

The Catholic Register,

PUBLISHED EVERY THURSDAY,
AT THE
OFFICE, 40 LOMBARD STREET, TORONTO.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION:
TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM.

FOR ADVERTISING RATES APPLY AT OFFICE.

TRAVELLING AGENTS.

Messrs. Patrick Mungovan and Thomas Pughan.

CITY AGENT.

Mr. Lawrence O'Brien.

THURSDAY, JANUARY 25, 1894.

Calendar for the Week.

Jan. 25—Conversion of St. Paul.
26—St. Polycarp, Bishop and Martyr.
27—St. Vitalian Pope and Confessor.
28—Sexagesima Sunday.
29—St. Francis de Sales, Bishop, Confessor and Doctor.
30—Commemoration of the Passion of Our Blessed Lord.
31—St. Peter Nolasco, Confessor.

The Mail's Palinodia.

The congratulations of the Catholics of Ontario are due to the distinguished Archbishop of Kingston for bringing the *Mail* to a sense of propriety. Some one signing himself "Ontario Priest" had written a very pointed letter to the *Mail*, which was published on the 18th inst. In his opening paragraph the writer apologized for not appearing in the columns of a Catholic weekly. These papers are so dependent upon the hierarchy that correspondence of such a nature would not be fairly treated. As a Catholic journal we scorn the allegation. With criticisms of the hierarchy we have nothing whatever to do. That misunderstandings between bishops and priests have occurred, do occur, and will occur we have no doubt—but that the *Mail* will not rectify these we also have no doubt. On the contrary we are quite certain that letters, such as "Ontario Priest" wrote, will do injury to the individual and to the body Catholic more than to the prelate against whom the poisoned shafts are directed. Nor would we have taken any notice of this anonymous and disgraceful letter were it not for the after-part.

In a leading article of Tuesday last headed "His Grace to the *Mail*," our morning contemporary publishes the following letter from a Kingston law firm on behalf of his Grace, Archbishop Cleary:

KINGSTON, Jan. 20, 1894

To the Publisher of the Toronto Mail, Toronto.

SIR,—We have received instructions from the Most Reverend the Archbishop of Kingston, relative to your publication of a very scandalous libel against the Roman Catholic Archbishop and Bishops of the Province of Ontario in general, and against himself in particular, over the signature of "Ontario Priest," on the 18th inst.

Although his Grace takes no notice ordinarily of anonymous revilers, he deems it right to call attention to this attack upon him as being directed, not only against himself personally, but against the character and prestige of the episcopate.

The ex-priest who figures as your correspondent makes several charges which the Archbishop declares to be notoriously false, calumnious, and derogatory to his sacred office; and you appear almost to emulate him in the desire to injure the Archbishop when you head his letter with the extraordinary language which you have used, and which certainly justifies the Archbishop in regarding you as conspiring with the writer to reflect upon his character, and the administration of his sacred office.

On behalf of the Archbishop, we warn you that should you publish any more libels against him, he will in his own time, and in such manner as he may think fit, take such legal action against you as he may be advised.

Yours truly,

WALKER & WALKER.

The comments are given in the form of an apology as polite as we would expect from this source, and as self-guarded as the liberty of the press and fear of Kingston would dictate. The *Mail* says:

With regard to this intimation, it can only be said, first, that the headlines to which exception is taken were simply a summary of the letter. They told the reader, as headlines generally do, the contents of the reading matter which followed, so that he might read on, or pass on, according as he should feel disposed. The letter itself came in the ordinary course of events. As it dealt with a matter of interest it received publicity without the slightest suspicion that his Grace would be reviled by it, or that Dr. Cleary's prestige would be impaired. A complaint was made as to the policy pursued in respect of certain priests who are citizens of Canada. Complaints of this nature can surely be entered, in this free country, without incurring the charge that the object in view is to bring the authority whose action is commented upon into contempt. Were it otherwise no alleged grievance could ever be considered, and certainly no wrong could be righted.

We all know that the *Mail* in the discussion of every Catholic question is guided by principle, devotion to public interest and the purest desire to maintain the most cordial relations with the Catholic citizens of the Dominion. Its columns have lately been filled with a more than usual amount of slander—but no discussion has taken such a sudden turn as this cowardly attack upon the Most Reverend Dr. Cleary. A single letter and the *Mail* explains, and promises its better conduct in future. And although the *Mail* cannot avoid its habitual sneer, and tries to keep up courage in making an explanation, it shows its feeling of meekness under the severe but well merited lash of the letter from Messrs. Walkom and Walkem by which has produced a very beneficial effect in stopping what promised to be a series of ill timed and ill placed slanders. What impression the Solicitors made may best be seen by the rest of the *Mail's* article:

Judging by Archbishop Cleary's view of the question, his Grace must entertain the opinion with regard to the relations of the press to the ecclesiastics which prevails in the Province of Quebec. There it is a scandal to criticize a bishop, and an offence to decline to assent to his decrees. Here, his Grace must remember, the conditions are different. We are neither in Quebec nor in Ireland. All men are entitled to be free, and the press is at liberty, not to calumniate or slander, but to discuss matters affecting any class of subjects with the utmost liberty.

The announcement by the Archbishop that he will take action against the *Mail* should libels be issued against him in its columns is an unnecessary warning. All men are entitled to defend their characters from false and malicious attacks. But it must not be supposed that a threat such as this is going to gag the *Mail*. This journal will exercise the right appertaining to a newspaper in Canada. It will open its columns to free discussion, but not to libellous charges, uninfluenced by threats from Kingston, or even from Rome. What is more, it will help the oppressed in such manner as it can, whether the complainants be Protestants or Roman Catholics, in the full hope that its services will tend to the advancement of the liberty of the individual, and the good of the people.

Biting a File.

The *Orange Sentinel* can scarcely keep itself from bursting with wrath and rage over the fact that the Beauport Asylum for the poor and insane has been purchased by the Sisters of Charity—\$125,000 is the sum stipulated for by the ladies now in charge. The Provincial Government guarantees the interest on this large sum—and thus exclaimeth the *Sentinel*, "one more institution is under the thumb of Rome."

The *Sentinel* avoids telling its readers how cheaply the good Sisters are

able to house, clothe, feed, and nurse the helpless patients left in their care. One hundred dollars per patient is their agreement with the Provincial Government that is about eight dollars per month. We fancy the Provincial Government has the best of the bargain. The *Orange Sentinel* would make believe that it is all the other way. "No wonder," it says, "Quebec is poor and the rate of taxation high. Millions of dollars wrung out of the toil and sweat of the peasantry go into the coffers of the Church."

The *Orange* sheet must have discovered some new method of reckoning up accounts with margins for profit and loss, when it can see millions resulting from the constant care and keep and maintenance of helpless idiots at the rate of about two dollars and ten cents per week per patient.

"Both political parties," continues the *Sentinel*, "seem to be tumbling over each other in their desire to fling favours and money to the Church of Rome; but the meanest and most contemptible surrender of all is that which hands over to religious bodies the care of the poor and the insane, and allows these to make money out of the afflictions and miseries of others."

It is quite easy to account for the thorough confidence which both political parties have in the piety, honesty and enduring industry of the Hotel Dieu Nuns, or other Religious Orders in the Province of Quebec. Both Rouges and Bleus have witnessed the great works achieved by those ladies in the past. Nuns have been engaged in deeds of mercy and charity right in the very midst of their towns and cities for the past two hundred years; they have lived and grown with the country's life and growth, and there should be a feeling of satisfaction in all honest minds—in the *Sentinel's* as of others—that those ladies have never once lost the confidence or the respect of any party in Quebec, political or otherwise.

But how does it happen that in the United States, especially since the Civil War, ending 1865, a large number of city hospitals and asylums for the poor and helpless are left by the municipal authorities in the hands of Catholic Sisters of Charity? Can the *Orange Sentinel* give any explanation of the infatuation that urges real Americans to thus lay down their institutions under the thumb of Rome, and enable the Nuns "to make money out of the afflictions and miseries of others?"

The French Infidel Government has been trying the plan of the *Sentinel* and replacing the Religious Orders with trained lay nurses; but the *Orange* plan of campaign adopted in France has been a most decided failure. The lay nurses could not be controlled; the expenses were most exorbitant; other abuses were reported daily, and the Nuns had to again be requested to resume their old duties of self-denial and love.

What happened in hospitals and ambulance work of the Crimean War was repeated during the United States civil embroilment. The Sisters of Mercy and Charity were the only military nurses admitted as successful by

the authorities of both nations. The *Orange Sentinel* may rant and fume because Virtue has always its reward, and because Rome is inexhaustible in her supply of valiant women to purify and bless the world with their presence and their deeds of heroism. They are like our first parents before the Fall, and the *Orange Sentinel* is the Devil envying their happy state.

Principal Caven.

While we proved in a former issue that Principal Caven either know nothing at all about the Syllabus, or went out of his way to lend the Protestant Persecuting Association some of the used up building material of bigotry upon which they might erect a platform, we feel that further notice is due to this gentleman and his opinion upon the P.P.A. Not only does his criticism of the Syllabus display a lamentable want of knowledge, but the argument which he establishes thereon is unfounded. He tells us Catholics that we are better than our principles. "If," he seems to say, "you follow out your principles logically, you cannot be loyal to the State, and the condemnation of these propositions is with difficulty harmonized with the principles of religious liberty and the conception of civil government, which we (Protestants) feel bound to maintain." That is the argument. Let us quote the *ipsissima verba*:

"But here is the error of those who, on the ground of ecclesiastical deliverances, would refuse to Roman Catholics full civil rights. They infer that because such and such principles are avowed, Roman Catholics cannot be loyal to the State. They deduce conclusions from these principles (perhaps logically), and then charge Roman Catholics with accepting such conclusions, even though they strongly repudiate them. As a matter of argument, it is perfectly fair to show what follows from certain premises, but we must not practically treat those who reject our conclusions or inferences as if they accepted them."

What is that but telling us we are better than our teachings? We resent the insult, gratuitous in its assumption and crafty in its insinuation. We demand that our principles be carried to their logical conclusions. It is our right, and come what may we have no fear. When examined without prejudice they will be found to contain far more respect for every form of civil government, and make a much stronger defence of individual liberty, than can be found in the principles of a resbyterianism, or any other form of Protestantism. There is no principle in our Church setting civil power at defiance. And the "ecclesiastical utterances" to which our enemies turn for an excuse of their prejudice, are reasonable when viewed in their only proper light, the light in which they have been delivered. Both Republican France and Imperial Germany have been greatly strengthened by "utterances" of this kind coming from the Sovereign Pontiff, Leo XIII. The Protestant portion of the civilized world, and especially the thoughtful, educated portion, ought to be very grateful to the Papacy for these "utterances." They are the voice of truth and authority sounding above the storm which now threatens every order of society. If men like Dr. Caven now find in them only danger and tyranny, future generations of men, equally well skilled in logic and more generous in sentiment, will re-