

The Catholic Register.

"Truth is Catholic; proclaim it ever, and God will effect the rest."—BALMEZ.

VOL. V.—NO. 16.

TORONTO, THURSDAY, APRIL 2ND 1897.

PRICE FIVE CENTS.

A HINT TO CONTROVERTISTS.

[WRITTEN FOR THE REGISTER.]

There is something indecorably wasteful in having to take note so constantly of misrepresentations of our religion by Protestants. If they were specially remarkable for piety in their own persons, or could show their past fruitfulness in a line of saints, commanding the respect of the world, nay, if they could only agree amongst themselves about the plainest truths of the Gospel, and so exorcise an unaided and, therefore, powerful action on society in the promotion of all that tends to the public good, then, of course, we would not believe what we know to be wrong from its beginning; but we might be led to think them only deceived, and, possibly, in good faith. But it is not by any manner of means. For not merely has each set its own particular hobby, which is called the Gospel, and drums away about to the overlooking of all else, but even congregation differs from congregation, and St. Peter's west look into St. Paul's, nor St. James' worship as St. Luke's; and the "Garment, seamless and woven from the top" (that is, Christ) throughout, is replaced by shreds and patches, the products of earthly looms, and no two of them the same in shape or size or color. Most lay the wear of buffoons or fools. Sad, ineffably sad, that any one should have disgraced Christianity by clothing it in such a robe!

Yet people in this deplorable state, differing amongst themselves at every point, a focus of discussion and disintegration, quarrelling and melting to quarrel, went up to themselves and try to find a remedy for their own ills, but must let their ugly tongues loose against the "Bride of Christ" herself.

If they attacked us for our personal shortcomings, it would be fair enough, and a generous, useful rivalry might be excited between us and themselves. But this is not their way. They must have at the Church. Everything that Catholics do, no matter what, must be charged on her. Cannot a Catholic, tell a lie or commit a sin on a Sunday, from motives of patriotism, or a Catholic merchant, if so he, break down in business merely through hard times, or bad business methods, or a Catholic who has been badly instructed, or is a weakling, tell a lie or commit a sin without any reference to his religious affiliations at all? What in the wide world has the Church to do or suffer from such things. She has done her best to prevent them, and is no more responsible for them than are the purchasers themselves.

How would Protestantism take it if we posted up a file of last week's papers telling how a great editor called a member of Parliament a liar and a slanderer, and how the member bit back and called the editor a liar or a rumpus, or then because both parties to the fight were Protestants, went on to draw a conclusion like this: lying and slander and bribery and corruption and all manner of dishonesty are the natural fruit of Protestantism! What a rumpus that would be! How they would strain and gasp in the struggle to find language appropriate enough to apply to me. Nay, would they not enquire if there was not some law to punish such insulting remarks. Their mighty love of free press, the allusions of our liberties, &c., &c., would never stop their fury to get at me.

Yet after all that would I have done in the hypothesis different in principle from what they are doing every day. To say the Church is blamable for this or that, and when called upon for proof, make answer that St. Thomas or Denis, or any other individual Catholic, did or taught the thing objected to, is just as bad logic and as gross uncharity, as to affirm that Protestants are liars and slanderers, and bribees and roovers of bribes—because two Protestant gentlemen impute this guilt to each other. The editor and the M. P. are following up their own professions, and come into disagreeable collision, resulting in interchange of some very unedifying language. Perhaps both are wrong, or extreme—and only mistaken—which is the charitable view. But suppose both were right, the Church to which they belong could say, honestly, it is none of my concern; it does not affect me at all, except as I am sorry for the fall of men I esteem; their mistakes and crime, if so be, are entirely their own, and no more touch me than if they were Jews or Mahometans. This would be quite correct. When the editor or the politician or moralist who is a Catholic in the works of a very difficult profession, gives evidence of his humanity by making a mistake, which outrage upon justice and fair play it is only any one but himself accountable for. Logic and charity alike forbid it. Only prejudice and bigotry could be guilty of so glaring a wrong.

Yet within the last few months two clergymen of this city, both doctors, I believe, and one still higher up, made very grave and shameful charges against Catholics in general, and when called upon to justify their conduct thought that they had done their duty by pointing, one to a passage in St. Thomas, the other to

some words of a theologian with the sharp name of Denis. Now, what have I, what have my neighbors to do with St. Thomas or Denis? We look for our guidance and direction to God's Church, founded by Christ upon the Rock against which the gates of hell shall not prevail. What she says God says; "He who hears you hears Me." And we believe it, every word of it, no more or less. And this is the faith without which it is impossible to please God. An instructed child is capable of it and the loftiest philosopher cannot go beyond it. This faith, infallible in itself, is communicated to us by the infallible Church in three ways: (1) by conciliar decree; (2) by the Pope speaking ex cathedra on faith or morals; and (3) by the universal teaching at any time. This single infallibility we admit, we profess, we glory in, but no other.

Doctors, theologians, canonists are as necessary and useful as teachers are in schools. But any one of them may make mistakes, not one is infallible, nor has the right or power per se to bind us more than the editor or the M. P. has to bind Protestants. This does not mean that we are not indeed greatly indebted to a man of letters, or to a prominent writer of the Church. They have done wonders in explaining and simplifying and harmonising the facts and truths of Revelation. They have used their splendid talents in the heavenly work of building up out of the divine Word, a theology or science of God and man, by the aid of which the difficulties of reason are greatly diminished and powerful help given us in following the light, shining here dimly, as in a glass, up to its source in the God who gave it to us for our guidance and sanctification.

Amidst these benefactors of Christianity, perhaps the very first place should be assigned to St. Thomas. Yet even he was the simple servant of the Church. For her he laboured. She watched his efforts with encouragement and reward, admired his depth and clearness, and after his death canonized him for his holiness. But she never thought of putting him in her own place, and transferring the duty of our obedience from her own divinely bestowed power, to his logic and general ability. Nay, when he made a mistake, not in the passage quoted by one of the ministers, and too deep for his understanding, she corrected it in the gentle and loving spirit of a mother, who would force to put her darling to right, kisses him for her pains.

St. Thomas wrote under the correction of the Church, as did all the Saints. To her they submitted their judgment in every thing, and every line, was on her infallibility as the first principle or postulate, they took their start, and on that they rested at the end of their labours. How unscientific, then, in theory, and practically how unjust, to say as accounts for any thing they said or wrote, unless that has the stamp of infallibility at whose nod they were ready and bound by their first principle, to change or give up entirely whatever it disagreed.

St. Thomas and St. Augustine and the Gregory and the St. Bernard and ten thousand others are great authorities in their own line, they are the illustration and the glory of the Christian intellect. But the Church is the one sole thing or person to whom we must look for our guidance and to whom we must look for our aid. Her we are bound by, her utterance we are bound by, her theologians speak her words they are our guides and benefactors, independently of her no more than the logic of the personal teaching of the Church. We hope controvertists high and low will take a note of this, and deliver us from both the irritation and amusement caused by their ignorance.

Irish Political Prisoners.

MONTREAL, April 19.—The regular monthly convention of the delegates representing every English speaking Catholic society in the city—national, literary and temperance—was held Sunday afternoon in St. Mary's Hall, sixty delegates being present. The object of the league, which is the advancement of the Irish people at home and abroad, having been gone into, the following resolutions were unanimously adopted:

"That we, the representatives of the Irish people of Montreal in convention assembled, do present a petition to Her Majesty the Queen on the occasion of her Jubilee praying that she may extend the hand of clemency to the Irish political prisoners now confined in British jails by granting them their freedom."

"That the Premier of this Dominion be requested to present said petition, and that a committee be appointed to correspond with all the representative Irish societies of Canada, including the Maritime Provinces, asking them to send delegates to the convention with the intention of having this petition a universal appeal from the Irish people of this, the largest and most important British colony."

STRENGTHENING is due to nervous excitement. The delicately constituted, the thinner, the business man, and those whose occupation necessitates great mental strain or worry, all suffer less or more from it. Sleep is the great restorer of a worried brain, and to get sleep cleanse the stomach from all impurities with a few doses of Parkeo's Vegetable Pills, which contain no mercury, and are guaranteed to give satisfaction or the money will be refunded.

HON. MR. COSTIGAN'S POSITION.

Following are the main portions of the Speech on the Address, delivered in the House of Commons on April 2nd by Hon. John Costigan:

With regard to the Manitoba school question, I must say at once that I had hoped that the policy of the Government would have been more in accord with what I consider has been the verdict in favor of the policy adopted, and that a reasonable settlement would have grown out of it. That brings me to the paragraph in the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, in which we are asked to say that we are pleased to learn that after negotiation, a satisfactory settlement has been made. Standing in my place here, entertaining the views I have always entertained, with the record I have made for myself, for consistency at least, in a humble sphere, I could not subscribe to the statement that that was a satisfactory settlement, nor can I subscribe to the assertion that the Manitoba school question is buried. Not at all. There is no funeral, and if it would delight hon. gentlemen to attend the funeral of that question, it will have to be a mock funeral, for there will be no corpse. That question is not settled. There has been no reference in the settlement that I can see to the grievances declared to exist by the Privy Council. There has been no reference in it to the reasonable demands of the minority, and therefore it is a very great mistake for hon. gentlemen on either side to say that the question is dead and buried. You might as well say that the constitution of the country is dead and buried. That question is dead, instead of being dead and buried, is in its full force and vigor. It is not dead in any more sense than the British North America Act itself. That question to day, so far as the rights of the people are affected, is just as much alive as the constitution itself, and it will last as long if not reasonably disposed of. There is but one way to bury this question, and that is by restoring their rights, and that is by burying the guarantees given by the constitution to minorities. There is but one way to bury the guarantees given to minorities, and that is to say that the common law of the Act. How can that be done? By the vote of this Parliament? No, thank God. You cannot do it by the vote of this Parliament. It can only be done by the powers that passed that Act. If any portion of the people here resort to the link to day that the fathers of confederation made a mistake when they gave these guarantees in good faith, when they pledged the honor of the country to the minorities in this country—at the time they were made, they are wrong, and they are wrong in the same way, if they wish to say to-day that the constitution is wrong in that respect does that give them any right to ignore the constitution? No, it does not; the constitution was not obeyed and it will be respected in the future. If that is any part of the constitution that is inimical to the interests of Canada, then ask for the amendment of the constitution; and if there be good reasons for having it amended, the Imperial Parliament may do it. I will make the amendment. Otherwise, I am sure it will not. I speak plainly on this subject because I want it clearly understood, from my point of view. There may be a number of gentlemen who differ very widely from me, but if I understand the constitution under which we live, when that little minority was deprived of its rights, when faith was broken with it, when it appealed to Parliament and its attention was called to the constitutional position, when that redress should be sought, when by following the usual constitutional methods which were pointed out, when it went to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council to obtain judgment, when that judgment declared that its case came within the operation of the Act of Confederation and pointed out what its grievances were and declared that an appeal lay to the Governor General in Council for a remedy, when that appeal was made, and the remedial order passed, and when that remedial order was obeyed, then the doors of that Parliament were unlocked to that minority; then they came to this Parliament, and the Remedial Bill was introduced by a Conservative Government and carried to a second reading successfully by a Conservative Government, with a majority of Conservatives supporting it, which majority was increased by the support of other members of the House, thus affirming the principle of the Bill. From that date, within the limits of the Act, the remedial order was obeyed, and the Remedial Order, this Parliament was seized with the legislation on that subject and no power can take it out of this Parliament. I am not going to say that this Parliament can be forced to exercise that power now. The majority of this Parliament may say it is not wise to exercise that power, as a majority may say that a minority must submit to the settlement and must not ask us to exercise that power here at all, the majority of Parliament can do as they please, but power and, to my mind, the obligation to legislate is here, and the question is not by any means settled. But I am not going to

argue that point. I have heard several speakers who have proceeded to say that the question has not been settled and that what has been said is an instalment, do not say that. I have argued taken by hon. those who have spoken on that subject. Because, I want it clearly understood that on that question I am not speaking for party purposes or as an old Conservative, but as a man speaking as a friend of the constitution. I happen to be a Roman Catholic, an adherent of the same faith as the minority in Manitoba. But I tell you solemnly, Mr. Speaker, standing in my place as a member of this House, that were I a Protestant I would take exactly the same ground. I speak as I feel about it and I speak candidly and honestly, I do not attack the Government or any member of the Government for any expression they may have used in or out of Parliament to show the settlement is not final. I do not find fault with that. I find fault with the settlement because I have reason to know it is not satisfactory to the minority. You may talk about carrying by-elections, but outside of the one principally affected, that does not do any good. I do not think that the French representatives in the province of Quebec, who are as much interested in the question, so far as sympathy is concerned, as I am, are satisfied. That does not affect my position. Well, yes, it does affect because it weakens my position; but it does not change my opinion, nor does it weaken the sense of obligation I feel resting upon me as a man elected to this Parliament and sworn to carry out loyally and truly the constitution of the country. I do not think that the case well from any of our friends because it might indicate a desire to continue an agitation for the sake of the agitation. I want it to be understood that I am not a party to that. But I blame hon. gentlemen on that side of the House, and I state it clearly and distinctly, for having used double arguments for political purposes, to defeat the Government of the day. For the same reason I condemn that policy as unworthy of the Liberal Government of the same unworthy grounds. I have never in any political fight I have ever fought, struck below the belt. I have never met an opponent whom I was ashamed to meet again. I have never taken any stock in those double games, and I do not care to honesty about them, there is no good to come to the country from their use. I recognize every man's right to his convictions, but I expect to fight fairly and to be fought fairly.

We are not compelled to argue and proceed to make separate schools as the center of the common law, and we do not shrink from the argument if necessary, but it is not required. We remember the cry of coercion that went up to the effect that the Dominion was coercing the little province of Manitoba, and that the separate schools were not a constitutional right. We had in New Brunswick an agitation for three years and an attack upon the Government led by the present Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair), because these concessions were made to them, and the result shows you the position we are in. In Nova Scotia, to the credit of the province be it said, that while our constitutional guarantee was swept away, while we had not a vestige of protection under the common law, there were not more than in New Brunswick, yet the law was administered by the Government of the day in such a way that harmony prevailed upon that question, and the Catholics there accept the common law, and prevent them from being. It is to-morrow the administration in New Brunswick or Nova Scotia on some wave of prejudice or religious excitement were to close up every Catholic school in these provinces, is there anything in the law there or in the constitution to prevent them from doing so, or to afford the minority any relief? Not the slightest. Then I say that while we are thankful, and while we cannot help paying a tribute to these men that their liberal treatment of the minority in their province, and their independent solely upon their good will for any concessions given. So will Manitoba be dependent. But is it the same case? Manitoba says no. The minority in Manitoba says: We felt that we were not to be satisfied without this guarantee. We felt that the majority might sweep us up and that we might lose those rights. They have been swamped, and they now say: Give us that which you promised us at the time of confederation, give us that which the highest tribunal on the land declared to be our right. Sir, their demand is a reasonable one. I heard a distinguished barrister in the province of Quebec quoting the judgment reciting the grievances that are found to exist, and that it was absolutely necessary for restoration of these rights that the law which was repealed by the Act of 1890 should be re-enacted. That is true. It is quite clear that all the grievances could be removed if the existing law of 1890 were supplemented by the law which would restore these rights or remove the grievances. The judgment lays down what the grievances are, and in proceeding to show how the rights of the minority might be restored, it points out two ways. One is by carrying out the old law itself if necessary, and the other by supplementing the Act of 1890 by such legislation as will meet the wants of the case. This does not require them absolutely to re-enact the old law, and at that point there is no argument in saying that the Catholic children who are attending the public schools in any part of Canada is an evidence as all affecting this Manitoba case.

I am prepared to vote for any amendment that may be moved to that par-

ticular paragraph referring to the school question, that would simply negative that statement congratulating His Excellency upon the settlement of this question. That amendment is not moved. No amendment is to be moved, as I understand. I do not think it very necessary that any should be moved, for the simple reason that the question is not affected at all by this settlement which is announced in the Speech from the Throne. The associations between the two governments have ended. If the Manitoba minority accept that settlement, I do not suppose anything here will rise to exercise the power which I contend still rests here. If the Manitoba minority accept that as the final settlement, I am not going to make any noise or to say that I am more interested than the people who are principally affected.

Now, I cannot sit down without a short reference to the Queen's Jubilee, and it must be short, because I am sure I could not add to the very eloquent expressions that have been given from both sides of the House on that paragraph which refers to Her Majesty's Diamond Jubilee. I will simply say that I join in the congratulations to the fullest extent, all that has been said by the two leaders in the House and the gentlemen who followed and spoke so eloquently on that paragraph, and while I, in my humble way, look with pride, as a loyal subject of Her Majesty, to the great development that has taken place all over the world, and particularly in that part of the world, which is considerable, that is enclosed within the limits of Her Majesty's Empire, when I consider the expansion of that Empire and extend to which I believe has been produced within her reign, what can I say but that it is the most wonderful Empire in the world, that it gives evidence of a wonderful amount of intelligence in the people, especially of that little island, which, compared with the rest of the Empire, seems to be a speck in the ocean, and that no one can help admiring—one need not be a British subject to admire—the British constitution, the British Empire and its history and its noble Queen. If we look too at all that has been done in her glorious reign, there is gratification for every subject, and there is one little corner within the shadow of the Throne itself, that little green isle, and while I do not hesitate to raise my voice and join my fellow-Canadians in a just tribute of praise to that great and successful sovereign, I do not think it over which she has presided so long and with such distinction, still when I think of that little island, I say that, if in that great monument that is to be raised at the celebration of this Jubilee, you could but have that little corner, that freedom had been given that little island which had suffered so long, with what an outburst would voices be raised from thousands of corners all over God's earth to join you still more heartily. But if that little island be not there, let no man say that an Irishman will not join in his best wishes for the success of the Empire. And let me say this, that the monuments that will be raised, in every form, to the glory of that great Queen and to the great Empire will attract the attention of the whole world, and I pray that Her Majesty may yet be regarded still longer than that sixtieth year, and that before she descends from the Throne, which she has graced so long and so well, she will have the pleasure—let to her Majesty—of signing a bill giving to Old Ireland home rule as we have it in this country.

Mr. Merry del Val.

A despatch to The World from Quebec on Wednesday says: Monsignor Merry del Val attended mass in the Seminary chapel yesterday. He was tendered a reception at Laval University, when the honorary degree of Doctor of Theology was conferred upon his Excellency, and an address was also presented to him. The delegate will leave here on Wednesday morning for Valleyfield, where he will spend a few days with Mr. Enard, proceeding thence to Toronto, where he will be the guest of Archbishop Walsh till Friday next.

A Montreal despatch on the same day says: Great preparations are being made in Valleyfield for the reception of Mr. Merry del Val to-morrow. The delegate will arrive at 6 p.m., when an address will be presented to him by the Mayor at the railway station. A procession will then be formed, composed of the different societies and the distinguished visitor will be escorted to the Cathedral through the principal streets of the city, which have been specially decorated for the occasion. On Thursday morning Mr. Merry del Val will see Mass in the cathedral, and during the day he will visit the different educational and religious establishments. In the evening there will be a reception in the parlors of the bishop's palace, and the delegate will leave for Ottawa on Friday morning at eight o'clock.

Dr. Chase Cures Backache.

Kidney trouble generally begins with a single pain in the back, and in time develops into Bright's Disease. People troubled with stricture, impediments, stoppage of water, or a frequent desire to urinate at night, will find Dr. Chase's Kidney Pills a blessing. Read the wonderful cures in another column. One pill is a dose, and if taken every other night will positively cure kidney trouble.