

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
Duignan.
CITY AGENT,
Mr. Lawrence O'Byrne.

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 21, 1893.

Calendar for the Week.

Dec. 21—S. Thomas, Apostle.
22—Ember Day, Ferial Office.
23—Ember Day, Ferial Office.
24—Fourth Sunday of Advent. Vigil
of Christmas.
25—Christmas Day.
26—S. Stephen, Protomartyr.
27—S. John, Apostle and Evangelist.

Christmas.

As on Monday next we celebrate the great feast of Christmas, it is with special pleasure we send greeting to all our readers at this holy tide—with the earnest wish that the Babe of Bethlehem may be the light and joy of their home and life. No memories are so sweet as those which cluster round the Infant Saviour's festive season. No time so precious as that fulness of time when God spake to the world by His Son, when the mystery of piety appeared, and the Word made flesh dwelt amongst us.

Angel heralds proclaimed it thus: "This day is born to you a Saviour, who is Christ the Lord, in the city of David—Glory to God in the highest and peace to men of good will." He was verily the Saviour who would blot out the handwriting over against us; the plenteous Redemption through Whom grace would more abound where sin had abounded. And what else was this Messiah if not the glory of God and the peace of mankind? In Him mercy and truth met, and at the manger where He lay wrapped in swaddling clothes, justice and peace kissed. Born in the silent midnight in a hovel by Bethlehem's slope, He came into the world as the poorest and the lowliest come into it. When the simple shepherds went to Him He looked to them as to all others a child of Adam's race and David's house. The winter's chill and the rude surroundings were to Him, as they would have been to all, pain and misery. And He nestled in His Mother's arms in what seemed unconscious happiness. But Babe as He really was, He was something infinitely more: He is God, blessed forever. And as He lay upon the wisp of straw the heavens told the glory of God as never before. All the hymns of all the ages are only the echo of that first Christmas carol sung by angels over Eastern hills. All the light that ever fell athwart this cold, dark earth is but a reflex of that light whose heavenly glare dazed the half-slumbering shepherds. In life and in death, in time and eternity, may He be to us, reader, the glory of God—the glory of His mercy, His holiness, His love.

But Bethlehem's Child is also the peace of the world. Sore need had the heart of man for peace. Sore need, too, had society for it, impelled

and controlled as it was in its laws and customs and conduct by selfishness, falsehood and corruption. At His lowly crib there is a treasure for the poor and the suffering which no earthly mine contains. Can we visit in spirit the stable and the manger, and not learn the lesson which He Himself afterwards taught from hill-side and sea-coast: "Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of Heaven." Contentment, therefore, and resignation to God's holy will are what the example of the Christ would teach us all.

Another thought at Christmas—sweet and common as the daisy upon English hill and dale—is peace amongst neighbors. "Peace to men of good will" was heaven's message to earth. Let us send it out upon that holy morn. Nothing is so much needed in these times and in this country. What one amongst us that loves his land with the patriotism of a freeman will not sound a note of more peaceful and friendly feeling than exists at present? What one amongst us will not pray most earnestly for good will towards all classes?

May the bells of Christmas morn

"Ring out the fond of rich and poor,
Ring in redress to all mankind;
"Ring out a slowly dying cause,
And ancient forms of party strife;
Ring in the nobler modes of life,
With sweeter manners, purer laws.
"Ring in the valiant man and free,
The larger heart, the kindlier hand;
Ring out the darkness of the land;
Ring in the Christ that is to be."

Gladstone's Policy.

Mr. John O'T. Bannon, Montreal, takes us task for drawing attention to Mr. John E. Redmond's inconsistency, and charges us with adoring or deifying Mr. Gladstone as though he never forged fetters or passed a coercion act for the incarceration of Irishmen, &c. &c. We are perfectly aware of the evil doings of both Tories and Whigs, and of all the coercion acts passed by both English parties during the last four score years. But sooner or later, in God's wise Providence, an end had to come to all this. In 1886 Mr. Gladstone was converted to the Policy of Home Rule for Ireland. Once convinced to the absolute necessity of such a policy, he abandoned all drastic measures and began a policy of conciliation—with the Irish people, and of education with the English people. He staked his reputation as a statesman and his position, with its emoluments of Prime Minister., on the question of Home Rule for Ireland, and was hurled from power in consequence. Did he become disheartened? Did he haul down his colors from the mast-head? Not by any means. He again faced Great Britain with the same charter of Irish liberty in his big right hand. He won the battle of Ireland at the English polls. He spent three whole months fighting the battles of Ireland against the fiercest and most unscrupulous opposition ever offered to any Bill in England's Commons. In his Patriarchal age of 88, or 84, when, in the ordinary course of nature, men retire into the seclusion of home and to well earned rest, Mr. Gladstone sat up at times until early morning in deadly conflict with the Orange foes of Ireland's peace and freedom. The conflict is not yet ended. The House of Lords has to be dealt with, and dealt with through

the voting masses of English freemen. And we now ask: is this a fitting time to cast obstacles in the way of Mr. Gladstone's prudent and heroic course of procedure? Are we Irishmen—and we pretend to love our country with just as intense and zealous love as Mr. Bannon, or any other man born and bred on the sod—are we Irishmen going to join the Balfours and Salisburys and Ulster Orangemen in their determined and Satanic efforts to thwart and wreck the work of the first and greatest statesman of English birth, who calls for justice to Ireland, and who stakes his all on the policy of making Irishmen the masters of their own destinies and the owners of their sea-girt Emerald Isle.

We are no hero worshippers, however; and therefore we feel at liberty to criticize Mr. John E. Redmond's obstructive policy and threats of opposition to Gladstone's Government unless his (Mr. Redmond's) views be adopted. We venture to say that England's Premier and his noble colleagues—Morley, Rosebery, Ripon, Harcourt and the others—know the temper and character of the English people better than Mr. Redmond, or any of his Party. Once the English masses, armed with household suffrage and one-man vote, are secured and well in hand Home Rule is carried for Ireland. No doubt, Dublin Castle still exists, and with the Castle the Constabulary that make possible evictions in mid-winter, and heart rending scenes, as lately witnessed on Lord De Freyne's estates. But with Home Rule, Dublin Castle comes down with a crash; and should the Lords stand in the way, a still louder crash may be heard that will startle Europe.

A cabled speech of the Hon. E. Blake, delivered on the 15th instant to Englishmen at Islington, proves all that we have advanced. In all that has been done in Parliament this fall and winter Ireland's interests have never been lost sight of, for all English legislation has had for objective point and ultimate view Home Rule for Ireland. We copy the despatch as received here on Saturday last: Hon. E. Blake addressed a great Gladstonian meeting at Islington Wednesday. The following paragraphs represent the tone of his speech: "The democracy of both islands have the same needs, the same aspirations, the same desires and the same work. The legislation which Liberals and Radicals are engaged in with reference to England alone are all in the direction of Home Rule. It is impossible to name hardly a measure of importance which is not more or less a development of the home rule principle. Take for example the Parish Councils Bill and the Government's dealing with the great question of disestablishment. Are these not a recognition of the home rule principle? The House of Lords is a power with which we have nothing to do, although we suffer under it. The great party which we support hopes to get a measure passed through the Commons to render the prejudiced opposition of hereditary legislators entirely useless." In conclusion Mr. Blake expressed himself as being thoroughly disgusted at the great amount of time wasted in the House of Commons with petty business that under Home Rule would be transacted by local authority."

Transubstantiation.

Our contemporary the *Evangelical Churchman* devotes a couple of columns to what it is pleased to call "Rome's Chief Error." When it does so, it is useless to deny the jurisdiction of the court. It is almost vain to argue upon the subject, for we would not be surprised if next week the *Evangelical Churchman* wrote upon Rome's *Chief Error*. As this time the Error in question is Transubstantiation we enter upon a discussion, and claim, with our contemporary, that we are contending for principle and battling for truth. We do not abuse, but we refuse to be drawn hither and thither, to be driven from pillar to post, and from point to point; and when others quote one author upon one idea, and another upon another, we certainly see nothing but "a *mixum gatherum*" of bold assertions, unwarranted deductions and controversial cant." An example occurs in its last issue, when the *Evangelical Churchman* gives Bellarmine credit for saying: "It is altogether improbable that there is no express place of Scripture to prove Transubstantiation without the declaration of the Church." We call upon our contemporary, since he is fighting for truth, to quote chapter and verse—to give us the exact passage from which this quotation is taken. It may be all right, but we have grave reasons for doubting its authenticity. It would be a strange thing if a theologian would undertake to prove Transubstantiation from the Word of God, and at the same time acknowledge that without the declaration of the Church it could not probably be done. We demand, in all justice, the exact chapter and treatise from which this extract is taken, and we pledge our reputation that no inconsistency will be found by the eagle eye of the *Evangelical Churchman* between the great Jesuit Theologian and THE CATHOLIC REGISTER. What Bellarmine did say, in concluding his proposition proving Transubstantiation from the Word of God, is: "Add this, that although there is a certain ambiguity in the words of our Lord it is taken away by many councils of the Catholic Church and the consent of the Fathers."—a very different thing from the proposition announced by the *Churchman*.

As a proof that Rome changes its doctrine we are told that the doctrine of Transubstantiation was first publicly taught by Paschasius Robert in the ninth century. There is a *non sequitur*. Why is Rome charged with inconsistency because the philosophical idea and scholastic term of Transubstantiation did not come up prior to the ninth century? If our contemporary would only study Bellarmine with more care, and more desire to arm himself with truth, whose champion he claims to be, we are confident he would trace Transubstantiation much farther back than the ninth century, and see no inconsistency in the teaching of Rome upon this very important subject. We promise a lesson—more than one, if necessary—laying down the doctrine and examining the *Evangelical Churchman's* arguments against it.

Mlle. Dupont, cousin of the President of the French republic, has become a nun.