

THE CATHOLIC RECORD

Published weekly at 688 RICHMOND ST. LONDON, ONTARIO.

Catholic Record.

London, Sat., July 9th, 1887.

AFTER THE STORM A CALM.

Now that the enthusiasm over the Queen's Jubilee seems to have exhausted itself, it is certainly not inopportune to enquire the cause which prevented so many millions of the English-speaking world from participating in the celebration.

Hence did United Ireland in its deep and almost unutterable indignation declare: "Ireland is the only civilized country in the world which did not share in the jubilee celebration."

"The corporation of Sligo has removed the doubt which was entertained as to its probable action with regard to the Queen's Jubilee. By a majority of thirteen votes to nine the Commissioners rejected the proposal to present an address to the Queen."

Creditable indeed has been the attitude of the Irish people to themselves and to their kindred throughout the world in the matter of this jubilee celebration. They would have wished to join in the celebration. But the minister with one hand invited them to participate and with the other held the chains that were to be their portion at its termination.

"The foul blot on the British escutcheon is the treatment of Ireland and this will prevent twenty million English-speaking people from sharing in the jubilee festivities in honor of the Queen. Those born in Ireland and their descendants do not feel in glorifying the ruler of an empire which has since her ascension of the throne, caused the death of 1,235,000 by famine in Ireland; evicted 3,000,000 tenants; driven 4,150,000 emigrants to alien shores to find a home; and decreased the population of the island 9,000,000. This awful indictment will explain why Ireland and three with Irish blood in

their veins will remain passive spectators while Britons and Scots roar themselves hoarse over the Queen during the jubilee fortnight."

Had, we repeat, the statesmanship of Mr. Gladstone prevailed and Ireland been now in the enjoyment of the blessings of self government, the Irish people would have raised their hands in benediction upon Queen Victoria. Then should she be their sovereign not by the law of force and of repression, but by the law of love and of gratitude.

THE CHURCH IN QUEBEC.

The Mail protests that it does not desire "to suppress anybody's religion or religious freedom. What it is trying to combat is not religion, but clericalism; and by clericalism we mean all those human contrivances, forged in an age long past, by which the French inhabitants of Quebec are kept poor in pocket and dull in mind."

It is rather late in the day for the Mail to put on the appearance of disinterested benevolence towards Catholics. The efforts of that journal to excite the bigotry of its readers are too recent to let us sleep in the happy consciousness that we have in the Mail a watchful guardian of our civil and religious rights, who will be ready to combat all assailants, and to defeat the machinations of all who plot against our liberties.

"Time danoos et dona ferentes." But it is true, as the Mail states, that the French Canadians are "poor in pocket and dull in mind," and that they are made so by the Catholic Church? Twice in late issues of the Mail has this been asserted, viz. in the issues of June 26th and 30th. First, then, are they so wretchedly poor as the Mail would have us believe? The last Dominion census, which is the most reliable source from which we can gather information on this subject, informs us that there are in Quebec 123,932 owners of the soil, that is to say 100 to every 1092 of population, while in Ontario the land proprietors numbered 169,140 or 100 to every 1131 of population.

It thus appears that property is more generally divided among the despised habitants than among the happy population of the boasted superior Province! And if we examine how the habitants enjoy the comforts of home, it will be acknowledged that a more quiet and contented population than the French Canadian cannot anywhere be found. This is the universal testimony of those who have lived among them, and this is indeed true wealth, which consists not so much in the amount hoarded, as in the use made thereof in rendering home happy.

The tenants of Quebec number 12,344, being less than one tenth of the number of proprietors, while the tenants of Ontario number 36,690, being considerably more than one-fifth of the number of land-proprietors. The amount of capital invested in all industries in the two provinces is respectively \$59,916,993, and \$80,950,847. The per capita value in Quebec, \$43.50, is less than \$42.00. Here we see the advantage in the value of property, which is a little short of her sister Province, the per capita value being respectively \$77.01 and \$68.14; but this does not indicate the wretched condition which the Mail pretends to see there; for Quebec is in this respect very far

ahead of both Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, where the per capita value of the industrial products are \$42.16 and \$57.63. Yet it is not pretended that these provinces are absolutely poverty-stricken; or if they are so, and the Catholic Church is to be held accountable for the pretended poverty of Quebec, by parity of reasoning we should hold Protestantism to strict account for the less thriving condition of these Provinces. And comparing county by county in Quebec, it is by no means the case that those which are largely Protestant exhibit more enterprise than those which are almost entirely Catholic. In fact in this respect there seems to be little difference in favor of either one religion or the other, for while among the counties which show the smallest amount of capital and results in proportion to population, we find side by side the thoroughly Catholic Lotbiniere, and the largely Protestant Compton; among those which stand in the foremost place we find alike Sherbrooke, which is largely Protestant, and Hochelaga, which is almost entirely Catholic.

It is evident, therefore, that the Mail's assertions are an impudent fraud, and the French Canadians do not require his interference to rescue them from poverty. But the Mail says they are also dull in mind. It is true the number of children attending school does not show so high a percentage as in Ontario. The people of Quebec are not so numerous as in Ontario, and they are scattered over a much larger area, and this is probably one of the causes, and indeed the chief cause of the fact. In Ontario the population is settled 15.9 to the square mile, in Quebec 7.2. So large a percentage of school children cannot, therefore, be expected; but the attendance in Quebec is very nearly equal to that in New Brunswick. In Ontario the number of children between 6 and 16 was 522,228 in 1881, of whom 54.36 per cent. attended school. In Quebec the total number of children between the same ages was 330,020, of whom 63.52 per cent. attended school, while in New Brunswick the percentage was 67.81. It is to be regretted that the school attendance in Quebec is not larger; but the discrepancy is not such as to justify the insulting language of the Mail, and it arises from causes altogether different from those to which the Mail attributes it. It is well known that the Catholic clergy of Quebec, equally with those of Ontario, take a deep interest in the education of the young, and that in every parish efficient schools are established both for elementary and high education, wherever the circumstances of the locality make it possible; and it is a matter of fact well known that French Canadians, both in Parliament and elsewhere, will compare very favorably with persons of any other Province, in respect to ability and intellectual culture. Indeed, in regard to advanced education of both sexes, Quebec is not at all behind the sister provinces. There were in Quebec 44 universities and classic colleges, and 186 young ladies' boarding schools, the latter having 10,101 inmates, whereas in Ontario there were but 17 universities and classical colleges, and 44 young ladies' boarding schools, the latter having 1711 inmates. It appears, therefore, that in some respects at least Quebec is decidedly at the front.

Other assertions of the Mail in these leading articles are not worth serious refutation. The immense wealth of the church in that Province is true merely to this extent, that the parishes are in a flourishing condition, well supplied with churches, orphanages, schools, priests' residences and the necessary vestments and altar decoration for the decorous celebration of divine worship. Of course when the value of these items are all added together the sum will necessarily be large, but not larger than is required for the purposes named. But this fact affords a ready refutation of one of the Mail's principal subjects of complaint. He asserts that the French Canadians are poor in pocket, and that their poverty is caused by the Catholic Church, yet he makes it a cause of complaint that "the immense wealth of the Church enables her to advance money to the habitant to buy out the English settler after the latter has been subjected to a judicious process of squeezing." It would appear from this that the habitants are, after all, not so poverty-stricken as the Mail elsewhere pretends, and that the church does not endeavor to keep them so. The Mail's charges refute each other; but certain people should have good memories, or their statements will not agree very harmoniously together.

UNREPUBLICAN AMERICANS.

Not a few Americans are there who regret that Burgoyne was compelled to surrender at Saratoga and that Cornwallis was forced at Yorktown to yield his sword to American institutions, and loudly vaunt the excellence and superiority of the effete, blood stained monarchies of Europe. The visit of a semi-savage queen from the Sandwich Islands, or the occurrence of a British queen's golden jubilee brings into full play their stupid sympathy and degrading servility. In their eyes everything British, everything

regal or even vice-regal is sacred. Of such is evidently the editor of Truth (N. Y.), a journal already referred to, who had heartlessness to thus write of Mr. William O'Brien's visit to America: "In the meantime Mr. William O'Brien left America on the Adriatic last Wednesday. His Canadian tour was a farce, his American tour a farce. That a man of his small mental capacity and insignificant standing in his own country should be able to visit America and receive nearly as much attention as a dog with the mange, is only another evidence of the want of common sense which is hourly displayed by what is known as 'the people.' O'Brien is a man without principle, a liar and a rascal. As such he came here, as such he goes back, carrying with him, I am glad to say, the supreme contempt of the better class of our citizens."

We crave the indulgence of our readers for the reproduction in our columns of this gross outcome of cowardly prejudice and wicked racial hatred. We give it place in our journal to impress on our readers the important fact of the existence in the United States of a school, neither insignificant as to numbers or influence, pro-British in the extreme in its sentiments and imbued with deadly hostility to Ireland. This school was in existence at the time of the late civil war, and constituted one of the chief dangers of the nation. The defeat of the Southern Secessionists was to its members a heavy blow. It has, however, since taken new life, and to-day speaks out boldly its non-republican sentiment—its sympathy with injustice and its detestation of equality. Truth is not by any means a journal of great influence. The N. Y. Times is the leading journal of the pro-British party. But Truth says things that the Times thinks, but fears to utter.

CHAMBERLAIN EXPOSED.

There can now be no doubt that the alliance between the Liberal Unionists, so-called, and the Tories, is likely to be of a permanent character, that in fact the absorption of the former faction by the latter great party, is but a question of time, and brief time at that. The Marquis of Hartington has already intimated that the Unionists cannot, without the previous consent of their Tory allies, entertain any proposals looking to the reorganization of the Liberal party in its old form and strength. Mr. Chamberlain has, since the declarations of the noble Marquis, said fully as much. He is now, in truth, as much of a Tory as even the Marquis of Salisbury himself. He has become an admirer of Tory leaders and a panegyrist of Tory methods. Speaking lately at a Unionist banquet, he declared that while he did not suppose it would be possible altogether to get rid of the old lines which have divided political parties through generations of strife, the only lines no longer representative of old ideas. The Dartford speech of Lord Randolph Churchill, made while he was yet a prominent member of the government, and confirmed by subsequent speeches of several of his colleagues, sounded, he thought, the death knell of the old reactionary Toryism, a statement received with cheers by the newly converted adherents of Tory policy. Mr. Chamberlain then added, "I confess I do not think it is altogether impossible that the great social questions and problems of our time, which most urgently demand solution, should receive satisfactory settlement at the hands of a national party, which should exclude only the extreme section of the party of free action on the one hand, and the party of vanity on the other." There was here again loud cheering, though we may be permitted to observe that if ever there was a party of vanity it is that of which Mr. Joseph Chamberlain is the deputy-leader. He makes a pretence of a profession of Liberalism by asking disingenuously what is the mandate of the constituencies, laid aside by the unnecessary intervention of the Home Rule question? And he answers the question himself: "We have to reform the land laws. We have to provide for a great increase in the number of the owners of the soil. We have to secure an improvement in the condition of the agricultural laborers. We have to protect the rights of the poor in the charities, endowments, and old foundations created for their benefit. We have to provide for the extension of local government on a popular basis. We have to secure increased facilities for primary and technical education. We have to revise our taxation, so that we may more nearly approach the ideal which has always been put forward by Liberal statesmen of an equality of burdens; and last, but not least, we have to secure an economical administration of the revenues of the State, in order that the results may correspond more nearly with the extent of the expenditure."

The speaker was several times, during this stream of verbosity, interrupted by cheers. If Mr. Chamberlain allowed himself to be deluged by these cheers into the belief that he can deceive the English masses by the mere enumeration of the reforms they desire, so far as to convince them that he is now the true friend of reform, he will before many years have passed over his head meet with a rude awakening. The real spirit of the man,

his coveting of place in the Tory ranks, his desire to drag his wretched followers through the mire of his own inconsistency, treachery and treason—all are conspicuously evident from what follows: "These are the duties which are cast upon us—we are Conservative in the highest and truest sense, since by them we can strengthen our institutions to bear the strain which is cast upon them. They are Liberal also, because they involve the generous recognition of the claims of the less fortunate members of the community, and the duties and obligations which are contingent upon the possession of property, and they are consistent with the determination which we all feel to uphold the integrity of the empire and the authority of the law."

He protests that he does not want to be absorbed in old Toryism, which is, he says, a dying creed, nor does he desire to surrender to the new English radicalism, but declares: "We are ready to ally ourselves with all, whether they call themselves Conservatives, or Liberals or Radicals." This is the Mr. Chamberlain who in 1885 declared, "I do not believe that the great majority of Englishmen have the slightest conception of the system under which this free nation attempts to rule the sister country. It is a system which is founded on the bayonets of 30,000 soldiers encamped permanently as in a hostile country. It is a system as completely centralised and bureaucratic as that with which Russia governs Poland, or as that which prevailed in Venice under the Austrian rule. An Irishman at this time cannot move a step; he cannot lift a finger in any parochial, municipal, or educational work without being confronted with, interfered with, controlled by, an English official, appointed by a foreign Government, and without a shade or shadow of representative authority."

This is the same Mr. Chamberlain who, in the same year of grace 1885, also said, speaking of the Liberal party of that time, "Our Liberalism is broad enough and free enough to include within its borders all the friends of progress. We may differ among ourselves, as we have done at every period of our history, as to the order or even as to the nature of the measures that we shall take from time to time to give application to our principles, but these differences we will settle amongst ourselves and without Tory assistance. I do not think that there are any of us who will be tempted to desert our own cause and our own party in order to make a new alliance with that heterogeneous combination which styles itself the Constitutional party, and which includes within its ranks Free Traders and Protectionists, Ulster Orangemen and English Roman Catholics, Licensed Victuallers and Established Churchmen, Tory Democrats and fossil Reactionists."

This is the same Mr. Chamberlain who in 1884, expressed himself in these terms: "I believe at this moment, if there is any danger to the peace in Ireland, it lies in the proceedings of a certain section of the population in Ulster, led by men of rank and by men of education, who know enough to know better, and who seem to have been stimulated into a burst of unreasoning ferocity by the mild eloquence of the leader of the Opposition."

Catholic Colored Mission of Windsor, Ontario.

As Dean Wagner, who has in his hands the work of the Catholic Colored Mission of Windsor, wishes to begin the erection of a suitable school-house and church at the earliest possible date, all persons who have received his appeal for help are kindly requested to fill their lists as soon as convenient, and send the proceeds, together with the benevolent lists, to the reverend gentleman. All moneys received will be immediately acknowledged. Persons not receiving in due time such acknowledgments, will be pleased to notify Dean Wagner by postal card.

A BISHOP'S CHARGE.

At the opening of the Montreal Anglican diocesan synod, on Tuesday, June 21st, Bishop Bond delivered his "charge." We must compliment the Bishop on its literary character—surpassing in this respect many like productions. It seems to us that our respected fellow-citizen, Bishop Baldwin, has in this respect set his colleagues an example that some, at all events, among them are now striving to put to profit. Bishop Bond's charge is, in the main, restricted to mere matters of detail concerning the local self government of the church. Its exposition of the internal affairs of the Anglican organization in the diocese of Montreal, which includes the largest portion of habitable Quebec, is not, we think, of a nature to afford comfort or gratification to the average adherent of the "Church of England in Canada." His Lordship begins by informing the Synod that "during the year he visited ninety-nine parishes and missions, exclusive of the city churches, and that he, during the same period, confirmed 373 men and 680 women, the largest number yet in any one year in any episcopate." It does not certainly appear from this that the rite of confirmation, as understood and practiced in the Anglican communion, is held in much veneration by the people, for if we divide the whole number of the confirmed among the 99 churches visited we find that fewer than ten persons in each church approached the bishop to be confirmed. The Bishop then proceeded to inform his hearers that "six priests and four deacons" had been ordained, two churches begun, one church opened for divine service, two churches "consecrated," and a new portion of a burying ground likewise "consecrated." When the vast extent of the territory comprised in the Anglican diocese of Montreal, when the numerical strength of the denomination in that territory, when the relative wealth of its members—greater than that of any other religious body in the same extent of country, are taken into consideration, we are, we would fain believe, guilty of no injustice, when we declare that this is a very poor showing indeed—a showing which gives no evidence of strength, vitality, or promise. The Bishop seems to feel the situation keenly, for from the mere recital of the figures above given, he proceeds at once to the consideration of the "inadequate remuneration received by our laborious clergy." Herein he says "there is danger as well as disgrace to the Church," very justly adding that "men weighed down by the difficulty of keeping out of debt, whilst compelling themselves to do their duty, must find that it is almost impossible to labor efficiently and cheerfully in their mission." Bishop Bond then entered at length on the discussion of what he termed the "Quebec Scheme," whereby the missionary clergy should receive their stipend directly from the board which appoints them, instead of as at present, in part from the people of the mission served.

"The power to appoint missions is vested in the Bishop. The Bishop asks for a stipend partly from the executive committee and partly from the mission to be served. The necessary stipend having been agreed upon and the clergyman having consented the Bishop appoints and the pastor enters on his duties. When the day of payment arrives it too often happens that the money promised by the mission falls short or part of the sum is contributed in 'kind,' and it by no means follows that the 'kind' is that of which the clergyman's family stands most in need. (Laughter and applause.) These payments in kind are seldom profitable, the market value is not taken into consideration, and if it were the pastor could not send it to the market (applause), and if not needed for his own use it is superfluous and waste."

The Bishop very charitably adds that such things often occur rather from want of thought or sympathy than from actual unkindness, on the ground that "such intangible things as spiritual privileges and religious teaching are not so easily weighed and measured." We are strongly inclined to the belief that many Anglicans in the diocese of Montreal are on this point of a different opinion from His Lordship, and are firmly convinced that "the spiritual privileges and religious teaching" offered them can be very easily weighed and measured. They at all events fearlessly assume the task of weighing and measuring—much to the Church's loss. Hence, to borrow the words of the "charge," in the "mission parishes there are often aching hearts—fathers with the fear of insolvency and want before their eyes—mothers, care-worn and over-worked—children under-fed and under-clothed, and, of course, under-educated."

We will not follow the Bishop through his not overdrawn picture of Anglican clerical misery—at which we rejoice not indeed—but feel deeply pained, nor through his argument in favor of the adoption of the "Quebec scheme." We have not referred to this subject but for the reason that some Catholics, looking at the surface of things, think and say that financial matters are so much better managed in the Anglican church because the laity are there permitted representation in its temporal government. Many Catholics are indeed as remiss or as guilty as the

most stubborn of low-church Anglicans in their failure to support their churches and pastors. But we know of no instance of the want and misery among the Catholic priesthood in Canada which Bishop Bond declares to exist amongst Anglican clergymen. True, the stipend of the Catholic missionary is in nine cases out of ten extremely small, but his wants are few, and self-sacrifice makes up for a great deal.

It was not to be expected that the Bishop could forego the opportunity of indulging in Jubilee "gush." Amongst other things he said: "What nation is more free than the British nation, both at home and in her dependencies? Ours is not the freedom of license, where might is right, but the freedom of mutual trust and protection, where virtuous men stand shoulder to shoulder for the maintenance of law and order. We have true freedom of speech, for we may speak all true things without respect of persons. The only freedom denied us is the freedom of vice, the freedom of ignorance, the freedom of selfishness."

There are here some few inaccuracies that must have grated on the ear of, for instance, the Hon. W. W. Lynch, one of the lay delegates to the Synod. There is a very important portion of the British dominions "at home," less free than many of the very worst governed portions of Europe or Asia, and on which in this "Jubilee" year of Her Majesty's reign new shackles have been placed, and that portion of the United Kingdom manacled and misgoverned is known as Ireland. The worthy bishop also talks of freedom of speech. Would that he had Canon Dumoulin, to whom he might give a lesson or two as to the due exercise of that right. Bishop Bond lives in a city where freedom of speech is eminently respected, but he should at the same time know that there are cities in Canada where Anglican and other Protestant clergymen successfully incite men to mob violence, to the "freedom of vice, the freedom of ignorance, the freedom of selfishness."

PRIVILEGE! PRIVILEGE!

Such was the indignant, but expressive and ever memorable cry raised by the Commons of England, when Charles I. ruthlessly, despotically and unconstitutionally entered their chamber to vent his anger on members who had crossed his tyrannical purposes. The Commons then claimed that their chamber was sacred to freedom of speech, and that neither monarch nor subject could interfere with any of their members for speaking his mind freely in debate and voting as his conscience told him he should. This was, indeed, long the boast of the British Parliament. It set itself up as the refuge and the temple of freedom of opinion, freedom of deliberation, and freedom of conclusion. When in 1877, Messrs. Biggar and Parnell made up their minds to use the forms and the rules of Parliament to force its attention to the consideration of Irish grievances, many, sore and pressing, all England labored itself into fury. These two determined Irishmen were denounced from pulpits and from platform and unparaphrased assailed by the English press. They were termed "obstructionists" and freely called enemies of Parliamentary liberty. When, at the next general election, the Irish party acquired renewed strength, and began to assume a more aggressive attitude it was decided by the Commons House of Parliament that the time had come to cast aside the traditions of freedom of deliberation, long the proud boast of that chamber, and adopt a method of choking off discussion, especially on Irish subjects. A plan of *cloture* was devised and put in force. It did not work. The Irish members would keep the Irish question before the House in session and out of session, with the result that a British Prime Minister was at length constrained to bring in a Home Rule Bill. That minister fell, and a new government came into office whose leader declared that it was not Home Rule but twenty years of coercion which Ireland needed. But he foresaw that his coercive bill would never become law, if vigorously opposed, as he knew it would be, by the Irish and British Home Rulers. Hence he had introduced into the House a barbarous code of repressive rules, to shut off discussion just whenever the government leader of the Commons would so decide. Anything more tyrannical, more subversive of the right of free speech and of the liberty of the minority it is impossible to conceive. Acting on this policy of repression, Mr. W. H. Smith, government leader in the Commons, moved during the coercion bill debate:

"That at 10 o'clock p.m. on Friday, the 17th day of June, if the Criminal Law Amendment (Ireland) Bill be not previously reported from the Committee of the whole house, the chairman shall put forthwith the question or questions on any amendment or motion already proposed from the chair. He shall next proceed and successively put forthwith the questions that any clause then under consideration, and each remaining clause in the bill, and part of the bill, unless previously moved as hereinafter provided. After the clauses are disposed of he shall forthwith report the bill as amended to the house. From and after the passing of this order no motion that the chairman do leave the chair, or do report progress shall be allowed unless moved by one of the members in charge of the bill, and