

Technical and Bibliographic Notes / Notes techniques et bibliographiques

The Institute has attempted to obtain the best original copy available for filming. Features of this copy which may be bibliographically unique, which may alter any of the images in the reproduction, or which may significantly change the usual method of filming, are checked below.

Coloured covers/
Couverture de couleur

Covers damaged/
Couverture endommagée

Covers restored and/or laminated/
Couverture restaurée et/ou pelliculée

Cover title missing/
Le titre de couverture manque

Coloured maps/
Cartes géographiques en couleur

Coloured ink (i.e. other than blue or black)/
Encre de couleur (i.e. autre que bleue ou noire)

Coloured plates and/or illustrations/
Planches et/ou illustrations en couleur

Bound with other material/
Relié avec d'autres documents

Tight binding may cause shadows or distortion
along interior margin/
La reliure serrée peut causer de l'ombre ou de la
distortion le long de la marge intérieure

Blank leaves added during restoration may appear
within the text. Whenever possible, these have
been omitted from filming/
Il se peut que certaines pages blanches ajoutées
lors d'une restauration apparaissent dans le texte,
mais, lorsque cela était possible, ces pages n'ont
pas été filmées.

Additional comments:/
Commentaires supplémentaires:

This item is filmed at the reduction ratio checked below/
Ce document est filmé au taux de réduction indiqué ci-dessous.

10X	14X	18X	20X	22X	26X	30X
12X	16X		J		24X	28X

The Catholic Register.

PUBLISHED EVERY THURSDAY

AT THE

FIFTEEN LOMBARD STREET TORONTO

APPOINTED AND REGISTERED AS AN ANNUAL
PUBLICATION AND LEGAL PAPER THROUGHOUT THE DOMINION.

SUBSCRIPTIONS \$2.00 PER ANNUM.

Advertisers are requested to make remittance by post office stamp or money order. All remittances will be acknowledged and some of these can be procured and the money sent back in letter. All postmasters are required to register letters and forward to us at once.

Always give the name of the post office to which your paper is sent.

Any change in his place of residence will please communicate with us—stating both the old and new address. All letters should be addressed to The Catholic Register Co., 15 Lombard Street, Toronto.

Matter intended for the Editor should be so directed, and must arrive not later than Monday's or Tuesday's issue. The publishers must be notified by letter when a subscriber wishes his paper stopped. All arrears must be paid.

Agents.—P. MUNNOVAN AND Wm. RYAN.

THURSDAY, JULY 9, 1896.

Calendar for the Week.

July 9.—Marvels of the B.V.M.
10.—Seven Brothers, Mrs.
11.—S. Plus I., P. M.
12.—John Guibert.
13.—S. Agnes, B.C.
14.—S. Bonaventure, Bp., Dr. of the
Church.
15.—S. Henry.

St. Catharine has appointed a splendid delegation to the Irish National Convention. Other cities should lose no time.

There is a prospect that the French Committee of the Ottawa Separate School Board, will re-engage the Christian Brothers who recently withdrew from the schools. The master has been up before the Board and it has been decided to confer with Bro. Fanion, of Montreal, with a view to the re-engagement of the Brothers. It has surprised most people that the Christian Brothers, who are such excellent teachers elsewhere, should have had any unpleasant experience in Ottawa.

The sons of Ireland beyond the seas were represented last week at the inauguration of the new Academic Union of past Maynooth by the Most Rev. Dr. Colgan, Archbishop of Madras, and Right Rev. Dr. Howley, Bishop of Newfoundland. The Archbishop of Halifax would have been in Ireland also, for the occasion, had he not been summoned home to the death-bed of his venerable friend, the late Mgr. Carmody. The synopsis of Dr. Howley's address at Maynooth which appears in our Irish news columns to-day has the true ring in it.

Rev. Dr. Langtry, a Toronto minister of the Anglican denomination, having undertaken to discuss the latest letter of His Holiness regarding Christian Religion, the editor of The World pointed out with a great deal of good humor, but with perfect fairness, that in order to preserve consistency between all his statements it would be necessary for Dr. Langtry to take the side of the Pope. It was a disappointment to the public, we fancy, that Dr. Langtry saw fit to retire out of The World's way; but we observe that he did so in a very peculiar fashion. He took to calling names as he retreated. Today "Papists" is but a sorry sort of argument.

Mr. Chamberlain has been carrying things with a high hand of late. He has been forcing Mr. Balfour out of public life, getting nearer himself to the leadership of the Unionist party; and, as a side issue, he has been abusing Sir Hercules Robinson, who is in London on leave from his South African post. All these things have been making the affairs of Government in England the subject of Liberal ridicule and Conservative anger. It may take a "host of traitors" to work havoc in any other Government; but it stands to reason that one bold hornet like Mr. Chamberlain, given imperial opportunities can do a great deal singlehanded.

Our readers will recall the news published in this paper recently concerning the arrangements made by the Jesuits whereby an increased number of Catholic students could pursue their higher studies at Oxford. It appears an objection was carried to Rome, but the Holy See has fully approved of the new foundation. We publish a further item in connection with the University of Cambridge to-day, announcing that the Catholic College of St. Edmund's at Oldham, has become affiliated with Cambridge. This is good news of the Catholic forward movement in England, and it is certainly a matter for Catholics to take a pride in.

Archdeacon Lauder has been advising a general agitation in the Anglican denomination for what we take to be the reorganization of the Ontario Public School system. A notable article on this subject appears in The Church Evangelist (Anglican). The writer, Mr. Lawrence Baldwin, demands voluntary schools for Ontario, which "will secure for the state the secular instruction of public schools, and for parents the

religious instruction they desire for their children. There cannot be a shadow of doubt that the writer in The Church Evangelist is a gentleman of earnest religious views, and he presents an entirely logical and forcible case.

The Antagonist Casket makes an unexpected attack upon Mr. James Clancy, M.P. for Bothwell speaking of him as "Clancy," "a man for whom we have little respect," and "a good kind of a man to keep in private life." Why this scathing invective? The only excuse offered by the Casket is a remark about "a Catholic in name." What would any of us think of a Catholic who made it his business to go around among his acquaintances swearing at the religious character of his neighbor? What is wrong for the individual is wrong for the newspaper. Indeed it is a hundred fold more culpable in the newspaper, because the slander is spread far and near and once printed there is no telling what pain it may cause and what injury it may inflict. Nor can we see why the Catholic newspaper should lay claim to any privilege in this line above its secular contemporaries. It comes to this, that a man has a right to his private character or he has not. If he has there is not a jury in Canada that would hesitate to find a verdict against The Casket. If on the other hand we take it that the public must be allowed the unlimited privilege of criticism, we would expect of The Casket that it is prepared to come into court and impeach Mr. Clancy's conscience in the public interest. But the only hint it throws out as to its being prepared for such a call is that the man attacked "was the chief lieutenant of Meredith in his anti-Catholic crusade." We are afraid The Casket does not know whereof it speaks, in the anti-Catholic crusade referred to Mr. Clancy was defeated by the P.P.A. vote for the reason that he stood up for Catholic schools inside and outside the Manitoba School question some distance away from their influence; and they are deeply concerned that the final disposal of the matter should not be injuriously affected by the altered situation. Therefore, they are all the more inclined to demand a fair field for the trial of Mr. Laurier's plan of removing the vexed matter from the arena of politics. There can be but one settlement; and that settlement one can be pleasing to Protestants and Catholics, who desire to live in peace and harmony in this young country.

If we are to see their natural and constitutional rights restored to the Catholics of Manitoba by a French Catholic Premier, certainly the prospect is one that ought to be pleasing to Catholics. Nor could the bitterest partisan deny the greatness of the achievement to the new Premier.

English-Speaking Catholics and Cabinet Representation.

Upon the appointment of Sir Hibbert Tupper to the Solicitor-Generalship, which had remained vacant for some time after Mr. Curran's elevation to the Bench, an article appeared in The Register calling attention to the matter of the representation of English-speaking Catholics in the Dominion Cabinet. The method by which Sir Hibbert Tupper was brought back seemed to threaten Catholic interests as recognized both by Conservative and Liberal Governments; but inasmuch as the Montreal seat was then lost to the party in power, it could be fairly said that the disposition of Sir Hibbert Tupper was only a temporary matter.

In the Government of Sir John Macdonald, as in the Government of Hon. Alexander Mackenzie, there were always two English-speaking Catholics with portfolios. After the death of Sir John Abbott, Sir John Thompson became Premier, which did not lessen the Catholic representation, although Mr. Curran soon became Solicitor-General. The recently revealed confusion which followed the death of Sir John Thompson may explain why Mr. Curran was never brought into the Cabinet; but at all events had the Conservatives been returned again to power in the late election the claims of Mr. Quinn to the Cabinet position that Mr. Curran should have had would be insisted upon both in Ontario and Quebec. Thus the proper representation of English-speaking Catholics would have been restored.

We have been examining all the states of the coming Cabinet in order to see how Mr. Laurier proposes to preserve the Cabinet representation of English-speaking Catholics so long recognized by the Premiers of Canada. If the forecasts made are at all accurate, Mr. Laurier does not intend to adhere to the precedents set by all his predecessors. But we can hardly credit the information so far supplied as correctly describing the plan of the Liberal Cabinet and the timber of which it will be formed. According to The Globe's forecast the French representation is to be increased, and as we view the situation this must be

at the sacrifice of English-speaking Catholics interests. Mr. Devlin alone is mentioned for a Cabinet position by The Globe, although The Mail omits Mr. Devlin and gives the name of Mr. Fitzpatrick, Q.C. Mr. Devlin represents a Quebec constituency in the House of Commons, and we have no doubt that he is entirely acceptable. He is a gentleman of ability and sound principles. His public career is altogether in his favor, and we believe that Mr. Laurier neither could nor would overlook him.

But Mr. Devlin is only one representative English-speaking Catholic, and two there always have been, and two there must be, unless Mr. Laurier has been forced into showing a sudden and hostile change of front.

The situation of the Liberal Party in the day of its triumph is not by any means such that a difficulty about finding the second representative can be pleaded. Mr. Scott had strong claims, and although it would seem that there is a settled opposition in the present Liberal Party to bestowing upon the Senator the honor he enjoyed in the MacKenzie Government, the principle of Catholic representation cannot be allowed to suffer because of the weight of personal considerations within the party or Cabinet.

But they realize, also, that the vote of the French-Catholics of Quebec has withdrawn the settlement of the Manitoba School question some distance away from their influence; and they are deeply concerned that the final disposal of the matter should not be injuriously affected by the altered situation. Therefore, they are all the more inclined to demand a fair field for the trial of Mr. Laurier's plan of removing the vexed matter from the arena of politics. There can be but one settlement; and that settlement one can be pleasing to Protestants and Catholics, who desire to live in peace and harmony in this young country.

If we are to see their natural and constitutional rights restored to the Catholics of Manitoba by a French Catholic Premier, certainly the prospect is one that ought to be pleasing to Catholics. Nor could the bitterest partisan deny the greatness of the achievement to the new Premier.

Whoever may be appointed the principle is one that every English-speaking Catholic in the Dominion will stand up for. We press the matter now in no ill-considered way, but deliberately, as in the forecups to date we read a disposition to deny the principle of English Catholic representation; and we venture to say that Mr. Laurier cannot under any species of pressure set aside a precedent which has been recognized by every Premier of Canada. This is no time for new and menacing changes of front towards a great body of the citizens of the Dominion.

To Birch, or Not to Birch?

Parents as well as teachers should give their attention to Cardinal Gibbons' essay in the July North American Review on "The Teacher's Duty to the Pupil." The Cardinal offers reflections that are wise and moderate upon the spirit of this country and this day, which seems to be growing more and more averse to the application of the rod.

One aspect of this question was forcibly presented in the conversation between Dr. Johnson and Boswell at Slains Castle, concerning Lady Errol's methods with her children, which our readers may recall from the "Journal of a Tour to the Hebrides." Lord Errol's brother had been telling the travelers that:

Lady Errol was one of the most pious and sensible women in the Island; had a good head and as good a heart. He said she did not use force or fear in educating her children.

Johnson.—Sir, she is wrong; I would rather have the rod to be the general terror to all to make them learn, than tell a child if you do this or thus you will be more esteemed than your brothers or sisters.

The rod produces an effect which terminates in itself. A child is afraid of being whipped and gets his task, and there's an end on't; whereas by exciting emulation, and comparisons of superiority, you lay the foundation of lasting mischief; you make brothers and sisters hate each other.

Cardinal Gibbons presents a riper view. He opens with the lesson drawn from Plutarch that to be effectual the moral precepts of the teacher must be enforced by his own example. The

Hortian axiom puts the same truth in other words. We are reminded that the good name of Quintilian was marred by the vicious conduct of some of his scholars. "The reputation of Seneca suffered on account of the crimes of Nero, his former pupil."

The Cardinal points to Jesus Christ as the model teacher. His conduct towards Peter, the Sons of Zebodaeus, Thomas and others are examples showing that the natural spirit of each disciple was directed to high and holy ends. The following rules for teachers are quoted from the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore:

Let the discipline for regulating the whole course of life in the seminary be so arranged that it may savor neither of excessive rigor nor indulge pernicious laxity. The vigilance of superiors should be so tempered and moderated in maintaining it that it will not pry too closely into minute details, nor so hamper the minds of youth, as it were with chains, as to impede the normal expansion of their energies.

The discipline of the rod belongs to the parent, and when the Christian teacher is worthy of the confidence of the parent there is no reason why the parental prerogative should not be delegated. The Cardinal is in favor of the rod; but, recognizing the unwillingness of American parents to admit in practice Solomon's maxim: "He that spareth the rod hateth his son," he comes to the conclusion that the model teacher of to day should exhibit the tenderness of the mother in the exercise of the paternal prerogative of applying the rod to the youth who must be disciplined.

The article suggests a comparison of the present age with that period in Grecian history when every man propagated his own notions and all sound thought was smothered in the general melee of the Sophists.

In Plutarch's time corporal punishment was not tolerated. The teacher had no power to extinguish the flame of freedom or break down the noble independence of the soul by the degrading application of the rod." The Cardinal goes on:

Plutarch informs us of a novel and ingenious method employed by his preceptor Ammonius in correcting his pupils. Our master, he says, having one day observed that we had indulged too freely at dinner, ordered his freedman, during his afternoon lecture, to give us his own son the discipline of the whip in our presence. The philosopher all the while had his eye upon us, and we knew well for whom the example of punishment was intended.

"Our American youth," comments the Cardinal, "would, I presume, submit with patient resignation to this vicarious sort of punishment, for it is easy to bear the misfortunes of others." Which is not more complimentary to the American youth than it is to the spirit that forbids the application of the rod.

Prof. Clark and St. Irenaeus.

Prof. Clark of Trinity College, preaching on Sunday evening in one of the Anglican churches of the city, gave his attention to the Papal encyclical on Reunion, a summary of which has been published by Cardinal Gibbons; speaking of it as the utterance of "the first Bishop of the Christian Church." It is to be regretted that Prof. Clark, who as a learned debater is always courteous and invariably interesting, was not more fully reported in the daily papers. Enough is given, however, to show us the substance of his argument. Without pinning him down to any of the contradictions manifest in the published report of the sermon, we cannot misrepresent him when we say he took his stand against the Papal authority, and the doctrine that the Holy Roman Catholic Church is the same identical Church founded by the Apostles, and which was descended to the present day by an uninterrupted succession.

Ones aspect of this question was forcibly presented in the conversation between Dr. Johnson and Boswell at Slains Castle, concerning Lady Errol's methods with her children, which our readers may recall from the "Journal of a Tour to the Hebrides." Lord Errol's brother had been telling the travelers that:

Lady Errol was one of the most pious and sensible women in the Island; had a good head and as good a heart. He said she did not use force or fear in educating her children.

Johnson.—Sir, she is wrong; I would rather have the rod to be the general terror to all to make them learn, than tell a child if you do this or thus you will be more esteemed than your brothers or sisters.

The rod produces an effect which terminates in itself. A child is afraid of being whipped and gets his task, and there's an end on't; whereas by exciting emulation, and comparisons of superiority, you lay the foundation of lasting mischief; you make brothers and sisters hate each other.

Cardinal Gibbons presents a riper view. He opens with the lesson drawn from Plutarch that to be effectual the moral precepts of the teacher must be enforced by his own example. The

is absolutely without foundation in early Christian antiquity. It cannot be doubted," the Pope says, "that the church, by the will of God, rests in St. Peter." If he means that the words of our Lord here referred to can have only one meaning he must know that fathers of the greatest authority have differed widely in their exposition of them. If he means that St. Peter was invested with any teaching authority not possessed by the other apostles, then the whole testimony of Scripture is against it. Peter was foremost among the apostles—call him prince if you please—but he had no authority over them. Nor is there the slightest trace of St. Peter having handed on to the Bishops of Rome any authority he possessed. The testimony of Irenaeus might settle that for ever.

So far as he is reported the only authority appealed to by Prof. Clark in support of his objection to authority is St. Irenaeus. Is it not a matter for regret to all who are interested in this discussion that Prof. Clark did not quote the testimony of St. Irenaeus upon which he relies? We suppose that if Prof. Clark had quoted any particular words or passage from St. Irenaeus the reporter would not have omitted the point upon which the whole of the preacher's argument depended. St. Irenaeus is an excellent authority, an authority whom our Anglican friends should accept. And when they have accepted him they will find that, as far as he goes, he settles the question of authority, not as Prof. Clark would settle it, or (unsettle it); but quite the other way. St. Irenaeus is a second century Greek authority. And if Prof. Clark and the Anglicans desire to profit by his writings, and to stand "upon the old ways," they are quite right in going back so far. This is what St. Irenaeus will tell them:

"All the Churches must depend on the Church of Rome as on their source and head."

With this Church, on account of her more powerful headship, it is necessary that every Church, that is the faithful everywhere dispersed, should agree.

Pointing out that tradition which the greatest, and most ancient, and universally known Church of Rome—founded and constituted by the two most glorious Apostles, Peter and Paul—derives from the Apostles, and that faith announced to all men, which through the succession of (her) Bishops has come down to us; we confound all those who in any way, whether through self-complacency or vain glory, or blindness and perverse opinion, assemble otherwise than as behoveth them. For to this Church, on account of more potent principality, it is necessary that every Church, that is, those who are on every side faithful, resort; in which (Church) ever, by those who are on every side, has been preserved that tradition which is from the Apostles." [Adv. hinc. I. 3, c. 3.]

If anything further from St. Irenaeus is wanted Prof. Clark knows where to look for it. We have taken the liberty to quote St. Irenaeus for him. And if he says St. Irenaeus must settle the question of succession and the Papal authority "for ever," we say well and good.

Irish Education Bill Rejected.

A cable despatch says that Hon. Edward Blake, on behalf of the Irish members, has rejected the Bill introduced into the House of Commons by Mr. Balfour dealing with the schools of the Christian Brothers in Ireland. The emphatic refusal of this measure has been a foregone conclusion since the Irish Bishops over a month ago put on record their entire disapproval of it. On that occasion the Bishops passed the following resolution:

Resolved.—That we, the members of the Standing Committee of the Irish Catholic Bishops, having given the fullest consideration to the Bill now before Parliament to amend and explain the Irish Education Act of 1892, regret that we feel it our duty to express our entire disapproval of it.

Amongst other grounds of objection we have to state that, in accordance with the terms of the letter addressed in our name by His Eminence Cardinal Logue to the Lord Lieutenant before this Bill was introduced, and in pursuance of the settled policy of the Catholic Church in Ireland as expressed in a letter addressed by the Archbishops and Bishops of Ireland to the Right Hon. Sir George Grey, Bart., in the year 1860, we firmly protest against public funds being voted for primary education in Ireland to schools open to children of different religious denominations without giving these children the protection of a Conscience Clause.

Why Mr. Balfour should omit the control of a Conscience Clause for the Irish Christian Brothers' schools is

