

The Catholic Register.

PUBLISHED EVERY THURSDAY

OFFICE, 40 COLLEGE ST.

Catholic Register, Ltd. and Pub. Co. of Toronto Limited.

SUBSCRIPTION PER ANNUM \$2.00

A single copy is sold at the rate of 10 cents.

ADVERTISING RATES.

First rate of advertisement per line per week.

Second rate of advertisement per line per week.

Third rate of advertisement per line per week.

Fourth rate of advertisement per line per week.

Fifth rate of advertisement per line per week.

Sixth rate of advertisement per line per week.

Seventh rate of advertisement per line per week.

Eighth rate of advertisement per line per week.

Ninth rate of advertisement per line per week.

Tenth rate of advertisement per line per week.

Eleventh rate of advertisement per line per week.

Twelfth rate of advertisement per line per week.

Thirteenth rate of advertisement per line per week.

Fourteenth rate of advertisement per line per week.

Fifteenth rate of advertisement per line per week.

Sixteenth rate of advertisement per line per week.

Seventeenth rate of advertisement per line per week.

Eighteenth rate of advertisement per line per week.

Nineteenth rate of advertisement per line per week.

Twentieth rate of advertisement per line per week.

Twenty-first rate of advertisement per line per week.

Twenty-second rate of advertisement per line per week.

Twenty-third rate of advertisement per line per week.

Twenty-fourth rate of advertisement per line per week.

Twenty-fifth rate of advertisement per line per week.

Twenty-sixth rate of advertisement per line per week.

Twenty-seventh rate of advertisement per line per week.

Twenty-eighth rate of advertisement per line per week.

Twenty-ninth rate of advertisement per line per week.

Thirtieth rate of advertisement per line per week.

Thirty-first rate of advertisement per line per week.

Thirty-second rate of advertisement per line per week.

Thirty-third rate of advertisement per line per week.

Thirty-fourth rate of advertisement per line per week.

Thirty-fifth rate of advertisement per line per week.

Thirty-sixth rate of advertisement per line per week.

Thirty-seventh rate of advertisement per line per week.

Thirty-eighth rate of advertisement per line per week.

Thirty-ninth rate of advertisement per line per week.

Fortieth rate of advertisement per line per week.

Forty-first rate of advertisement per line per week.

Forty-second rate of advertisement per line per week.

Forty-third rate of advertisement per line per week.

Forty-fourth rate of advertisement per line per week.

Forty-fifth rate of advertisement per line per week.

Forty-sixth rate of advertisement per line per week.

Forty-seventh rate of advertisement per line per week.

Forty-eighth rate of advertisement per line per week.

Forty-ninth rate of advertisement per line per week.

Fiftieth rate of advertisement per line per week.

Fifty-first rate of advertisement per line per week.

Fifty-second rate of advertisement per line per week.

Fifty-third rate of advertisement per line per week.

Fifty-fourth rate of advertisement per line per week.

Fifty-fifth rate of advertisement per line per week.

Fifty-sixth rate of advertisement per line per week.

Fifty-seventh rate of advertisement per line per week.

Fifty-eighth rate of advertisement per line per week.

Fifty-ninth rate of advertisement per line per week.

Sixtieth rate of advertisement per line per week.

Sixty-first rate of advertisement per line per week.

Sixty-second rate of advertisement per line per week.

Sixty-third rate of advertisement per line per week.

Sixty-fourth rate of advertisement per line per week.

Sixty-fifth rate of advertisement per line per week.

Sixty-sixth rate of advertisement per line per week.

Sixty-seventh rate of advertisement per line per week.

Sixty-eighth rate of advertisement per line per week.

Sixty-ninth rate of advertisement per line per week.

Seventieth rate of advertisement per line per week.

Seventy-first rate of advertisement per line per week.

Seventy-second rate of advertisement per line per week.

Seventy-third rate of advertisement per line per week.

Seventy-fourth rate of advertisement per line per week.

Seventy-fifth rate of advertisement per line per week.

Seventy-sixth rate of advertisement per line per week.

Seventy-seventh rate of advertisement per line per week.

Seventy-eighth rate of advertisement per line per week.

Seventy-ninth rate of advertisement per line per week.

Eightieth rate of advertisement per line per week.

Eighty-first rate of advertisement per line per week.

Eighty-second rate of advertisement per line per week.

Eighty-third rate of advertisement per line per week.

Eighty-fourth rate of advertisement per line per week.

Eighty-fifth rate of advertisement per line per week.

Some of the papers said it was all right because of the signs on the street that the battle for religious liberty had to be fought over again in the capital of the Province of Ontario. It is good to hear them say that. We have been trying ourselves for a long time to make them believe it. Mark that there was no protest raised against the attempt to arouse an anti-Catholic prejudice. Whether that attempt succeeded, or to what extent it was a success, there is no use in asking, now that the election is all over. Anti-Catholic campaign prejudices are too familiar to the politicians to be offensive. It is only when the non-Christian principles of the Unitarian religion are called into question by zealous partisans that any alarm in behalf of religious freedom makes itself felt. So far Mr. Bertram's declaration of religious faith from a political platform in Toronto is instructive.

The Archbishop of Kingston and the Press

Our friends of the secular press are once more in arms against the Archbishop of Kingston. It appears that Dr. Cleary was guilty of "profanity" on Thursday last. This at least is The Globe's definition of it. "clerical and scholarly profanity." The profanity consisted in Dr. Cleary expressing his candid opinion of the character of a section of the press of Ontario. Profanity is defined in the dictionary as "irreverence of sacred things." The press of Ontario must therefore be a sacred institution. We are not aware that the press in any other part of the world lays special claim to holiness; but we must not be surprised that Toronto should be considered an exception to the general rule in this matter.

However, let us come to the particulars of Dr. Cleary's profanity. He is said to have described certain of our able editors as "agents of Satan," and some of their recent output against himself as "hollish spite and lying." He added that strangers in the Province had spoken of our "vile press allowed to pollute society;" and in his own opinion among two dozen or more of anti-Christian scribes "there is not one truthful or honorable man, not one educated man, not one who could pretend to be a gentleman; taking them all in all they are the vilest gang of outlaws on this western continent, the shame of Ontario."

The utterances attributed to Dr. Cleary will be found complete on our front page as they appear in The Kingston News of Nov. 26th; but it is only right to observe that the Kingston paper says "there was no reporter present" when the Archbishop was speaking, and that the report of his remarks as published was subsequently gathered from "those around him." Granted, however, that Dr. Cleary uttered every word attributed to him, and that he used them in the exact connection in which they appear in print let us see whether there is really anything so shocking in his denunciations. In order to do this we must first understand what the press is, and what its liberties are. With all respect to The Globe we deny that there is anything holy in the character of any section of the press. Newspapers are an influence for good or evil, just as their conductors are willing or capable of directing them; and if we take the opinion of the world at large the press is neither pure nor intelligent in all its members. If it were to the purpose more could be said against it.

As to the liberties of journals and journalists, this is a matter that is viewed from various standpoints. It is conceded that the English view is the most practical of all; and in England both public opinion and the law see in the journalist only an anonymous writer who is allowed a freer range of criticism than the critic in private life. The journalist may be ignorant or educated, he may be fit or unfit to deliver a criticism or a piece of advice; but that is all beside the question. The point is that neither by the public nor any other authority whatever is he appointed to advise or criticize anyone or anything. He and the individual, or joint-stock company, in whose employment he is, assume wholesale responsibility between them. The natural consequence of such a condition of things is that the journalist and his employers are made a mark for any offenses they may commit either against the general public or the individual; and punishment is visited upon them either in the courts

or by public denunciation. We are still talking of England, and we are wasting the ink by saying that few of the great world-wearies of England, from Carlyle to Kipling, and from Queen Victoria to Sarah Grand, have failed upon occasion to apply to the offensive press denunciations at least as severe and emphatic as the language used by the Archbishop of Kingston towards The Globe and certain other journals of the same stripe throughout the Province of Ontario. Indeed one of the highest public duties that the individual whose opinion carries respect is capable of performing is to denounce villainous, mendacious and scandalous in the newspapers. The Globe may consider it profane in Archbishop Cleary to perform, either as a scholarly citizen or a bishop of the Church, this high duty; but really the Globe's opinion has nothing to do with the case, because Dr. Cleary's language condemning The Globe is exactly itself when contrasted with The Globe's own language of a week ago condemning The Evening Telegram. We do not say that The Telegram did not richly deserve all the good opprobrium hurled at it by The Globe, what we do say, and intend to prove, is that The Globe merited on a far greater measure the lash laid upon it by the Archbishop of Kingston. It would help this point had we the space to run the two styles—The Globe's and the Archbishop's—in parallel columns; but our space is short.

So that after all it comes to this, Was the language right and just which the Archbishop of Kingston used towards that section of the Press that went mad over his recent instruction on the sacrament of marriage? We believe that it was not only just but urgently demanded in the public interest and under all the circumstances. We know that the section of the press under consideration kept on asserting for a week or more that Dr. Cleary had described Protestant marriages very offensively. If this malignant and monstrous calumny called for condemnation, there can be no question that the Archbishop of Kingston spoke as he did on Thursday last simply as a matter of public necessity. And if the general public had no need to be told that the newspapers were lying, still it will be conceded that the shameless lie itself called for the strongest denunciation. It was The Globe that started the howl against the Archbishop. The rest of the papers only echoed or imitated The Globe. The Globe has since persisted in lying—either through ignorance or malice—regarding the Archbishop of Kingston's instruction on the sacrament of marriage. More than that The Globe itself actually offered the same burning insult to the conscience of Protestants that was and is falsely imputed to the Archbishop of Kingston. We shall prove these assertions beyond any room for doubt.

The first point is that The Globe lied either through ignorance or malice when it falsely imputed to Dr. Cleary any insult to Protestant marriages. The highest dignity Dr. Cleary or anyone else can claim for the Catholic marriage is that it is a sacrament. Now in the pastoral which The Globe so foully misrepresented, Dr. Cleary claimed all of this dignity for the Protestant marriage. He described all Christian marriages as on an equality; every marriage contracted between baptized persons being a sacrament whether the parties be Catholics or Protestants. Here are the words of the Archbishop's pastoral, not a few words separated from the context for the malignant purpose of misrepresentation, but all the paragraph in full bearing upon Protestant marriages, i.e., Christian marriages contracted between baptized persons:

It is the blood of Jesus Christ, the Son of God, sealing the matrimonial contract that gives it inviolability and perpetuity excludes the state and the politicians from all power to lay unholy hands on it: "What God hath joined together let no man put asunder." Hence it is that in every country where the sacramental character of matrimony is ignored or denied the politicians of latter times take the whole matter into their own hands, make laws regulating the requirements for validity of the contract and issue bills of divorce for the sovereignty of the conjugal bond. In this they seem to be logical; and in truth if the marriage be only a profane contract it is subject to their power like every other civil engagement. But if the contracting parties be validly baptized persons their marriage is a sacrament whether they or the politicians think so or not. For

the Catholic Church speaking as the authority of Jesus Christ and His Holy Spirit, and His taught from the blessed days of a Christendom that...

the contract and the sacrament are inseparable from each other the contract being itself the sacrament and the sacrament being itself the contract.

This is the teaching of the Catholic Church and this is Dr. Cleary's instruction beyond chance of misunderstanding. Yet in the face of this The Globe has kept on howling that Dr. Cleary insulted Protestant marriages. Did he insult Protestants by telling them that marriage contracted between them is a sacrament? Unless the insult consists in this positive assertion of the highest Christian dignity that can be claimed for marriage, The Globe is either hopelessly ignorant or it is resolutely lying.

Our second point is that The Globe has persisted in its shameless lie—shameless whether due to ignorance or malice. To prove this we have only to quote an editorial in its issue of Monday last.

He the Archbishop referred to Protestant marriages in language which can only be described as insulting. Our code of criminal law rigidly maintains this principle of participation in crime by voluntarily assisting at the performance of the evil deed. It is true that he used here and there such expressions as, "We nowise blame non-Catholics in this matter," but as a matter of fact he did blame them.

This is the reiteration of what we have plainly proved to be a monstrous lie. It is given semblance by the misuse of a few words quoted in an improper connection, the very opposite connection from their actual use. Is the Archbishop too severe when he says this is lying like an "agent of Satan"?

Our last point is that The Globe actually offered the very insult to Christian marriage—whether the contracting parties be Catholics or Protestants—that it falsely imputed to the Archbishop of Kingston. It published in its editorial columns the following declaration:—

For our own part we see no reason why two lawless should not contract a marriage as sacred as any which the Archbishop or any other minister of such domination may be pleased to sanction.

This statement in a public print wantonly insults all Christian marriage, whether the contracting parties be Catholics or Protestants. And really we have now to ask ourselves whether we enjoy Christian freedom or not in Ontario? Are newspapers to insult Christian marriage and claim immunity from public condemnation on the score of the sacredness of the press? Are newspapers to publish and reiterate the most glaring calumnies of a Catholic bishop and then say it is "profanity" to tell them that they lie like the "agents of Satan"? The Globe goes even a step further. Not only does it impeach the Archbishop of Kingston of profanity; it protests that what he wanted when he issued his instruction on Christian marriage was "a friend in his own church to tell him that he had done wrong and that an apology was in order." This is too much. People may maintain silence before a shameless liar; but when the liar begins to play the clown it is high time to put him in the pillory.

Hon. Edward Blake at Strathroy.

No really great speeches have been made in Canada in recent years. Many had begun to think that native eloquence had retreated from the public platform and that political craft had gained popular favor. And some of the causes of this deterioration readily suggest themselves to-day. In the first place the federal arena had too long been occupied by one party. The country too long looked for its statesmanship to a few men and did not look beyond them. Public opinion ran in a rut around the little group of leaders, and to the party in opposition it must have seemed that there would never be an end to the monotony of the thing. The restive men on the Liberal side got desperate in their impatience for a change. They swung the party round to a policy of commercial union with the United States. They were challenged by their opponents for annexation intrigues and were defeated upon that challenge. Had the Liberal party then followed the counsel to remain faithful to

honorable traditions that Hon. Edward Blake had been impressed upon them for years, the greatest humiliation of its history would have been averted. The situation that resulted in the debacle of "I was fully described in Mr. Blake's West famous Durham letter immediately after the general election of that year. That letter although it associated Mr. Blake as a Canadian Liberal, stamped him at the same time the first statesman of Canada. Nor was his wisdom entirely lost upon the Liberal party. Better late than never the party pulled itself off the commercial union mud bank, and it had not long to wait until the copy from the prairie province wafted it into no power it now enjoys. The public must wait a little longer to see how the responsibilities of office are going to affect the Liberal party. A speech made at Strathroy last week by Hon. Edward Blake will, we believe, fix the attention of all Canadians upon this question. It was a deliverance that recalled the palmy days of Canadian statesmanship, of the statesmanship of Confederation. Clearly the old leader indicated the course that the party must follow, the selfsame course that he publicly advised in 1891 and had privately urged upon the party for years. Mr. Blake indeed seems now to have put himself on record as the tried and trusted Canadian Liberal who is satisfied that the party has at last entered upon the right course. In this connection he also took occasion to speak some words that have raised no end of speculation throughout the Dominion as well as the old country. He plainly enough foreshadowed his probable return to Canadian politics and the Canadian Liberal party. Here are his words, describing the interval between 1891 and the present time:

But though the difference which had caused my severance from Canadian public life had ended, new conditions had been created for myself, and, anxious as I was to return to my own people, there never has been a time at which in the opinion of confidential friends it was possible for me to resign my seat without some substantial detriment to the cause in which I had labored. For the time when I may return I have looked and looked without cessation; and I still look and long, earnestly desiring that the path of duty may some day approximate closer to the path of pleasure, and may let me back to the land of my birth, where my children, my grandchildren, and friends abide, and give me the greatest solace and the purest gratification which a man at my years can hope to have: nor had I ever doubted lost the great masses of my Canadian fellow countrymen, whom I have loved and served so long, would love or trust me less because it happened, under the circumstances which I stated, that I took a course in respect of which I have never had occasion to retract a single step, and to which I am now able to appeal as my ample vindication.

By a large section of the Canadian press these words are interpreted as meaning more than they express. In some quarters the entrance of Mr. Blake into the Liberal government is regarded as not entirely outside the realm of possibility. In Ireland, according to a message to The Montreal Star, a cable report of the Strathroy speech seems to have raised a supposition of Mr. Blake's "desertion" of Ireland, at least in the camp of Mr. T. M. Healy. It is easy to understand that the wish is father to thought with Mr. Healy. But we incline to the opinion that Mr. Blake's words were not accurately represented by the cable correspondent. We in Canada know that since the Irish cause he has never looked back nor changed one point from his first declared intentions. What he said then is what he says now. The "path of duty" will be in Ireland as long as Ireland's cause needs his help. The "path of pleasure" of home joys and life-long friendships is in Canada. The two paths will run so nearly side by side when the Irish cause has triumphed that Mr. Blake may again return to the land of his birth. And when he does return our hope is that it will be to ornament and direct those Canadian political principles with which he and his family have always been identified, principles which the very name of Blake stands for to the mind of every Canadian Liberal. Mr. Blake in this connection has frequently said as much as this Strathroy speech foreshadows. He never intended to enter Irish politics in an Irish parliament. Ireland has plenty of some capable of giving her

the best service in the administration of her own institutions. At the present moment Mr. Blake is in Canada in Ireland's interests, not to tell the world that he contemplates an immediate change from her service. The change we believe and hope will come, and may not be so long delayed, and the fact that Mr. Blake himself sees it drawing near will raise the hopes of every friend of Ireland, to whom that better days are close at hand for her. Mr. Blake's is now more in the Canadian Liberal party to say than he was in 1891. The professional politicians and crack-brained partisans who led the party into commercial union are now leading it in every imaginable direction—and heaven as self-interest directs. They would make it the party of protection; they would make its policy conform with the principles of Confederation. They would make it a mere office-keeping machine. Another debacle like that of 91 awaits these politicians just as soon as they gain control of the ship of Liberalism only give them their way and they would presently have this Dominion again governed from Downing street content if only they could continue to hold office. The Liberal party and its great and historic principles must be rescued from this element by the Liberals of the old school.

Mr. J. B. McColl.

We have waited a week for some intimation of personal action as a result of the letter from Mr. J. B. McColl, barrister, Cobourg, which appeared in our last issue. We have heard no thing and as we are of the opinion that Mr. McColl's letter deserves the very widest publicity we propose to make some comments upon it without more delay, and without intention of prejudice to any of the parties concerned. But at the outset some palpable misapprehension on Mr. McColl's part must be corrected. He asks us to name our correspondent, "Truthful Friend," and he seems to suspect that this correspondent and Mr. McAllister are one and the same person. We need only say that the correspondent enclosed his name to prove what he described himself over the pen name, and that there is no reason in the world why he should not write as he did or sign a pen name, even if it should come to a matter of his assertions standing against Mr. McColl's.

Mr. McColl will have plenty to do to defend his own letter. It is as candid an exposure of the system of "political boss" rule as civil service reformers could wish to be armed with. Mr. McColl, who has no connection himself with the public interests, any more than that he is an active politician, controls the "patronage of the riding" as he tells us himself. Before his time it was controlled by Mr. Guillet, who is a member of parliament. One of the first results in Mr. McColl's incumbency was the removal of Mr. McAllister who entered the civil service in 1879. Mr. McColl says 1882, according to the Civil Service List; but Mr. McColl is wrong. Mr. McAllister's removal was accomplished by a peculiar method, viz., superannuation upon a pittance. Mr. McColl does not pretend that at the time of his removal any intimation whatever was conveyed to Mr. McAllister that he had been guilty of an "indictable offence" by "purloining" an office. It is only when Mr. McAllister's friends have raised a vehement protest against the "boss rule" that put the old civil servant's head upon the block that Mr. McColl raises the cry of scandal. At the same time he does this Mr. McColl declares that he strongly sympathizes with Mr. McAllister. This is strange that sympathy should accompany the endeavor to destroy the private character of the man whose family are the first victims of the "patronage" which Mr. McColl "controls." The control of patronage knew that Mr. McAllister "has a large family some of who quite small," and that in "the people are indignant by retiring allowance is so small." Mr. McColl's extraordinary sympathy prompts him to threaten Mr. McAllister's friends that if they do not bottle up their indignation an "indictable offence" under the Criminal Code, of which he constitutes himself judge and upon which he renders a verdict off hand will be investigated before parliament. He leaves the inference open that Mr. McAllister's allowance, a pittance though it be, may be cut