

# The Catholic Record.

"Christianus mihi nomen est, Catholicus vero Cognomen." — "Christian is my Name, but Catholic my Surname."—St. Pacian, 4th Century.

VOLUME 12.

LONDON, ONTARIO, SATURDAY, JANUARY 11, 1890

NO. 586

## Catholic Record

London, Sat., Jan. 11th, 1890.

### EDITORIAL NOTES.

"In this Province the Roman Catholic minority has been treated not merely justly, but with generosity, and if, which I do not deny, prejudice exists in some quarters against the Roman Catholic, it is, in my judgment, due mainly to the youth of the country being educated together, and to a system of education which tends to separate from the rest of the community a body of its citizens by creed lines, as well as to the injudicious and intemperate utterances of men on both sides, who do not know, or have forgotten, what civil and religious liberty means."

In the above extract from Mr. Meredith's letter it will be seen that he contradicts himself. If a prejudice exists against Catholics, it is but reasonable to draw the conclusion that that prejudice is made to work against them in many ways. This being the case, how can they be treated with justice and with generosity? Let us consider the matter for a moment. Take all the public offices in the Province in the gift of the electorate. Let us look over the names of the members of the Legislature, the mayors, and those holding other positions of responsibility and prominence, and we will find that there is and always has been a sort of boycott hanging over the heads of Catholics. In a few places liberality has been shown, but the instances are hardly worth mentioning, so few are they. Let the name of a Catholic be mentioned in connection where selection of a candidate for Parliamentary honors is being made, and the uppermost thought in the minds of the delegates is "He is a Catholic and cannot be elected." A few Catholics have at times presented themselves for the office of Mayor of Toronto and other Ontario cities. They were, so to speak, almost annihilated because they were Catholics. We are speaking plainly, and we know whereof we speak. These events are of recent occurrence and will be borne in mind by all who read the papers.

Then let us glance in another direction. A vacancy occurs for some important civic post in the gift of a corporation. One or more Catholics are included in the list of applications. They are old residents, honorable and capable men, who have always ranked high among their acquaintances. They are, however, Catholics, and all their claims and qualities avail not. They are passed aside, and the office goes to another. It may be to an Episcopalian recently arrived from England; it may be to a Presbyterian from Scotland; it may be to an Orangeman just out from Belfast; it may be to a Canadian who stands high in the Masonic order or in some other oath-bound organization; but the Catholic is boycotted because he is a Catholic. We are making a plain statement of the case. Every sentence we write we believe to be the truth. Where is the proof? Kingston, Toronto, Hamilton and London will bear witness. Is this justice? Is this generosity?

Let us follow the matter a little closer still. It is a painful subject, and with sorrow do we find still more to write about. The Catholic people will not take second place with any others in the world in a sincere desire to have their children educated. They will make many sacrifices in order that their boys and girls may be the equals of any in the land in the matter of a sound education. We are not now considering the subject of religious, but merely secular training. We know of cases where Catholics sent their children to the public school. The weather was severe, the distance to the separate school very great, and necessity compelled the adoption of this course. Those children were sent home because they were Catholics. Was it a question of taxes? No. The parents owned no real estate. What then was the cause of such cruelty? Ask the London public school board. Ask Inspector Boyle. Was this justice? Possibly. But was it generosity?

A few years ago a Catholic young lady of high attainments made application for a position in a public school in London. A member of the school board, Mr. Wilson, declared he would rather give the place to a Hottentot than to a Catholic. Will we call this justice and generosity?

Mr. Meredith tells us that all these disagreeable things would not happen—that we would be all a very happy family were the separate schools abolished. We cannot accept this rosy picture. Do you want proof? Take your eyes from the map of Ontario and let them rest on the Province of Quebec, where all the so-called "medievalism" exists. What do we find there? Schools for Catholics and schools for Protestants. The separation is far more complete than it is in Ontario. The Catholics are a very large majority of

the people, the Protestants a very small minority. Is there bigotry there? A thousand times no. The proof! Ask Mr. Colby, the Protestant member for Stanstead, and ask, also, all the other Protestant members of Parliament for that Province. Would Mr. Colby be inclined to speak thus liberally of Catholics because he represents a Quebec constituency? No, because the great bulk of the people in his riding are Protestants. But how are we to know the opinions of these Protestant members? Read the debates on the Jesuit Estates bill, and you will find that equal rights, justice and generosity are recognized principles of action in Catholic Quebec. Would we could speak likewise of Protestant Ontario!

Will we tell you where the bigotry comes from? Like the lightning, we will have to cross the ocean to find the germ. To England, Scotland and the North of Ireland belongs the discredit of its origin. It was brought here many years ago and planted and nurtured by the Ogle K. Gwynne and the narrow minded presbytere of that day. You will find it fostered in many of the Sunday schools—you will find it thundered Sunday after Sunday in some of the rural and city churches—you will find it cherished at the tea meetings and anniversaries—you will find it bubbling up and over at the conferences—you will find it dressed up in all its glory and gorgonzolous on the 12th of July. And, worse than all, you will find some of our Canadian Christians hiring such characterless and shameless persons as Widows, Colquhoun and the Baptist from Boston to disseminate the deadly poison in all its hideousness over the fair fields of Ontario, settling neighbor against neighbor, friend against friend, misrepresenting Catholic faith, and leading innocent people to the belief that life-long and trusted associates are at heart traitors because they worship in the Church of their Fathers—the grand old Catholic faith. Is this justice? Is this generosity?

But although this is a dark picture, right glad are we that there is a silver lining to the dismal cloud. Protestants there are, and not a few either, whose sense of justice and love of fair play is seen towering above this mountain of shameful bigotry. We meet them every day in social converse and business relations. The words that fall from their lips give us hope that their influence will yet be felt and that ere long a term will be put to that baneful and noisy and careless strife which has been sent abroad by politicians without portfolios and preschere with empty pews.

A word to Mr. Meredith. He tells us he is not bigoted. A time there was when we would ourselves warmly contradict the man who placed a charge of bigotry at his door. That time, however, has passed. How can we believe the Wm. R. Meredith of long ago is the Wm. R. Meredith of 1890? Look at his surroundings. Look at the muddy fumes of bigotry that is inundating the land. He is in the midst of it. The Wm. R. Meredith of long ago would have struggled and struggled to reach the shore. He would have exerted all his manly vigor to leave the murky element. The Wm. R. Meredith of 1890 is carried away with it. He tells us he bears no ill towards Catholics. Next to their faith Catholics will cling tenaciously to their schools. Mr. Meredith is pledged to cripple them in their operation. Is this friendliness? He tells us he is our friend and yet he is championed by C. W. Bunting and James L. Hughes. How can we trust a man who keeps such company? Mr. C. W. Bunting's life work seems to be to publish a gentleman's paper for a constituency of unreasoning bigots. He walks to his office every morning, carefully and coolly removes his kid gloves, takes up his oiled knife, and smiling all the while like Mr. Carker, placidly inserts the blade under the fifth rib of a Catholic bishop or priest? This is the friend and patron of Mr. W. R. Meredith, and Mr. W. R. Meredith claims to be the friend of Catholics. Mr. James L. Hughes is the person who introduced into Canada Rev. Mr. Falton of Boston—as vile a preacher as Rev. Mr. Widows who is now in prison. Although the salaried employee of the Toronto school board, yet he is permitted to employ a large portion of his time prowling about the country delivering rabid no-Popery addresses, and with a false tongue and a black beet stirring up into life the embers of discord and strife. Mr. Hughes is the friend and follower and admirer of Mr. V. R. Meredith and Mr. W. R. Meredith claims to be the friend of Catholics. How can we think so!

Of what crime have Catholics been guilty that they should thus have poured upon their heads all manner of abuse and misrepresentation? We are

told day after day that we are very much beloved—that it is all a mistake if we suspect there are any feelings save those of friendship entertained for us—that it is the faith we profess which is all wrong and sinful and behind the age, and that therefore our so-called friends deem it their duty to condemn and denounce that faith. We hear a great deal of this nonsense constantly reiterated, and we can come to no other conclusion but that the man who gives rein to his tongue in this glib fashion is either a knave or a fool or both. Put to the crucial test, true friendship and liberality will in vain be sought in such an individual. Admitting for the moment that such a state of things exists—that the Catholic is esteemed while his faith is detested—where is the evidence that this esteem takes practical form? In remarks we have already made the hollowness and hypocrisy of the cry has been amply shown.

The condition of party politics in the Province of Ontario is most deplorable. What good purpose can be served by dragging religion into the political battle-field? Catholics are not responsible for this. They are not, they never have been, the aggressors. They are willing and anxious to go hand in hand with their fellow-Canadians, and do their full share in the work of building on broad and solid foundations a glorious future for our favored country. With a large section of the people hatred of Catholics and their faith is deep and intense. What are we to think of politicians who trade on this causeless and senseless hate, and who endeavor to ride into power and prominence on the crest of that foul and accursed wave of fanaticism now sweeping over the country. They will not succeed, however, for sensible men have studied the political atmosphere and have found that greed and selfishness and ambition are the propelling motives of the prevailing agitation.

A DINNER was given by the commercial travellers in this city some days ago, at which was present Dr. Leonard, the American Consul. Many speeches were made of the usually pleasant character, and general good feeling seemed to pervade the gathering. One unpleasant feature, however, we regret to note. That American Consul has done and said many things since he came to London which most people will, we think, deem very unbecoming in one holding such an office. For the benefit of our American friends we will in a few words explain the situation. In the Province of Ontario the Catholics are allowed by law to have separate schools, the Protestants of Quebec Province being given the same privilege. In the first mentioned section an agitation is at present on foot to deprive the Catholics of these schools. At the dinner referred to Dr. Leonard gave it as his opinion that the people should be all educated together. Of course this is a free country and our people are in favor of free speech but in this not a case in which exceeding bad taste was displayed by the consul? The people of Ontario can discuss and settle their differences without interference from outsiders. Nobody, as far as we are aware, asked Dr. Leonard to advance his views on the school question, and, indeed, were such the case, he would be all the more admired were he to make answer that he preferred minding his own business.

### A ONE SIDED ENQUIRER.

A Galt correspondent of the Empire endeavors to make a strong point against the school law as it stands because some Catholics presumably in Galt are rated as separate school supporters, though he asserts that "they did not give notice to the Clerk of the Municipality of their desire to support separate schools." There might be some ground to complain if these separate school supporters were rated as such against their will, but it is not pretended that this is the case. However, he adds that "to my own knowledge one Roman Catholic gave notice to the town officials of his intention to become a supporter of the public schools. He removed his children from the separate to the public school. This was three years ago. The following year the assessor, knowing the man to be a Roman Catholic, and either not knowing or forgetting of what had been done the previous year, put him in the column of separate school supporters and so continued him. The separate school got the rates, the public school educated the children." The writer then states that the rate-payer did not know until recently, how his taxes were going. In regard to such cases we have already to say in the law points out how Catholics and their supporters may have themselves transferred to the public

school roll. The probability is that the person in question neglected to take the proper course.

It often happens that assessors and other officials are anxious to be fair toward the Catholic schools, but it very seldom occurs that they will strain the law to favor them, and we may well doubt that a straining of the law in the direction indicated by the Empire's correspondent has taken place. Sometimes, of course, it may happen that assessors may make mistakes; but our experience has been that the separate schools suffer most from this cause, and we could give plenty of instances if it were necessary. But it will be remarked that the Empire's correspondent wishes the law to be rigidly enforced, where it would bear hardly upon Catholic schools, whereas he would like to see it stretched where the public schools might suffer ever so little. This is the style in which the Equal Rightsists would do justice. The law favors the public schools at every point, and if the public school supporters sometimes place the blame on the right shoulders—their own.

This indignant critic further asks the readers of the Empire in every municipality where a separate school exists to go to work and ascertain how many "Roman Catholics" have moved in during the past six years have given written notice of their intention to support separate schools, and how many have in consequence of this neglect been rated as supporters of the public schools. It will afford us great gratification to get all this information, as it will show the public to what extent this glaring injustice has been inflicted upon Catholics. It is laying a trap to catch hold of their money for the education of the wealthy Protestant children of the country, when they have children of their own for whom education a righter use live ought first to provide. There are other injustices too which have been practiced which these enquirers might bring to light; as finding out how many municipalities have surreptitiously paid the rates of Catholic supporters over to the public school fund, and how many have handed over to the public school trustees moneys collected for general municipal purposes. But these are enquiries which the Empire's correspondent does not want.

### CORPORATION TAXES.

In the Province of Quebec a fair distribution is made of the corporation taxes to the Catholic public and Protestant separate schools. By corporation taxes we mean such taxes as are levied on banking institutions, railway companies, etc. All the school taxes levied on such companies in Lower Canada are pooled together and one-third handed over to the Protestant separate schools. We should not say this mode of partition is in any way fair, because, as the Protestants in Quebec are but one-seventh of the Catholic population, they are entitled to but one-seventh of the corporation taxes. The Catholics, however, are willing to let them have one-third; and yet we are told by such ranters as James L. Hughes and such journals as the Toronto Mail that when Catholics are in the majority they oppress their Protestant fellow-citizens. Or, as Mr. James L. expressed it so forcibly in his London lecture of last Friday week: "You cannot tell me a spot on God's beautiful earth where the Roman Catholic Church is tolerant when it is the power." The direct he is given to this broad charge by the action of Catholics in Quebec granting more than double their share of the corporation taxes to the Protestant separate schools. And even now we are told that the Protestants are not satisfied, but that because of late years some Protestant merchants in Montreal have become millionaires, the contributions of railway and banking companies should be divided between the Roman Catholic and Protestant schools, not as at present, upon the basis of population, but according to the faith of the shareholders. Thus has it been at all times the policy of Protestant politicians and school trustees. While they are in the minority, and pay taxes, they are willing to be co-partners with the Catholics and to accept an even share of the total amount levied, but the moment they get more numerous and become richer, then woe to the Catholic ratepayers. They will agitate the country, appeal to the strict letter of the law where it will tell against their Catholic neighbors, and, if possible, break up their schools altogether, as they have been doing, according to Bishop Grandin's complaints, in the North West Territories. When the population of Lower Canada was a few hundred thousand more than the Protestant population of Ontario the latter were willing to have sixty-two representatives from each Province as a joint Parliament, but as soon as things

were reversed, and the population of Upper Canada came to be a trifle in excess of the Catholic population of the sister Province, then loud cries were raised for representation by population, and the whole country was stirred up almost to civil war by the representation by population agitation. The same intolerant spirit is being just now exhibited in the demoralized annals from the Windsor schools. How differently things are managed in the Province of Quebec, where Catholics are in the immense majority! Here, as Mr. Colby declared from his place in Parliament last session, the Protestants are allowed to legislate for their own schools without let or hindrance. "In fact," said he, "we have the legislation of our Protestant separate schools in our own hands."

Mr. James L. Hughes had the audacity to say in his London lecture: "Special privileges granted Roman Catholic separate schools in Ontario were denied to Protestant separate schools in Quebec." Mr. Hughes might have given himself the trouble to name some of those privileges. As he did nothing of the sort it must be inferred that it was utterly out of his power to mention any such. But here is a privilege, and a very tangible one, granted to Protestant separate schools in Quebec which has never been granted to Catholic separate schools in Ontario, viz.: the privilege of receiving one-third of the corporation taxes. How much of the corporation taxes do the Catholic separate schools in Ontario get for their share? Not one cent. Not only do we not get it, but we dare not ask it. The Government that would dare to propose such an act of justice would be accused of truckling to Rome. A shout of bigotry would go up, and a roar of "Popish aggression" would be belted from every pulpit in the land, and from every bigoted newspaper that no Government could resist and live one week. If the school taxes levied on the banking institutions, the loan companies, the railway properties and other corporations were divided among the common and separate schools in the same proportion as they are in Lower Canada, it would be only doing an act of justice and fair play all round. If the Catholic school trustees had one-third, or even one-seventh, of the corporation taxes at their disposal their schools would very soon attain a degree of efficiency never yet reached by the public schools.

The Protestants in Lower Canada, it appears, are not satisfied with even one-third. They would sweep it all in down there as they do in Ontario. But we are told by the Mail that His Eminence Cardinal Taschereau threatens that if they make any move in that direction he will agitate for a change in the law and base their share of the corporation taxes upon the relative number of Protestant and Catholic populations. This would reduce the Protestant share of such taxes to one seventh instead of one-third. We in Ontario dare not even ask for any share in such corporation taxes, and yet we are told by Mr. Hughes and others that we enjoy school privileges that are "not granted to the Protestant separate schools in Quebec." Such statements, besides being injurious, are an insult to common sense.

### THE BALLOT OR THE BULLETS.

Mr. Dalton McCarthy addressed his constituents in the town hall of Barrie on last Friday evening. The hall was crowded to the doors. Mr. Pepler, the Mayor of the town, occupied the chair. Mr. McCarthy spoke for over an hour and a half, explaining to the people who elected him to Parliament all his wayward course and extraordinary conduct since last they had seen him. He addressed himself especially to the history of the Jesuit Fathers, whose teachings and whose virtues he assailed in a vigorous manner. He traced their history and outlined the legislation that had given the Jesuits the position they now occupy in this country. As the despatches are silent about the portion of history he traced, or the facts he adduced, we cannot vouch for the accuracy of what he told or the complexion he gave to the early evangelical labors or the sacrifices which those early pioneers of Canadian life and civilization underwent in order to map out Canada for England's future conquests. We fear he did not inform the people of Barrie that as early as 1620 the Jesuit missionaries had reached Barrie and had planted the symbol of Christianity on the shores of Lakes Simcoe and Huron, and that not twenty miles from where he slandered those Fathers they had reddened the soil with martyrs' blood. If Mr. McCarthy were a true and faithful historian he should have opened a page of Parkman's valuable work on the lives

and virtues and self-imposed sacrifices of the Jesuits in establishing Christianity amid the forests that since have been cleared and where Barrie now stands, and, instead of attacking their memory, he would have advocated a subscription to be taken up for the erection of a grand monument that, while decorating the town hall and square of their village, would help the cause of true history and perpetuate forever the sainted memory of Lallemant and Brechef. Like his friend and colleague, Mr. Meredith, he repudiated the charge of attacking any man's religion, while attacking Catholic priests and saints very vigorously. Then he entered into the question of dissolution and change of constitution in Manitoba so that the French Catholics in that section of the Dominion might be legally deprived of their cherished language and their Catholic schools. He repeated part of his Swayner speech, and stated once again that the question of race should be settled now by the ballot box or at some future day by the bullets of Orangemen. "He hoped and believed that both political parties would unite in settling the question of race, so that from the pole to the Southern confines of the Dominion there will be one language and one united race." What means Mr. McCarthy has discovered for destroying the language or the race distinctions of two millions of French people the orator did not reveal to his audience. He might just as well try to empty the ocean from its bed or blow down the Rocky Mountains with Orange bullets as to force the French people to forget their mother tongue, or even to miscegenate with Anglo-Saxon or Orange blood to such a degree that there shall be in this Dominion but one language and one race left. Even the Orange oath forbids it. For it will not allow any member to contract matrimonial relations with any woman having Papist blood in her veins. Mr. McCarthy must contemplate raising an army some day, and a mighty one it should be, and making war upon the Province of Quebec with the intention and avowed purpose of compelling the French people to speak English or of driving them into the Gulf of St. Lawrence. However, he says he will do all in his power to rouse public sentiment on these great issues. "He might fail for a time," he continues, "but the day is coming when this question will be solved, and the Dominion will be British from ocean to ocean." Seeing and knowing that the French in Quebec are ever found loyal to the flag of our country, and that, as history has proved, theirs is no lip loyalty, Mr. McCarthy's appeal to British loyalty against a great, faithful and noble people is worse than rhetorical nonsense. It is an insult and an act of defiance hurled against a neighboring Province that minds its own business, that is true to its history, and that by its divine faith and heroic virtues is a tower of strength and stability to this great and promising Dominion. If Mr. McCarthy would settle down to his law business, and not trouble himself about the French Canadian people and their languages and their schools, it would be much more profitable to himself as a man and a statesman. The French-Canadians can afford to shrug their shoulders and smile at his folly.

### CATHOLIC CHURCH BURNED.

We were very much pained to learn one week ago, just as we were going to press, that the Catholic church in Freetown had been destroyed by fire. This beautiful new church had just been roofed in, the pews and windows had been all completed, and everything foreboded a joyous and grand celebration at the opening and a still happier and more cheering enjoyment of the Christmas festivities, when, through some neglect, no doubt, of the workmen in not removing all inflammable material at the proper time, the beautiful edifice in which Rev. Father O'Leary took so laudable a pride was suddenly wrapped in flames on the night of the 14th December, and totally destroyed. Father O'Leary has all our sympathies, and should he undertake the work of a bazaar, towards the erection of a new church, we promise him every possible aid, and will recommend to all our faithful subscribers to send a donation to Rev. J. S. O'Leary, Freetown, County of Wentworth, Ont.

### TO OUR SUBSCRIBERS.

We would remind all who remit their subscriptions to this office that the money order system is the cheapest and safest method. When this cannot be conveniently done it is desirable in every case that the letter should be registered. If either of these precautions be not taken, subscribers will be responsible for any loss that may occur.