

The Catholic Weekly Review.

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

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

Vol. III

Toronto, Saturday, July 27, 1889.

No. 24

CONTENTS.

NOTES.....	369
THE ROMANCE OF A JESUIT.....	370
BOOKS AND HOW TO USE THEM.....	371
ALLOCATION OF HIS HOLINESS LEO XIII.....	373
CARDINAL GIBBONS ON CHRISTIAN EDUCATION.....	374
DEATH OF MGR. CONCORAN.....	375
EDITORIAL—	
Brother Azarias' Article.....	376
"The Use of Books".....	378
Church Exemptions.....	377
Mr. Justin McCarthy on the Monarchy.....	376
The Possibilities of Change.....	378
Mr. Badgshot's Opinions.....	378

Notes.

The announcement of the appointment of Bishop Walsh of London to the Archbishopric of Toronto is, we believe, correct.

We published in a late issue of this REVIEW the last of the able series of letters in which the Rev. Father Egan of Thornhill replied to the attacks of a Presbyterian clergyman, the Rev. Mr. Percival, upon the teachings of the Jesuits and the doctrines of the Catholic religion. The readers of the REVIEW, so many of whom followed these letters with interest, will be glad to know that the whole series will shortly be put before the public in an attractive pamphlet, and that acting under instructions from Father Egan, THE REVIEW PRESS is now engaged in its publication. The letters of both disputants will have an equal place, and so far as our observation goes, the public, non-Catholic as well as Catholic, will find nothing half so good, so instructive, or so effective, in the whole sea of stuff that has been written anent the Jesuit question. Father Egan's handling of the subject is throughout most brilliant and scholarly, and the Catholic public are sensible of the great service that he has rendered to the cause of Truth and religion.

We publish elsewhere a full translation of the Allocution recently delivered by the Holy Father before the Consistory of Cardinals. A pronouncement from the Holy Father is, at any time, an event of the first importance; but not often of such special importance as at the present, when the rights of the Holy See, and the independence of the Sovereign Pontiff are so menaced, and the peace of Europe so threatened as to give rise to a belief that the Sovereign Pontiff may find himself compelled to leave the Eternal City. In view of the circumstances of the hour the exact words of the Allocution become of supreme importance; and a careful perusal of them leaves little room to doubt that the Holy Father is considering the possibility of the necessity arising, in the present revolutionary temper which is dominating the Italian nation, of his seeking asylum for a time amongst some other Catholic people. Secret societies seem to have honeycombed that once great Catholic land; the revolutionists and infidels are in the ascendant; and they teach, in the words of the Pontiff, "that war to the death is to be waged against the Catholic name." All the signs are that Europe is on the eve of a terrible conflict, and at the moment when war breaks out Christianity, says the *Irish Catholic* of Dublin, "will fully realize, for the first time, the practical effects of the change by which the Pope has been deprived of his temporal sovereignty, and independence." In the event of war, into which Italy would assuredly be drawn, the Pope would be reduced to the condition of a prisoner, and his freedom of communication impeded, if not entirely ended. It cannot be said that the outlook is not full of seriousness.

The *Halifax Chronicle* of the 22nd says of the late Twelfth of July celebration,—an event which the *Mail* went to painful lengths to describe—that "the demonstration in Toronto was on a large scale, some sixty or seventy lodges marching in the procession, and to the credit of the place everything passed off without bloodshed. This is a matter for congratulation, but the usefulness of a society that perpetuates the religious and social animosities and prejudices of the past may well be doubted, especially in an age and in a country of civil and religious liberty. We ought to all enjoy our freedom and abstain from demonstrations that revive old sores and rekindle old fires and passions."

After a time these views will prevail—even in Toronto. After a time it will come home to these people that men who will walk in such processions, keeping step to ribald and insulting tunes, do not represent the highest type of civilization

One of the provisions of the bill for the prevention of cruelty to children, recently introduced in the English House of Commons, is that children under the age of ten shall not be employed in theatres. An amendment to alter the bill by striking out this provision and to permit the employment of children in pantomimes and like performances, led to an interesting discussion, but was defeated by a fair majority. One of the arguments brought forward by the mover of the amendment was that from this little army of juveniles the great leaders of the stage are recruited, and that in the child of seven in a pantomime may be seen the future Ellen Terry. Miss Kate Terry, it was claimed, had performed in a theatre long before she was ten years of age, and Miss Ellen Terry played the part of the "Duke of York" in *Richard III.* when she was between four and five years of age. Mrs. Bancroft, Mrs. Kendal, Miss Bateman and others, were mentioned, who had appeared on the stage before the age of ten. The strongest plea put forward in favour of the continuance of this form of child labour was the need of the parents for the earnings of the children. The theatre, it was urged, offered to hundreds of children remunerative employment and when it was most needed, namely, in the depth of winter, and when their parents were out of work, and when their houses were going to pieces; but not even the most necessitous conditions of parents could justify the placing of the welfare of their children in danger. The *Weekly Register*, commenting upon the discussion, observes that another, and a more cogent plea, might have been advanced, namely, that girls of thirteen, and fourteen, and fifteen, who will impersonate the infants henceforth to be banished from the boards to bed, are more liable to dangers than are their younger sisters. But one evil, it says, must not be made the sanction of another, and the appearance of these young things behind the footlights is itself an evil, "not even the most airy member of Parliament—Mr. Labouchere himself—could be found to deny." That greater evils abound must, of course, be conceded. Other forms of ill-usage of children might better first have been attacked, and made impossible, before dealing with this particular phase of a difficult question. "Nevertheless," adds the *Register*, "we cannot but be glad that Parliament has taken under its protection these weary little fairies of the footlights, and be glad, too, that nearly all the Catholic members were on the side of that elementary principle of humanity which shrinks from the idea of a child coming into contact with the life of the stage, which—notwithstanding all exceptions to the contrary—is accidentally associated in every city with corruption."