing conditions, is always a sacred right of personal liberty—"one of the most intimate rights of his being." Going direct to the heart of the subject and brushing aside all issues that are not vital, we question the Archbishop's position on this the most vital principle for which he contends. Let us take an example. A number of men in a certain department of industry go out on strike on the ground that their wages are unjustly low, having regard to the rate of profit being made by the employer. For the purposes of the present argument, we are clearly entitled to assume, as against the Archbishop, that the men are right, and that the rate of wages is unjust, since he asserts without exception or reservation the absolute right of one man to take another man's place irrespective of the question whether the rate of wages that has been paid, and that is offered, be just or unjust. In the same city in which the strike takes place there happen to be a certain number of men out of employment who have more or less skill in the kind of work that was done by the strikers. These men have wives and families. They are suffering one of the most terrible forms of misery that a man can suffer, that of seeing his wife and children want for the necessities of existence and not being able to supply them. Under the duress of this misery they decide to go and ask for the jobs of the strikers, and to accept a rate of wages which they know to be inadequate and unjust. The strikers determine to prevent this, if possible. They picket the approaches to the works. They jeer at and deride the so-called "scabs" as they come and go. They institute as rigorous a boycott as they can, and they make things extremely unpleasant for the new men. Recourse is had to the courts. An injunction is procured. The soldiers are called out to protect the new workmen. The pickets are dispersed; the boycott is raised, so far as may be, and the new workmen are protected from annoyance in going to and coming from the factory.

Now, is the main effect of the action of the authorities in such a case to assert the right of personal liberty? This question really states the issue between us and the Archbishop. There can be no doubt but that, in a certain sense and to a certain degree, the action does assert the right of personal liberty. It asserts the right of a man, acting under the duress of a crushing misery, to accept an unjust rate of wages for his work, because the

so-doing offers the only way for even a partial escape from his misery. It asserts his right to do this, although his doing so may, and probably will, have the effect of causing others to suffer for an indefinite time to come the misery from which he is trying to escape; these others having had the job before him, and having thrown it up simply because they were unwilling to accept an unjust rate of wages for their labor. On the other hand, it is equally clear that this action of the authorities also asserts, in a very effective way, the right of the employer to avail himself to the uttermost of the desperate need of the employe. If sternly, consistently, and thoroughly pursued, it must ultimately have the effect of breaking down the restraint which the labor unions have succeeded in imposing on the action of competition as an agency for the fixing of the rate of wages. And certainly, if there be any lesson which the economic history of civilized man clearly teaches, it is this—that the leaving of the rate of wages to be fixed by the unchecked action of competition, under such a system of production as ours, means the forcing of the rate of wages down to the lowest rate at which men can work and live.

Once more, then, we ask—is the action of the authorities above set forth, in its ultimate analysis, and having regard to its ultimate results, really in the main an assertion of the right of personal liberty, or is it really in the main an assertion of the right of the man who has capital to avail himself to the uttermost of the desperate need of the man who has not? We take it that the Archbishop would say that it is in the main an assertion of the right of personal liberty. We would, with very great respect, say that it is in the main an assertion of the right of the capitalist to avail to the uttermost of the desperate need of the laborer. We invite our readers to think out the question carefully for themselves and decide between us.

We shall merely say in conclusion that we hold, with Mr. Ruskin, that it is impossible to shirk the question of justice. You must first determine whether the treatment of the striking laborers has been just or unjust, before you can say with confidence that the taking of their places by other laborers is, in the true and high sense, an exercise of the right of personal liberty. There is a right of personal liberty and a wrong of personal liberty. The right of personal liberty, properly understood, never confers on a man a privilege to aid and abet injustice.

A PAINFUL NECESSITY.

In another column appears a letter which The London Times has published. The writer is an English Bishop, Right Rev. Dr. Brownlow. The mere reading of the letter must suggest at once that Bishop Brownlow recognized an absolute necessity for this appearance in print. Every Catholic in England felt the necessity of it just as keenly when The Times published a communication signed "Mechtildis Pynsent Abb. O.S.B.," along with an editorial characteristically anti-Catholic. The object both of the letter and the article was to provoke ill feeling between English and Irish Catholics; but Bishop Brownlow's reply shows how far short the bolt has fallen. The Universe gives the facts leading up to the outbreak, and it must be said that The Times would have been better advised to let the case alone. The Universe says:

About the year 1886 the head of the Irish Augustinian College in Rome, on the demolition of the ancient house of that province of the Order in the Eternal City, decided to erect a church and monastery in honor of St. Patrick in the centre of Catholic faith and unity. The Holy Father approved of the project, and the Irish race at home and abroad were appealed to for the necessary funds to realize the undertaking. Large sums of money were subscribed; but after erecting the monastery and purchasing the ground for the site of the church, the foundations of which involved a considerable outlay owing to the nature of the soil, it was found to be impossible to proceed with the building of the church with the amount of money in hand.

The monastery itself was found

to be considerably too spacious for the needs of the Irish Augustinian Fathers. So after careful consideration the authorities of the province decided to part with it. A number of English ladies in Rome, who had formed themselves into a community, with at least one wealthy member, and who called themselves English Benedictines—though unrecognized, so far as we know, by any branch or congregation of that historic Order in this country—agreed to take over the Monastery of St. Patrick, which underwent a change of title, being subsequently known as St. Benedict's. The nuns agreed to pay the Irish Augustinian Fathers the sum of £24,000 for their property after a lapse of six years, and during that period interest at the low rate of two per cent. Any man of business instincts will see at a glance that the nuns had here a very good bargain. In fact, the Irish Augustinians were themselves paying interest at the rate of 4 per cent. on a mortgage of £7,000 in connection with the very building, on the purchase money of which the nuns were paying only 2 per cent.

Beyond one half-year's interest, the nuns paid nothing to the representative of the Irish Augustinian Province in Rome. The wealthy member of their community brought disgrace upon herself and her sisters in religion, and the nuns were immediately reduced to a state of insolvency. Instead of retiring as quietly as possible from the monastery they were unable either to support or pay for, as one would naturally expect them to do, they insisted on remaining in possession. The representative of the Irish Augustinians had recourse to every argument in his endeavor to induce the nuns to retire from what everybody recognized to be an impossible position. He delayed all unpleasant action for years. But all in vain. Ultimately he was forced to establish his claim to the property of his Order in the Italian Civil Courts, but with the full concurrence of the Holy See. Not even then could the few nuns that remained in the monastery be induced to act as reasonably. So after still further delay the property was taken over in the usual way required by law. The General of the Augustinian Order a man noted for his generosity and warmth of heart, had implored the nuns to avoid scandal. He even asked them to accept a substantial sum of money as a present from himself. But all in vain. Every thinking man must admit that the Augustinians of the Irish Province acted throughout this painful matter with considerable patience and liberality. Miss Pynsent would fain have the English public believe that they were actuated by feelings of enmity towards a body of English religious. But this lady's wild and venomous charges are certain to recoil upon her own head, and, while she has caused considerable pain to every loyal Catholic in England, we question whether the English Protestant public she seems so feverishly anxious to propitiate, will come to her assistance with that show of alacrity she evidently anticipates.

MUNICIPAL MATTERS.

It is the custom of the taxpayers of Toronto to show little or no interest in municipal conditions up to a few weeks before the election. Then there is not sufficient time to hear the claims of the men in the field, and the results invariably include the old men in an overwhelming majority. This practice of "playing low" is still more in favor with Mayoralty candidates. The people should demand of aspirants to the chief magistracy that they come to the front at least two months before they ask for the votes of the electors. The present custom is the habit of the gambler. It lends itself obviously to wire-pulling. Any public-spirited man who intends to run for office because he believes his election would improve the civic administration should not wait and watch till the last moment to estimate the strength of this or that possible opponent and calculate what possible chances or combinations might allow himself to slip in. Last year's election was scandalous enough in this respect to warrant the citizens in reprobating all future resorts to mere trickery. We all know what happened a few days

before the election. A certain citizen then thought the moment had arrived for making his decision known. He named his favorite, two newspapers turned their backs on the man they had been supporting and began to shout as they were ordered. From that moment the election was decided. The wire-pullers knew how their combination would work. It is only by demanding that candidates shall announce themselves early that the electors can retain the power of making their vote tell.

This year we are likely to have at least four mayoralty candidates. They may be four good men; but there will be room enough for making a choice among them. More than a few weeks will be required to make that choice, and the man who keeps longest in the background figuring out the chances open to a dark horse should come into the contest under the greatest disadvantages. He is the man who should have the least chance of success. He should be handicapped according to the measure of his faith in election trickery. Two or three members of the Council very probably will be among the contestants. He who comes forth soonest and announces himself should be allowed to have the best claim on the confidence of the electors. He certainly will have time for making the most of the opportunity to tell the people many things they desire to know at the present time. Though the history of the City Council in 1901 has been by no means peaceful, it has been by no means free from faults. The interests of the citizens have not been as aggressively championed as in past years. The results of this are plain to all eyes. So plain are they that the bulk of the people have come to the conclusion that it is absolutely necessary to have men in the Council who will assume and maintain an aggressive attitude towards all corporations operating public franchises. When Ald. Spence dropped out of the Council, the keenest student of municipal government and the most vigilant sentinel of the people's rights in the street car and gas questions was lost. Next to him stood Ald. Urquhart, who has yet to gain the hold upon the Council's attention which Ald. Spence commanded. Aldermen who are strong enough to disengage themselves to some extent from the little ward questions should be encouraged. There are not enough of them in the present Council.

The Toronto Railway Company has taken a sweeping advantage of the piping time of 1901. The street car service to-day is at its worst in many years. There are fewer cars which are run at a more rapid rate. This deterioration in the service combines the maximum of public danger with the minimum of public convenience. It is a common thing to see people standing at a crossing while one crowded car after another rushes past at steam railway speed. The passenger who gets on as a strapholder may consider himself fortunate. Many men have been thrown out of employment by the reduction of the number of cars, so that in various ways the greed of the company for large dividends calls for attention on the part of the Council. This is one question that should not be dropped from among the municipal issues of 1902. Cheap gas we are also entitled to. That point has been settled long ago. There has not, during the year 1901 been the faintest sign of a disposition in the Council to press the rights of the citizens upon the Gas Co. In the hurry of a brief election campaign candidates will promise anything and everything. The present is the time for asking men to give the public reasons why they should be re-elected.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

A Roman correspondent sends confirmation of the report which we lately announced that Mgr. Prior will shortly be nominated to the Bishopric of Nottingham, England.

On the occasion of the silver jubilee of the Holy Father's Pontificate it is reported that a representative pilgrimage of English Catholics, headed by Cardinal Vaughan and the Duke of Norfolk, will proceed to Rome to offer their congratulations.

Two letters in The London Times exactly sum up the question of reducing the representation of Ireland in the House of Commons. Says one: "In spite of the present number of members, Ireland's population has dwindled from nine millions to four; does that not prove that Ireland wants more members, to ensure for her better

laws? The other says: "If England is to break the agreement made at the Union, well and good; but, in that case, let her restore to Ireland the status quo ante, e. g., Home Rule!"

The Paris Univers tells an amusing story of American journalistic enterprise on the occasion of the assassination of President McKinley. When the news reached London the correspondent of a great American news agency was struck with the idea of a striking bit of enterprise. He hurried off to the telegraph office, and despatched the following message: "His Holiness, Pius IX., Vatican, Rome.—We invite the expression of your opinion upon the assassination of President McKinley." Two hours later the central office at Rome wired back the simple reply—"Not known as addressed."

The Jesuit Superiors have issued a manifesto explaining and defending their refusal to submit to the Law of Authorization. The law, they say, is a law of coercion, "wounds us deeply in our most essential rights as freemen, as citizens, as Catholics, as Religious; and in striking at us it violates the inalienable rights of the Church." Those rights they declare their inability to reconcile with the decrees of M. Waldeck-Rousseau. They have accordingly chosen the hard way of exile. "It is a sorrowful resolution that we are compelled to take," says the manifesto. "All the works to which we have vowed our lives are threatened with destruction. In a moment when the future seems dark to us our greatest grief is that we can no longer labor for the good of France, and see endangered, in our Missions, works which were not without honor and usefulness for her. Yet we declare it, we have no bitterness in our soul against those who have condemned us. We do not forget that we are disciples of Him Who said, 'Pray for those who persecute you.' May the Merciful Hand of God stay France upon the fatal incline upon which it is being dragged in our ardent prayer."

Last week the term expired during which the Religious Orders of France might appeal for authorization under the new law passed for their subjection to the State authority. The question of appealing or not appealing was left absolutely to the discretion of the heads of the Orders, and a great many engaged in works of charity made the necessary application. The total number of congregations existing in France at the date of the law was 1,663, including 152 Orders of men and 1,511 Orders of women. Out of this number 910 had been previously authorized, leaving 753 unauthorized. Besides these latter 276 of the authorized congregations had opened 10,970 establishments without consulting the Council of State. These are obliged to appeal for special authorization for the various establishments. Only 351 of the 753 unauthorized congregations applied for authorization, 45 being Orders of men and 306 Orders of women, and only 65 of the authorized congregations for the special license of the Council of State for their establishments. Among the Orders that have applied for permission to stay in France are the Dominicans, the Third Order of St. Dominic, the Capuchins, the Franciscans, the Passionists, the Oblates, the Marists, the Fathers of St. John of God, the Carthusians of the Grand Chartreux (the other houses of the Order have gone into exile), the Fathers of the Holy Ghost, of St. Philip Neri, the Redemptorists, and a few others. The Jesuits, Benedictines, Assumptionists, and the greater number of the Trappists and Carthusians have closed their houses and churches, and amidst extraordinary scenes of mourning have bade farewell to France.

MacNab & Co.

We have one price for everybody. Our goods are marked in plain figures. We give you references as to quality, fit and price from Canada's leading families.



In the making of ladies' furs we excel. Write for Catalogue. Call and examine our stock of Sables, Seal, Blue Fox, Mink, Lynx and Otter Pelts.

F. MacNab & Co.

374 Yonge Street.
Telephone Main 2305.