

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 Mong, van, C. N. Murphy,
John P. Nelson and L. O. Byrne.
THURSDAY, AUGUST 15, 1895.

Calendar for the Week.

August 15—Assumption of Our Lady.
16—St. Roch.
17—Octavo of St. Laurence. Feast.
18—Solemnity of the Assump. St. Joseph, Father of the B.V.M.
19—St. Urban II., Pope.
20—St. Bernard, De. of the Church
21—St. Jane Francis de Chantal.

Isn't there just a "little" too much Holmes, morning, noon and night, seven days a week, in the newspapers?

Our correspondents who do not see their contributions in THE REGISTER will understand that we cannot publish anything which comes unaccompanied by the name and address of the writer.

Mr. Gladstone's voice rings through civilization for protection of Armenian Christians. The time is ripe for decisive action if the British Government want to prevent the vengeful course of extermination upon which the Turks have entered.

The British Liberals are still looking for the cause of their destruction. The consensus of opinion among them at the present time is inclined to lay the blame on the Catholic vote. Supposing it is true it is very good to hear that Catholics can overturn things so completely.

The Mexican Government is offering inducements to the Irish people to emigrate there. The Irish are preferred because they are rapid settlers. But the Irish won't go where the cactus is the indestructible reminder of the crown of thorns to every Catholic who knows the history of miserable Mexico.

An official report gives the population of Ireland on June 30 as 4,574,807, the lowest mark reached since the Union. And yet the annual birth rate in Ireland is over 24 per 1,000 of the population. But in the three months ending June 30, 28,862 people emigrated. And still Englishmen are trying to govern the country in the interest of the landlords.

The British Catholic journals are recalling with comfort Mr. A. J. Balfour's policy in respect to higher education in Ireland. This is with reference to the report that one of the first measures of the new Government will be to establish an Irish Catholic University. During the Committee stage of the Home Rule Bill on June 21, 1895, Mr. Balfour dealt with this important question as follows:

"I cannot look at what has been done in Germany and Belgium, or at the aspirations uttered in Ireland, without seeing that in all countries where the Roman Catholic clergy are in a dominant position they do insist that higher education for members of their own creed shall only take place in institutions under their own control. I thought in 1890, and I think still, that it would be politic, wise—I will not say just, but it would belong to the higher region of statesmanship, closely bearing on justice... that the Imperial Parliament should do something to meet this demand in Ireland, without which, I believe, neither the Roman Catholic clergy nor the Roman Catholic population will ever be contented."

The Register had occasion a few weeks ago to name one of the daily papers of the city for the publication of a sermon which contained little else than mocking and insulting references to the sacraments of the Catholic Church. A correspondent of The World told that paper it should have ignored the preacher who regarded the Orangemen and True Blue ladies in Wood green on Sunday last. The circumstances are not the same. In the one case the paper published the sermon without showing the slightest sign of disapproval or amusement; on the contrary all that approving head lines and a sympathetic introduction could lend to the stuff appeared with it. The World reporter was shocked and said so, and the Editor explained that he published the sermon only to warn the public against the preacher. Besides, the Woodgreen party had previously appeared as an Orange semi-political leader on the 18th July. The World clearly understands the journalistic province.

The Dublin Freeman's Journal publishes a couple of pages of correspondence which has passed between Mr. Morley and the Irish Board of National Education, with the view of framing a scheme to admit the Christian Brothers schools to the benefits of the National Education system. The Freeman admits the uncertainty of the issue of the negotiations at the moment the Government fell. This, it appears, was due entirely to Mr. Morley. The fundamental principle of the National system is, that "no attempt shall be made to interfere with the peculiar religious tenets of any description of Christian pupils." Mr. Morley's scheme was to throw open all denominational schools to children of every other denomination; a direct violation of the spirit and letter of the Education Act. There is one thing the Irish people have reason to feel thankful for when a Conservative Government returns to power—there will be respect maintained for religious convictions in educational matters.

There has never been much room to doubt Rev. Principal Cayven's attitude on the Manitoba School question. His correspondence with Mr. John S. Ewart is of little importance to the public therefore. The only paragraph in the exchange of letters that is not worthless is Mr. Ewart's statement of the facts of the problem which may be interesting to those who have not already taken the trouble to understand the bargain made with the Red River people:

(1) That the territory belonged to Great Britain and not to Canada; (2) that Canada desired to annex the territory; (3) that there were about 12,000 inhabitants there, half Protestants and half Catholics; (4) that Great Britain required Canada to come to an agreement with these people before the annexation was consummated; (5) that an agreement was made to, and part of it provided that for the future the schools were to be Separate (this provision was then thought to be one which would more probably be of advantage to the Protestants than to the Roman Catholics, but that is immaterial to the problem); (6) that thereupon the agreement was put in the form of a statute which the Imperial Parliament confirmed; (7) that the clause embodying the agreement as to the schools being Separate was badly drafted, and when technically examined was held not to provide; (8) nevertheless the existence of the agreement, and the intent to embody it in the statute are undoubted.

The Course of the Globe.

The Globe opens its eyes in innocent amazement because Mr. John S. Ewart objects to its assertion that the Manitoba bill of rights No. 4 was first mentioned in December, 1889. In reply to Mr. Ewart's invitation to be candid about this business, the Globe merely proceeds to argue that bill No. 8 "was the authentic and final expression of the settler's demands"; that "the origin of bill No. 4 is shrouded in mystery," and that it cannot admit "that provisions inserted (in the Manitoba Act) by the politician or the draughtsman or anybody else at Ottawa, can take rank with provisions inserted as the result of the demands of the Red River people."

In all this the Globe is very far from being original. We might go over, clause by clause, Mr. Dalton McCarthy's speech delivered in the House of Commons on July 18, and show conclusively that the Globe is merely reading from the same brief as the member for North Simcoe. It recounts all of his statements, adds a little more positiveness to them, and conscientiously omits the corrections of these statements made by the speaker who followed the counsel for the Manitoba Government. And one of the very pertinent things it omits to say is that the evidence now offered against Father Richot's copy of bill No. 4, and against the copy put in evidence in 1874 at the trial of Lepine, is nothing more or less conclusive than a clipping from the Globe of April 28, 1870. It was merely this clipping, which was forwarded by Lord Lisgar to the Colonial Secretary, and it is not too much to say that the Globe was no more entitled to claim infallibility in 1870 than it is to-day.

Was it modesty that prevented the Globe from discussing the matter fully, according to Mr. Ewart's challenge? Nor are we surprised that we should have to ask this question, for the Globe has been the thick and thin defender of the Manitoba Government from first to last in this school discussion.

Now, what is the object of all this attack upon bill of rights No. 4? In the speech on the floor of Parliament

already referred to, Mr. McCarthy put it in this light:

Then what conclusions are we driven to? That in the three different lists of rights prepared by the people of the Red River, one in November, one in the early part of March, one in the latter part of March— one by the Council in November, one by the Council of forty, and one by the Provincial Government—no claim was made in reference to the schools except in one, I have forgotten which, that they should have a certain amount of money annually for the support of their schools. We are therefore left in this position—that whatever appears in the Act of Parliament was the free grant or free gift of the people who were negotiating it here; it was not the result of any demand, it was not in consequence of any claim, but it was probably suggested here by the same influence which have from first to last claimed that in all our constitutions of the North West, and wherever we had the power, we should insert not merely a clause of this kind, but also a clause with reference to the dual language.

The Globe takes up the same position even more resolutely than Mr. McCarthy and after re-hashing all his "evidence" it says:

Though the first two bills were superseded by the third, they are important as showing that the omission of any stipulation for Separate schools was not a mere accident. All three alike are silent upon the point, and this is surely evidence that the settlers were not troubling themselves about Separate schools.

There is no other word to apply to the Globe when it goes this length, than pretence. The Globe knows how the Privy Council treated this ridiculous pretension. The reasons upon which the Lord Chancellor based the judgment have been quoted so often, and they are so conclusive, that we marvel at the cold cheek of the editor in still following Mr. McCarthy's subterfuge. This is what the Lord Chancellor said; and it has escaped no one's memory, for Sir Charles H. Tupper has nailed Mr. McCarthy down with it:

It would be shutting one's eyes to the most obvious facts, which were exhibited on the face of the British North America Act itself, if one were not to see that one of the obstacles to this federation scheme was the fact of educational legislation in the separate or distinct provinces which might affect the position of those who desired a denominational education. This runs through all the provisions of section 93, and it appears to me on the face of section 22 also. Therefore it is not extraordinary in that case to find limitations and safeguards, and superior legislative power given to the Dominion Parliament which represents the country as a whole.

Those who were stipulating for these provisions of section 22 as a condition for the union, and who gave their legislative assent to the Act by which it was brought about had in view the points then comprehended. The immediate adoption by the Legislature of an educational system obnoxious either to Catholics or Protestants would not be contemplated as possible. As has been already stated the Roman Catholics and Protestants in the province were about equal in number. It was impossible at that time for either party to obtain legislative sanction to a scheme of education obnoxious to the other, the establishment of a system of public education in which both parties would concur was probably then in immediate prospect. The Legislature of Manitoba met on the 15th March, 1871. On the 3rd of May following the Education Act of 1871 received the Royal assent. But the future was uncertain. Either Roman Catholics or Protestants might become the preponderating power in the Legislature, and it might be under such circumstances impossible for the minority to prevent the creation of the public coat of schools which although acceptable to the majority could only be taken advantage of by the minority on the terms of sacrificing their cherished convictions.

When, then, the Globe asserts that "the settlers were not troubling themselves about Separate schools" why does it omit to say that the Lord Chancellor had the hardihood to demolish this pat opinion borrowed from Mr. McCarthy's brief.

But we would not have wasted so much of our space with the irrelevant dispute concerning bills 8 and 4 if the Globe's policy did not indicate a distinctly mischievous intention. It takes issue with Mr. Ewart that the Manitoba Act was a treaty. This is the peg upon which Mr. McCarthy's hopes of keeping alive the misunderrstanding in Manitoba have been hung all along. This position means that the act of Parliament ought to be denied and discarded. And to what purpose? Clearly to inspire the Protestant majority in Manitoba with the idea that the provincial powers are not limited in educational matters, and that they can deny any and every settlement of the question in response to the action of the Dominion Government. It means this or nothing. The Lord Chancellor has finally declared that the intention of the Act was "in case either Catholics or Protestants became preponderant, and rights which had come into existence under different circum-

stances were interfered with, to give the Dominion Parliament power to legislate upon matters of education, so far as was necessary to protect the Protestant or Catholic minority as the case may be."

We would be sorry to think that when the Globe tells us "the treaty argument is being worked to death" it is not an irresponsible policy approving Mr. McCarthy's policy in the Manitoba question in its entirety.

Catholics for Temperance.

We publish to day a lengthy report of the great temperance demonstration which has marked the celebration of the Silver Jubilee of the Catholic Total Abstinence Union of America in New York. It is just as well to remember the circumstances amid which this gathering of Catholics—prelates, priests and laymen—has taken place.

At the present time the saloons of New York are closed on Sunday by virtue of a State law, which has received the determined opposition of the local representatives in the Legislature. These representatives had the political support of the self-styled "Catholic" party in New York, and saloon-keepers professing the Catholic religion, who have been defying the statute, have also been passing themselves off as expressing and acting up to Catholic sentiment.

We do not pretend to connect the gathering of the Total Abstinence Union and the liquor fight; but there never has been a happier coincidence of public events for the credit of the Catholic Church in the United States. Politicians and saloon keepers have certainly prejudiced public opinion in the neighboring republic against the Catholic Church to a greater degree than any other visible influence.

The report published elsewhere shows unmistakably where the Catholic Church, and the free Catholic people—free completely and absolutely as a religious people from any political bondage—stand. The press of New York, which champions respect for and the enforcement of law, has received a great deal of light from the proceedings of the Convention. The New York Evening Post says:

Not long since, in fact, since the agitation began, has been of equal moral and political significance with the extraordinary demonstration of Catholic sentiment, witnessed yesterday, against the arrogant saloon power. Endorsed by the presence and sympathy of the highest dignitaries of the church in this country, and of the special legation to the Pope himself, the religious celebrations of the day were highly important, but had to yield in popular effect to the great meeting held last night in Carnegie Hall. The audience gathered there was fairly representative, we are told, of what may be called the middle class Catholics of this city. Many active politicians were present of the kind that attend primaries and manage conventions. Yet the feeling of the meeting was so evidently and overwhelmingly in favor of enforcing the excise law, especially of closing the saloons on Sunday, that the lone Tammany orator, put up to test the sentiment of Catholics on the great Tammany platform of not enforcing the law, retired in complete discourtesy.

That the Catholic Church could have been expected to take any other position only shows how inconceivably stupid politicians can be when they set about it. Her official and authoritative attitude towards the liquor traffic and the Sunday question has long been known. It was eloquently set forth in Archbishop Ryan's sermon yesterday. The church does not lay down any absolute and binding doctrine of total abstinence. It does not rebuke declare liquor-selling of all kinds and under all circumstances to be a sin. But it has pronounced and will continue to pronounce in favor of temperance, and has stigmatized saloon keeping as an "unbecoming business" for a Catholic. The Archbishop freely acknowledged that a stigma had been brought on the Catholic name by the fact of so many nominal Catholics being saloon-keepers. But that was only an added reason, he maintained, for making the true teaching and attitude of the church known, and encouraging the Total Abstinence Union and every other moral or legal influence which would tend to diminish or cure the evils of drunkenness. Most outspoken was the Rev. Father Cleary, President of the Union. Amidst loud applause, he denounced "the liquor power, entrenched behind a fortification of wealth gathered from the earnings of the unfortunate," now grown "defiant of public opinion," "the uncompromising enemy of religion and country," "desecrating the sanctity of our Sunday and making a mockery of universal suffrage."

The gathering has altogether been a terrible denunciation of the professional Catholic politicians and bootlers of the United States, and its moral lesson cannot be lost on many worthies of the same stripe in Canada.

Mr. Laurier and the Globe.

It is satisfactory to see that Mr. Laurier, in his speech at Borol, availed himself of the earliest opportunity to make a declaration on the Manitoba School question wholly at variance with the policy which the Globe had declared a few days before. Let us examine the two declarations side by side:

MR. LAURIER. He had said over and over again that it was a question of fact, and that the Federal Government had a right to interfere. . . . Our Constitution guaranteed to our people every right to which they could lay claim, to every minority every right to which it could legitimately and fairly lay claim.

THE GLOBE. It. The Manitoba Act is invoked for the purpose of narrowing the powers of the Provincial Legislature, whereas we know that the purpose of the Red River settlers at the time was to magnify Provincial power. It is invoked for the purpose of justifying Federal interference with Manitoba, whereas we know that the settlers were jealous of Federal interference. We are asked to believe that they could not trust themselves or the future inhabitants of Manitoba in education matters, and insisted that the lines should be laid down so hard and fast that the Legislature should not be at liberty to repeal its own laws.

Here then we have Mr. Laurier on the side of the judgment delivered by the Privy Council, declaring that the power was advisedly entrusted to the Dominion Government to protect either the Catholic or Protestant minority in matters of education. Beyond this he is not now, in our opinion, called upon to go. The position taken by the Globe is that the Manitoba Act is in no sense a treaty, and that the Red River people did not want the Dominion Government to protect their educational rights, and that the matter was not in their minds in 1870. The Globe stands with Mr. McCarthy; Mr. Laurier stands with the Privy Council. It is needless to ask on which side the public opinion of this country is. Mr. Laurier, as the responsible leader of the Liberal party, recognizes the facts; the Globe is not responsible, and it is merely a matter of its own private business what cry it raises. But it is well to have this made clear.

An Instructive Spectacle.

It seems to us necessary that we should offer an adequate reason for making any reference to the infamous harangue delivered in the Wood green Methodist Tabernacle, on Sunday last by a preacher of the name of Cobourn to a congregation of Orangemen and woman known as True Blues. The man went into such a shocking paroxysm of beastly rage when denouncing the gentle nuns who are laboring and praying in our convents, that it seems almost inexcusable to keep the brute upon parade. But it must be remembered that this is a type of the class who want to sweep Catholic education out of Manitoba. The men and women who cheered his foul language represent the "intelligence" that would clear the name of God out of the schools of Canada. It is this ignorant class, which riots in filth even in the churches, that we have to account with. Are the Catholic people of Canada to be sacrificed to such a rabble? Is there a Catholic, or a Christian by whatever name he may be called, who would sacrifice religion in the remotest little school house on the Red River to people who attack it in this manner? Is not the conscience of one "mustang," as Dalton McCarthy with his superior ideas of offering insult would say, of more account than the bigotry of the entire brood that demanded from Cobourn on Sunday "religion" served with the assassination from the chancel house which it supplied to their taste without stint?

It is well that it should go abroad to the world what Catholics have to put up with in this enlightened part of Her Majesty's Dominions. It is right that the British public should comprehend the true character of the element in our population which is attacking the compact made between the Imperial Government and the Canadian people at the admission of Manitoba into the Dominion.

We also hope that Cobourn's religious refinement will help the great

body of the intelligent respectable Protestant people of Canada to rightly discern the class who are seeking and shouting for control of the public schools of the country. If Cobourn be but an utter irresponsible caterer to True Blue depravity let his brother ministers publicly denounce him. If they neglect to do this we must draw our own conclusions.

Our School Work.

As bearing on our remarks of last week comparing the work done in Catholic and Public schools, a fact of more than passing interest has come to our knowledge, and this time from the Separate School at Thorold. At the recent High School entrance examinations there, some forty candidates presented themselves, seven being from the Catholic Separate School. Twenty-eight passed of whom five were Separate School children. To the great surprise of examiners, candidates and the citizens generally, a little girl, one we might call a mere child, from the Separate School, Maggie Comarford, only eleven years of age, obtained the highest number of marks—614—out of all the 28 who passed. As many people who do not know otherwise assume that only prayers and Catechism are taught in our schools, the success of this little girl should convince them to the contrary, as we are certain she did not get any marks for those subjects though had they been; on the examination papers it is as likely she would have done just as well in them as she did in the other subjects. Maggie Comarford's teachers are the good Sisters of St. Joseph, and right well are they proving the work they can do. All honor to the Thorold Separate School.

The record of the Arthur Catholic Separate School, also is indeed a brilliant one. Last year at the High School entrance examination nine out of ten candidates passed. This year eleven pupils from the Separate school (tried the examination and all passed, one of them heading the list. At the primary examination for certificates sixty per cent of the candidates who were successful were Catholics. The following are the names of those who obtained certificates: Ethelred Sibley, Nellie Farrell, Lillie Smith, Maggie Keating and Mollie Sweeney.

A. O. H.

On the 7th, this division No. 5 of the A.O.H. of this city held a meeting in their hall cor. Queen st. and Broad-view ave., President Kelly in the chair. There was a very large attendance of members. The meeting was particularly interesting as there were seven candidates for initiation and visiting brothers in large numbers were present. The Rev. Father McDonnell (chaplain) delivered a stirring address and gave good sound advice. Amongst other things he told the members of No. 5 to pledge themselves this evening that at the next meeting each one would have a candidate to propose. By so doing they would make No. 5 the banner Division of this city, President Kelly said that they would put their shoulder to the wheel and give one stronger pull and pull altogether in order to carry out the Chaplain's advice. Speeches were made by provincial delegate McCaffry, School Trustee James Ryan, County President Falvey and Brothers, Boyle, Ryan, J. Rutledge, Richardson, McCaully and E. Rutledge. I must say that too much credit cannot be given to President Kelly for the able, effective and business like way that he discharged the duties of his office. It shows that he has the interests of the A.O.H. at heart.

A VISITING BROTHER.

Brave Arthur.

An Arthur Correspondent writes: Can any town or city in Ontario beat our record? No wonder Arthur supplies so many Catholic teachers for Ontario. You are correct in your editorial of last week, Mr. Editor in stating that our Catholic schools can hold their own against all others. Father Doherty, the Sisters of St. Joseph and the Catholic people of Arthur are to be congratulated.

[For the record of the Arthur Catholic School we refer our readers to the editorial in this issue. Ed. C. R.]

Next Sunday at St. Basil's.

Nine young men from the Novitiate will make their first step towards the priesthood, and will receive the tonsure at St. Basil's at 9 o'clock on Sunday next. His Lordship Bishop O'Connor of London, will perform the ceremony. The annual retreat for the priests of the Community of St. Basil begins next Monday and will continue throughout the week at the College.

Rev. Father Ryan rector of St. Michael's Cathedral is on a few days visit to Philadelphia.