

The Catholic Register.

PUBLISHED EVERY THURSDAY

OFFICE, 40 LOMBARD ST.,
Jatolic Register Pta. and Dub Co.
of Toronto, Limited.

SUBSCRIPTION PER ANNUM. \$2.00.

Advertisements accepted for sale per line.

Advertisements accepted for sale per line.

Advertisements accepted for sale per line.

Advertisements accepted for sale per line.

Advertisements accepted for sale per line.

Advertisements accepted for sale per line.

Advertisements accepted for sale per line.

Advertisements accepted for sale per line.

Advertisements accepted for sale per line.

Advertisements accepted for sale per line.

Advertisements accepted for sale per line.

Advertisements accepted for sale per line.

Advertisements accepted for sale per line.

Advertisements accepted for sale per line.

Advertisements accepted for sale per line.

Advertisements accepted for sale per line.

Advertisements accepted for sale per line.

Advertisements accepted for sale per line.

Advertisements accepted for sale per line.

Advertisements accepted for sale per line.

Advertisements accepted for sale per line.

Advertisements accepted for sale per line.

Advertisements accepted for sale per line.

Advertisements accepted for sale per line.

Advertisements accepted for sale per line.

Advertisements accepted for sale per line.

Advertisements accepted for sale per line.

Advertisements accepted for sale per line.

Advertisements accepted for sale per line.

Advertisements accepted for sale per line.

Advertisements accepted for sale per line.

Advertisements accepted for sale per line.

Advertisements accepted for sale per line.

Advertisements accepted for sale per line.

Advertisements accepted for sale per line.

Advertisements accepted for sale per line.

Advertisements accepted for sale per line.

Advertisements accepted for sale per line.

Advertisements accepted for sale per line.

Advertisements accepted for sale per line.

Advertisements accepted for sale per line.

Advertisements accepted for sale per line.

Advertisements accepted for sale per line.

Advertisements accepted for sale per line.

Advertisements accepted for sale per line.

Advertisements accepted for sale per line.

Advertisements accepted for sale per line.

Advertisements accepted for sale per line.

Advertisements accepted for sale per line.

Advertisements accepted for sale per line.

Advertisements accepted for sale per line.

Advertisements accepted for sale per line.

Advertisements accepted for sale per line.

Advertisements accepted for sale per line.

Advertisements accepted for sale per line.

Advertisements accepted for sale per line.

Advertisements accepted for sale per line.

Advertisements accepted for sale per line.

Advertisements accepted for sale per line.

Advertisements accepted for sale per line.

Advertisements accepted for sale per line.

Advertisements accepted for sale per line.

Advertisements accepted for sale per line.

Advertisements accepted for sale per line.

Advertisements accepted for sale per line.

Advertisements accepted for sale per line.

Advertisements accepted for sale per line.

Advertisements accepted for sale per line.

Advertisements accepted for sale per line.

Advertisements accepted for sale per line.

Advertisements accepted for sale per line.

Advertisements accepted for sale per line.

Advertisements accepted for sale per line.

Advertisements accepted for sale per line.

Advertisements accepted for sale per line.

Advertisements accepted for sale per line.

Advertisements accepted for sale per line.

Advertisements accepted for sale per line.

Advertisements accepted for sale per line.

Advertisements accepted for sale per line.

Advertisements accepted for sale per line.

Advertisements accepted for sale per line.

Advertisements accepted for sale per line.

Advertisements accepted for sale per line.

Advertisements accepted for sale per line.

Advertisements accepted for sale per line.

there understood this mission as a duty and talk of war with Spain Italy or England as a duty as if the territory and interests of the old world and the new were crowding each other for space. The majority of Americans see farther ahead and we never learn that their vision discloses war clouds looming up over the wide Atlantic.

Ontario Catholics Are Denied Representation on the Bench

We hear just now more perhaps than ever before the boast about the superior intelligence radiating from Ontario all over the other provinces of the Dominion. The object of this blowing of the Ontario trumpet is to cause people who know little of Canada to imagine it is the influence of Ontario alone that saves the French-Canadian province of Quebec from the utter desolation of its Egyptian darkness. Ontario spends more money than Quebec upon primary public education, and imagines it gets value for its money. If, however, the purpose of promoting primary education is to develop an intelligent public opinion we shall have an opportunity of asking for the evidence upon which the Ontario claim rests. It is universally conceded that the equality of all citizens before the state is a useful measure of the public intellect for the purpose of drawing a comparison between communities. But when we apply this measure to these provinces the claim of Ontario to a superior enlightenment appears to be nothing more than fine a sample of impudence. Quebec has always shown the example to Ontario in this matter; and it is a notorious fact that Ontario has not profited much thereby. The people here much prefer to rail against Quebec than to follow her lead in the fair and generous treatment of religious minorities. Ontario contents herself with asserting her superior enlightenment; but Quebec while making no boasts perseveres in doing right.

We intend for some time forward to draw instructive comparisons between the evidences of public intelligence found in Quebec and Ontario, in order on the one hand to give credit where credit is due, and on the other to stir up Catholic opinion in Ontario to the demand for a fair share of representation for the religious minority in this province.

We shall begin with a subject in which the appointing power rests with the Federal Government, but in regard to which provincial public opinion regulates the policy of the Dominion party in power. We refer to the Judiciary. The statistics which we shall quote will be taken from accurate sources. For the figures included in the present article we have not gone outside the Statistical Year Book of Canada and the Canadian Almanac, except where changes have taken place since the 1897 number of the latter publication was issued. Moreover in relation to the representative character of the Judiciary the lesson to be drawn to-day from a comparison of Quebec and Ontario represents without any alteration worthy of note the state of affairs that has existed since Confederation.

In a population of 2,114,921 according to the last census returns, Ontario numbered 858,000 odd Catholics. In a population of 1,291,700 Quebec included 100,000 odd Protestants of all denominations. To render the figures more easily borne in mind the Catholic minority in Ontario was 17 per cent. of the whole province, and the Protestant minority in Quebec less than 18 per cent. of that province.

The Dominion Government has in Ontario the power of appointing seventy-five judges in all, counting members of the Supreme Court of Judicature, the High Court of Justice, senior and junior County Judges. In these seventy-five appointments only six Catholics are included, and of those four are junior judges of County

Courts. That is to say nominally 5 per cent. of the appointments are held by Catholics. But it must be borne in mind that in the case of the one senior County judge the district is the most remote in the province and no other appointment was possible there, while four out of the six Catholics are but junior judges of the County Courts. Virtually therefore the nominal representation of 5 per cent. of Catholics in the Judiciary of Ontario is not worth half the face value, although this nominal representation is disgracefully inadequate in itself. On the superior bench of the province Catholics have one representative, a French Canadian holds a County Court judgeship in the wildest and most remote district of the province, and four Catholics are included among the junior judges to make up a show of representation for the entire Judiciary. Not to put too fine a point upon it Catholics in Ontario are without representation on the bench except for their sole representative in the High Court of Justice.

What do we find in the Province of Quebec? There the Dominion Government has the power of appointing forty-two judges, comprising the Queen's Bench and Superior Court. Included in the forty-two are eight Protestants, or in round numbers 20 per cent. of the total number of appointments. And bear in mind that this 20 per cent. is not made up of petty positions, like the junior judges of County Courts in Ontario; on the contrary the eight representatives of the Protestant minority on the Quebec bench hold the most honorable places in the gift of the Government short of the chief justiceship. Two of the puisne judges are Protestants and six are on the Superior Court bench.

Let us see the full force of this contrast. In Ontario where the Catholic minority is 17 per cent. of the entire population, the representation of Catholics among the judges is nominally 8 per cent. of the appointments; but in reality a big discount should be knocked off this nominal representation by reason of the inferior places for which the Catholics with one exception have been chosen. On the other hand in Quebec where the Protestant minority is less than 18 per cent. of the population, Protestants on the bench represent 20 per cent. of the appointments, and those the most honorable places to which men could be called.

Here then is the comparison between the two provinces made upon the most conspicuous evidence of an enlightened public opinion that could be asked for. Quebec, abused as she is for reputed ignorance and prejudice, accords to the minority nearly twice the representation to which it is entitled on the bench, whilst Ontario, with her incessant boasting of liberty and intelligence, virtually denies the Catholic minority representation in the Judiciary.

We shall next week consider the lesson which these facts should bring home to the Catholic people of this province.

The Press and the Archbishop of Kingston.

Our present issue contains the concluding chapter of the pastoral letter of the Archbishop of Kingston on the holy Sacrament of Matrimony. His Grace imparts solemn admonition to the members of his flock concerning one phase of a question which the press of the province has volunteered to discuss with a vehemence usually affected by persons who meddle in matters that cannot concern them. We do not know that a more striking illustration of the reason for the Archbishop's mandate to his immediate flock in the city of Kingston could be found near at hand than is furnished by an editorial article in The Globe, of Monday, attacking Dr. Cleary for two somewhat startling reasons. The Globe is not alone in proffering secularist wisdom to Catholics in

opposition to their Archbishop and we are surprised to see the great majority of its contemporaries throughout the province repeating advice which none of them have been asked for. In the first place The Globe assails the Archbishop for no other reason than teaching Catholic discipline to his Catholic flock, and in the second place our interesting contemporary seems to insist that his Grace should be "disciplined" for condemning opinions which it makes ostentatious show of entertaining itself.

Barely if Presbyterians, Methodists, Unitarians and Jews be allowed in this free country to expound their own discipline in their own meeting houses and synagogues and to be their own people, a Catholic Archbishop may—despite The Globe's sneers at his previous performances and his "too facile pen"—undertake likewise to instruct his own flock in his own cathedral. The Globe is especially provoked because the Archbishop of Kingston—evidently not wishing to particularize—on denomination or give offence to one class of citizens—referred to "some little sect." The Globe takes these words apart, and proceeds with them to tickle the all too irritable epidermis of the champions of sectarianism within hailing distance. Come here, it says, and read what Mr. Cleary calls you. But as a matter of fact the words in which the Archbishop's allusion was made serve only to show how nice and strictly parliamentary is the modern style of reference to the "sects," compared with the early history of the Church, and even the later history of the English "Reformation." Good old Saint Cyril, Bishop of Jerusalem, long ago used to say: "For the sects of the profane also attempt to call their own dogs houses of the Lord"; and if we read the English historian Cobbett, who wrote only ten years before Queen Victoria ascended the throne, we see that he, whilst eulogizing all the "sects" of our own day, calls them "motley mongrels," "tub-bawlers" and a variety of such picturesque titles. Such language has fallen into disuse now-a-days when custom demands the utmost courtesy and charity in all references to matters of conscience and religion. No one is better aware of this than Dr. Cleary himself, as he is careful to show in this portion of his pastoral letter, wherein he carefully guards against blaming Protestants, and on the contrary declares, three distinct and several times their entire freedom of conscience.

So that when Archbishop Cleary made the vague allusion to "some little sect," he only observed the courteous modern fashion of sticking to parliamentary terms in all utterances of religious nature. The Archbishop's words are: "The place where the contract was to be celebrated is known as the church of that sect." There can be nothing offensive in that. And in order to emphasize the fact that his own people alone were addressed, the Archbishop says: "We nowise blame non-Catholics in this matter. They act in conformity with their conscience." In another place he says he has "neither the right nor the power" to make reference to Protestants in the matter. What more is there needed to show that the subject he was addressing himself to concerned his own people and no others; that he felt called upon to condemn a practice growing up amongst them, and that his words denote all friendship and courtesy to the Protestant people of his neighbor hood.

We shall now consider the strange conceit of The Globe in denying to Dr. Cleary the right to concern an opinion which it happens to hold itself, and which it loudly proclaims, and the further conceit of volunteering to Catholic people its own secularist wisdom in opposition to the decree of a Catholic prelate pronounced inside his own Cathedral and which the members of his flock alone were supposed to hear. No exception in point of fact is taken to these words: "That it—a certain form and ceremony of marriage—is a more secular contract, not a whit more sacred than the marriage of any two heathens." So said the Archbishop. Now what says The Globe?

For our part we see no reason why two heathens should not contract a marriage as sacred as any which the Archbishop or any other minister of any denomination may be pleased to sanction. Marriage in this country is a civil contract, and whatever sanctity it may acquire beyond the law depends upon the hearts of those who take up its

solemn obligations. The demands of the civil law being satisfied, the rest is a matter of conscience in which none of us has a right to pass judgment upon his brother.

The Archbishop of Kingston admitted some of his people against giving the countenance of their presence to what he understood to be a purely civil contract of marriage. The Globe does not blather about the purely civil character of the contract, but on the contrary it declares that a heathen marriage is as good as a Christian marriage any day, that "marriage in this country is a civil contract," and it goes on to assail Dr. Cleary for having "abused his authority" by commanding his people to remember the character of the Catholic marriage.

There is no need to reason with The Globe. Its language in the extract which we give above verbatim is uncalled for by any members of Archbishop Cleary's flock. It merely blurs out in the most reckless fashion the anti-Christian doctrine that religion and marriage are in no way associated. "Marriage in this country is a civil contract and whatever sanctity it may acquire beyond the law depends upon the hearts of those who take up its solemn obligations." Religion and the Church have nothing to do with a mere affair of the heart. All Catholics regard such notions of marriage as The Globe believes in with horror. Let other govern their own consciences in the matter.

The Globe in its anxiety to make out a case against the Archbishop of Kingston does not stick at misrepresentation. When it says "none of us has the right to pass judgment upon his brother," it insinuates that the Archbishop went out of his way to make an attack upon a Protestant marriage. The contrary is the fact. He spoke to his own flock only. He spoke upon occasion given among members of his own flock; and The Globe's views on the subject although they may be generously intended to lead the Catholics of Kingston out of the discipline commanded by their Archbishop, are not likely to be preferred before the episcopal decree.

The Irish Catholic and Hon. Edward Blake.

We thank our esteemed contemporary, The Irish Catholic, for reproducing portions of our articles exposing the recent persecution of Irishmen of the old faith in the province of Manitoba. It is desirable that the facts we have stated should be known in every land where the Dominion is spending money to induce emigrants to try their fortunes on the prairies of Canada. We shall not attribute any motive to our Dublin contemporary for giving our case the hospitality of its space other than the desire to make the truth known. But we shall ask The Irish Catholic to take back the following allusion to Hon. Edward Blake in this connection:

Why cannot the Hon. Edward Blake, who is the representative of an Irish Catholic constituency, point out to his Canadian colleagues in politics the injustice and unwisdom of the course they are pursuing? Why cannot he interfere, in even the individual case referred to, and secure for Mr. Tennant restoration for wrong done him, and restoration to the public service?

There is no ground whatever upon which Hon. Edward Blake's interference in Canadian party politics at the present time could even be imagined. Evidently The Irish Catholic fails to understand the political party spirit in Canada. But for its information we shall make one or two references to Hon. Edward Blake's association with Irish Canadians in politics and apart from politics. There is no man in the Dominion or in Ireland for whom Irish Canadians have a more sincere admiration than Edward Blake. When, a good while ago, a blind and heartless immigration policy of the Canadian Government brought here to Toronto, and to other parts of the Dominion also, many Irishmen and women who had neither money to fall back upon nor friends to look forward to, Edward Blake was the first to show his sincere sympathy with the people of his race. Calling a few friends together he took steps to support the friendless immigrants through an entire winter and to afford them all possible help after the long inclement season had been tied over. He did that without letting others know; and until its appearance now in The Register an incident, so characteristic of Edward Blake, was never published. When Edward Blake was connected with the Government of Canada his impartial

treatment of all classes of citizens in connection with politics could not be excelled. The late Sir John Thompson had no higher or more disinterested ideal of the equal rights of every class and creed in all things concerning the state. There is not an Irish Catholic in Canada who does not feel regret over the loss of Edward Blake to Canadian politics, although they were all prouder of him than ever before when he gave his services to the cause of Ireland. But it should not be necessary to remind our Dublin contemporary that Edward Blake is not Boyle Roche's bird. He cannot be in Canadian politics and in Irish politics at one and the same time. If we had him in Canadian politics we would honor and trust him, and we hope that all Irishmen in the old land do the same.

Foreign Government of Ireland

The Tory-Unionist government at Westminster cannot be convinced that distress exists in Ireland. The first cry raised by the Lord Lieutenant was of exaggeration by "interested politicians." Now the Archbishops and Bishops of Ireland, at their Maynooth annual meeting have endorsed the declarations of the "interested politicians" from personal knowledge of the facts. Their resolution reads:

We deem it our duty to submit to the Government of the country the statement of our conviction, founded on the personal knowledge of several members of our body, that the failure of the potato and cereal crops in many districts of the country particularly on the Western and Southern coasts, must lead during the coming winter and spring to very acute distress amongst large numbers of the population, and unless well-conceived measures of relief are taken in good time, may result in disastrous consequences.

Already the representative boards of the country have given the alarm of approaching famine. Still the government will not believe. Why? Are Her Majesty's advisers afraid that recognition of the actual conditions would involve condemnation of their methods of government and that by taking relief measures they would be playing into the hands of the "interested politicians" of Ireland? That is the most probable reason behind their pretence of blindness. But when fully considered it is also a convincing proof of their actual blindness and incapacity. Can a government that refuses to believe, and from sheer prejudice distrusts, the evidence of every reputable and representative voice of public opinion in Ireland—the parliamentary representatives, the leaders of the clergy, and the members of public boards—be fit for the responsibilities of government? Prejudice could hardly go any farther than virtual condemnation of the whole nation as utterly unworthy. The Irish people and their representatives have always claimed that the needs of their country are as little understood by the English Government as if Her Majesty's advisers hailed from Stamboul. By meeting the request of Ireland for relief measures with the cool response, We can't believe you, Lord Salisbury and his conferees have given the whole world proof that the English Government of Ireland is exactly what the Irish represent it, an alien and unsympathetic system imposed by military force and gradually crushing the life out of a great people.

An Investigation Required.

Our correspondent, in his letter published on 14th instant, clearly and emphatically denies the allegation that he was actuated by a desire to injure the Government and to excite the prejudices of the Irish Catholics of the Dominion against it, in writing those communications which related to the penitentiaries. He showed that his object was to point out the causes which led to the recent rebellious demonstrations at St. Vincent de Paul, and to indicate the parties responsible for the decadence and demoralization of our penitentiary system of administration, in order that proper and effectual remedies be applied. Though the letters did not contain any expressions or sentiments that could be even tortured into hostility to the Ottawa Administration, yet we are pleased that the writer has seen fit to record his protest against any such interpretation of his motives. His doing so affords us the occasion to say that we, too, have no desire to censure the Government without cause. While not in accord with many features of its policy, and having but very little confidence in certain members of the