

The Catholic Register.
PUBLISHED EVERY THURSDAY

THE CATHOLIC REGISTER PUBLISHING COMPANY

SUBSCRIPTION

U.S. City including delivery \$1.50
U.S. All Outside Postage \$1.00
Subscriptions otherwise an additional
\$1.00 will be charged

OFFICE, 9 JORDAN ST., TORONTO.

Approved and recommended by the Archbishops,
Bishops and Clergy.

ADVERTISING RATES.

Transient advertisements 10 cents a line.

A liberal discount on contracts.

Remittance should be made by Post Office Order,
Express Money Order or by Registered Letter. If
by cheque, 25 cents must be added for discount.

When changing address, the name of former Post
Office should be given.

No paper discontinued until arrears are paid.



Telephone 489.

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 1901.

REV. ARMSTRONG BLACK.

There are times when any hint of bitterness, war or blood, is entirely out of place. Such a time is a funeral or solemnity pertaining thereto. What therefore is to be thought of the Rev. Armstrong Black of this city in his address to the soldiers talking of a "baptism of blood" upon the occasion of an official service in honor of the late illustrious sovereign, Queen Victoria? If that service were ordered by the government, either Dominion or Provincial, then Dr. Black was recreant to his trust and insulted every man in his own race or creed. Here he claims: "Before we come into the full, true and noble work of life we must be consecrated to that work in blood." In that consecration no man need expect to find much of Dr. Black's blood. He is a preacher. Three ways he suggests for the letting of this blood—the racial one, the religious, and thirdly the old world quarrels. We beg of Dr. Black to be more definite. To what race does he refer? Is it the Scotch vs the Irish, or "Scots who has w' Wallace bluid" vs the English? Surely it cannot be that the French are meant. Any man may deem it his duty, when meeting soldiers to talk war and hatred, but great God in heaven, a preacher brays when he speaks of the Baptism of blood. What war is not bad enough? A racial war is surely bad enough to satisfy the worst blood-curdling desire. What race is meant? No race that we ever heard of in this native land of ours wanted war. A great big braggart preacher from over the sea talks loud, and hints at racial war. The curse of the Most High will rest upon the man who wants to set brother against brother in this broad land. Did Premier Ross engage this preacher to deliver himself thus? By what right of position did Dr. Black call for race or religious war in this Canada of ours? By what right of history did he presume that Canada could gain admission amongst the nations only by blood? If Dr. Black takes upon himself to preach such flap-doodle to his own flock we have not a word to say. It is none of our business. But when in his impudent and insolent position he talks war and hatred and bloodshed to our volunteers we call the attention of the Minister of Militia to his utterances. He has no business using such language—and his superiors must call him to account for it. No man in this country is called upon to sow division much less is a minister of religion. And least of all should a man, who was selected to do reverence to Her Majesty, so degrade his position as to talk war from the pulpit pretending to be Christian upon that very special occasion.

We are very glad to see that Dr. Black's sermon has not gone unchallenged. Mr. H. E. Irwin of Weston challenged it very severely. With Mr. Irwin we agree. The door of Canadian national greatness is still ajar. It lies open to the union of mind and energy which bind English, Irish, Scotch, French and German—all may enter. The work they bring will solidify even if it does not unify. This will take place later, in the development of material, moral and social elements in this country's greatness. Mr. Irwin asks: "Do their years of ceaseless toil, their patience and abiding faith count for nothing? Are the sacrifices they made for country, home and liberty of no avail; that we must know anything of Sir Frank Smith, is

seek a baptism of blood, in a fraternal war of races to make fit for true national life? If the doctrine thus laid down be true, then the true patriot is he who does what he can to hasten the war that will open the door to national life by fomenting strife among his fellow-citizens. It is difficult to believe that a minister of the gospel holds a commission to preach this doctrine in Canada." That is all very well—but the case is more serious. Here is a minister preaching at an official, memorial service, to members of the volunteer forces of Canada—and preaching a baptism of blood. We call again the attention of the minister of Militia to the language of this semi-clerical chaplain of the forces. We want no such ranting, bloodthirsty division sowing talk from pulpit, chair or platform in this country. Better no memorial service in honor of Queen Victoria than clap-trap such as we have had from Dr. Armstrong Black.

SIR FRANK SMITH'S WILL.

In last week's issue of the Union, a new Catholic publication, edited and printed in Ottawa, there appeared a wholly unauthorized attack upon the terms of Sir Frank Smith's will. The late Senator is the subject of a two column editorial which is as intemperate as it is unreasonable. We had concluded to pass over the libellous attack unnoticed, but meanwhile the matter has gotten into the daily papers throughout Ontario and we are compelled in justice to the memory of the late Sir Frank Smith to say something on this question. To take up the article piecemeal. The Union says that it would reserve no space for a notice of Sir Frank Smith's life "until we see the terms of his will." We are not aware that Sir Frank Smith's heirs asked for any space; we feel quite sure that if the late Senator were consulted before his death, he too would decline to have any space reserved either before or after the publication of his will, whether in the Union or elsewhere. Sir Frank Smith needed no fulsome eulogy; his work stands as a monument to his memory. The Union then goes on to say that Sir Frank Smith was not only ungrateful but even unjust in not willing his property, at least to a large extent, to the Church and her institutions. This statement is laid down upon the foundation of shifting sand that it was through his religion that Sir Frank Smith acquired this wealth. It says "His entire political career was wholly and solely due to the fact that the leaders of parties regarded him as the representative of Catholics, and much of his success and much of his wealth came from the connections and the circumstances which his political associations brought him." The Union utters this sample of veriest rot for the digestion of its readers. Everybody knows that Sir Frank Smith made absolutely no money out of politics. The citizens of Toronto know where the money was made and that it was the result of Sir Frank Smith's own business acumen and executive ability. Was it because of his being the leader of Catholics that Sir Frank Smith at the age of fourteen showed such energy and such strength of character as to mark him out in the eyes of one Ontario's best business men as a boy with a future before him? Was it because of his being the leader of Catholics that Sir Frank Smith succeeded in business in London? Was it because of his being the leader of the Catholics that Sir Frank Smith was one of the foremost merchants in Toronto? Was it because of his being the leader of Catholics that Sir Frank Smith made for Toronto one of the best and most complete systems of street-railways in the world? Was it because of his being the leader of Catholics that Sir Frank Smith launched and financed the Niagara Navigation Company? We think not. Sir Frank Smith owes not one penny to his being the leader of the Catholics. He had the foundation of his future substantially laid before he entered actively into politics at all. Sir Frank Smith died a wealthy man, and an honest man. He would have acquired wealth no matter to what creed he belonged. He was an eminently scholarly character and one that could not but succeed, that will overcome obstacles however great. It is scarcely worth the space to contradict such an article as the Union's. Everyone who

sets of youths are being educated side by side—one set with God and religious principle in their life; the other, without God, with no creed but selfishness and no patriotism but anti-Christian hatred in soul and life and conduct. No wonder that French women find more joy in convents than in marriage proposals. Better act the part of Virginians and stab your daughter than see her married to an irreligious, sensual, anti-Christian young Frenchman. The cry in France to-day is what Gambetta wanted: Death to religion. It matters not that France will lose its name and prestige in the East. It matters not that these communities have a history and a right of existence from hundreds of years. It matters not that their work tells for the common good. They are anti-republican, and they must be swept away. They are not the centre of the target—not the main port. But if they be taken, then religion will be largely disarmed, and the first fort taken. The religious must go, or republicanism fail. In looking at the case there can be no doubt that the republic is wrong. The works of education and charity carried on by the religious of France are done with love towards France, and with no hatred towards any republican form of government. It is not likely that when the republic starts with the assumption that the religious are guilty, that these latter will be particular about their friendly attitude. It is a serious thing to throw all the religious and their friends into a hostile camp. How such action can tell for a country's welfare we do not know. Nor do we understand how the good people of France do not sweep into the sea the miserable faction of Jews and Free Masons who are making France to be a mockery for the nations.

The article in The Union, in strictly bad taste at all times, was doubly so in that it was an attack upon the dead. We greeted The Union upon its coming into the arena of Catholic journalism and wished it every success. If The Union purposes to assist the cause of the Church, it will do well to confine itself to the truth: to adhere strictly to what it knows to be true—a principle which its editor departed from in writing such an article as the one we have been referring to.

FRANCE AND RELIGION.

When in a republic the Government ceases to represent the nation, and in reality represents a faction, then is the abomination of desolation. What was meant for liberty makes for tyranny, and what makes for tyranny coquettish with its most virulent form. One need not go to ancient history for a lesson. France is a case in point. The government of France does not represent the nation. It represents a faction—and that the worst, the most violent, and the most anti-national faction from Belgium to the Pyrenees and from the Channel to Alsace. It represents the Jews and the Free Masons. It should not. No government of an elective form should represent a mere faction. But when a faction is in power, and has full control of the administrative and executive, it is hard to see how matters can be otherwise. If the executive is pure, then mistakes in administration may be rectified. But if both be unsound it is an impossibility without resort to arms to correct what must be deplored by every lover of his country. In France we have a very special form of public demoralization. It is not a question of an ascending party carrying out a policy opposed to that of the minority; nor is it a question of selfish maintenance of power. It is a bold, uncalled-for attack upon the institutions of France—an attack upon the religious communities of the country. Our readers well remember that the Concordat of Napoleon included simply the regular clergy, but made no direct mention of the religious. The present government is taking advantage of this silence, and making a direct attack upon the religious associations by its proposed measure of not allowing any association of more than twenty members. Now these religious communities devoted to both education and charity, were in existence prior to Napoleon's Concordat. They are trustees, pure and simple for the property invested in their name. Yet, in the name of liberty, in the name of equality, and in that of fraternity, the French Government proposes to alienate this property, to dissolve their communities, and to prevent any further action. No student educated in any school other than the public school's and institutions shall have a right to position, civil, military or naval, in the government. All this means—Death to religion. There shall be no education with religion—no future for the young man who is Christian, French and Frenchman. If he wishes to follow his Divine Master he must renounce all advancement, and deny all worldly prospect. This means also that two

billionaires but ill for their spiritual condition, it shows that they are too indifferent on matters of religion to spare a few moments in thinking on the absurdity of the teaching on this point. So much for that. The clergy of the Catholic Church are bound under pain of sin, to read a portion of the Holy Scripture every day. Are Protestant ministers so bound? Can Protestant ministers conscientiously declare that they read and study portions of the Scripture every day? Catholic laymen are exhorted to read the Scriptures. Our Holy Father, Pope Leo XIII, has granted an indulgence of 800 days for every quarter of an hour spent in reading the Scriptures, and a plenary indulgence where the pious practice is continued daily once a month, on the usual conditions of confession and communion. Surely that does not look as though Catholics are forbidden to read the Scriptures.

THE BUSINESS OF LIFE.

Carlyle declares that the real business of life is to find the truth and to live by it. The ancient philosophers spent their lives in the search after truth in the belief that the possession of truth, i.e. knowledge, meant happiness. They never found the truth in its entirety. It was left for the Great Philosopher, our Lord, to teach the truth and to live by it. We often wonder whether Catholics appreciate their gift of faith to the full. We are born heirs to the greatest possession that man ever had or can ever attain to in this life; to the treasure of Faith, to the glories of truth. The wisest men of the distant past strayed in vain for what we are born to. As children we are in possession of knowledge that Plato and Aristotle could not with their clear intellects and prodigious application arrive at. We have the truth, the teachings of the Author of Truth. There can be no possible doubt, not the slightest suspicion about that. We have an infallible teacher in our Holy Mother Church, the Spouse of Jesus Christ, and the divinely appointed teacher of the truth. For Catholics, then, the real business of life is to live by the truth. There is no necessity for us to search—we have it ready at hand in the teachings of the Church. If Catholics could but understand what a glorious inheritance they are born to; what heart-burnings, what agonies of soul they have escaped in being thus born to Christ's truth, there would be greater fervor among them; less indifference, and a more whole-some adherence to the rules of the Church. We are thus born heirs to the knowledge of God's truth, and are made acquainted with it from our infancy. It remains for us then to live by it. It is the business, the real business, of every Catholic to live by this truth which he has so easily acquired. If there were great difficulty in securing this knowledge, there would be a greater appreciation of what we have and what we are.

READ THE SCRIPTURES.

We are accustomed to hear from our Protestant friends that Catholics are not permitted to read the Bible. As we have had occasion to remark in these columns before, this is but one of the many inventions of the enemies of the Church in their efforts to make her appear in the role of a tyrannizing autocrat; to make people believe that the Church dreads to have her children read the Holy Scriptures for themselves; to give color to the libellous statement that the Church fears the light; to perpetuate the calumny that Catholics are but tools in the hands of the clergy. The question cannot but make Catholics regret that the tenets of their faith are so little understood by Protestants. A thorough knowledge of the Church and her teachings would mean thousands of converts to her fold. The difficulty lies in the fact that our Protestant friends are but too prone to accept as true any statement made from their pulpits without investigating an investigation for themselves. They forget that very often their teachers are quite as ignorant as themselves upon matters of Catholic faith; they do not stop to think that these ministers have only too often an axe of their own to grind, and that misrepresentation is the stone used in the grinding. Few Protestants ever seek their information as to Catholic beliefs from sources that would naturally suggest themselves, viz.—Catholics or Catholic authorities. Catholics ask nothing more from their Protestant neighbors than that they should become acquainted with the truths of the Church. To know her is to embrace her and become one of her children. To condemn without understanding is the act of a fool, and yet Catholics are accused daily of some of the most nonsensical practices imaginable. All we want is fair enquiry.

We are accused of not being permitted to read the Scriptures. The accusation is false. No fair-minded person can make it. We are not only permitted to read the Bible, but we are exhorted by the Church to do so. Moreover, we are taught that it is the inspired Word of God, and, as such, that each and every passage can have but one meaning, and that meaning has been interpreted by the Church by holy and learned men who have been trained for that very purpose in a lifetime of assiduous application and study. Up-to-date Protestants deny the inspiration of the Bible to the great scandal of the bulk of Protestants. We do not wish to enter upon the teaching of Protestantism with regard to private interpretation—it is too absurd to even consider, and the fact that Protestants still hold it as a

belief argues but ill for their spiritual condition, it shows that they are too indifferent on matters of religion to spare a few moments in thinking on the absurdity of the teaching on this point. So much for that. The clergy of the Catholic Church are bound under pain of sin, to read a portion of the Holy Scripture every day. Are Protestant ministers so bound? Can Protestant ministers conscientiously declare that they read and study portions of the Scripture every day? Catholic laymen are exhorted to read the Scriptures. Our Holy Father, Pope Leo XIII, has granted an indulgence of 800 days for every quarter of an hour spent in reading the Scriptures, and a plenary indulgence where the pious practice is continued daily once a month, on the usual conditions of confession and communion. Surely that does not look as though Catholics are forbidden to read the Scriptures.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

The law-makers are now in full swing. Fewer new laws and a better observance of the old ones might be a welcome change.

A Rome despatch to Paris declares that eight or ten new Cardinals will be created at the coming consistory. Among the names is that of Mgr. Martinelli. The news may be true and it may not. Despatches from Rome are about as unsatisfactory as those of the early days of the Filipino war.

The Pope's physicians declare His Holiness' heart and lungs to be as perfectly healthy as they were twenty years ago. His memory too is vouchéd for. In view of this pronouncement, rumors of the serious illness of the Pope may be taken with a grain of salt. Some of our city papers are already working upon his life in view of his immediate passing. Present indications point to their having plenty of time in which to boil down the history of this, the most distinguished man of the century. May he live to be a hundred!

England is to have a brand new ex-priest in Don Miraglia an excommunicated Italian. He is about to enter upon a lecturing tour in England. It is said that his tour through England has been planned to escape sentences of imprisonment and fines passed by the Italian courts, which are hanging over his devoted head. Other actions are still pending against him. Don Miraglia has quite a sufficiently strong past to preach on the "iniquities of Rome." Now that Slavery is running the gauntlet of rotter eggs in Australia, and the well-known, too well known in fact—Margaret Shepherd has dropped into sweet oblivion, and a host of other such people have turned their backs to something else, it is quite up to the bigots of America to introduce Don Miraglia into this country. He seems to us to have the necessary qualifications for abusing Catholicism. We submit his name for consideration to our Canadian bigots.

We take great pleasure in extending our heartiest congratulations to Mr. J. V. McBrady on his election to the Chairmanship of the High School Board in this city. It was a very gracious act of the board, and one that is highly appreciated by Catholics in Toronto. It was, in addition, a well-merited compliment to Mr. McBrady's ability and energy. The new Chairman of the School Board is a rising young Catholic lawyer, and his future promises to be more than usually brilliant. We congratulate Mr. McBrady on the honor conferred upon him, and the Board on the highly efficient chairman they have chosen.

