

The Catholic Record.

Published Weekly at 484 and 486 Richmond street, London, Ontario.

Price of subscription—\$2.75 per annum.

REV. GEORGE R. NORTHGRAVES, Author of "Mistakes of Modern Ireland."

THOMAS COFFEY, Publisher and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY, MESSRS. LEON KING, JOHN NICH, P. J. NEVIN and W. A. NEVIN, are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transact all other business for the CATHOLIC RECORD.

Rates of Advertising—Ten cents per line each insertion, agate measurement.

Approved and recommended by the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa, and St. Boniface, and the Bishops of Hamilton and Peterboro, and the clergy throughout the Dominion.

Correspondence intended for publication, as well as that having reference to business, should be directed to the proprietor, and must reach London not later than Tuesday morning.

Arrears must be paid in full before the paper can be stopped.

London, Saturday, June 22, 1895.

12TH OF JULY PREPARATION.

It is announced that Mr. J. D. Traynor of Detroit, P. G. M. of the Orange Order of the United States, has been invited to address the Winnipeg Orangemen on July 12. Mr. Traynor is also Supreme President of the A. P. A. A more clear declaration than this of the identity of objects and methods of the two associations could scarcely be looked for. The identity of the two societies was positively declared by Rev. Madill in the Orange P. P. A. A. P. A. gathering in Windsor last year. It is evident, therefore, that the attempt to boom P. P. Aism into life was nothing more than an attempt to revive the dying influence of Orangeism. The same principles characterize both orders, and for the most part the same men belong to both, and the failure of the P. P. A's is the failure of Orangeism.

We notice also that Mr. Clifford Sifton, Attorney General of Manitoba, has been invited for the same purpose. Mr. Sifton has proved by the no Popery speeches he delivered during the Haldimand campaign that he is made of just the right kind of cloth to grace a 12th of July platform, and so we are not greatly surprised to find this invitation extended to him. The plain opinion which Mr. Sifton expressed at Montreal concerning the Orangemen, as being "quite reliable to shout for you, to cheer for you, and to vote against you," meaning that they are not actuated by principle, would have been enough to prevent any self-respecting body from having anything to do with the gentleman afterwards, but were we to expect the Orangemen to exhibit any self-respect at any time, we would be egregiously disappointed, and if Mr. Sifton has any self-respect he will decline the invitation, which he cannot accept without stultifying himself. We may perhaps presume, however, that he will find the position congenial, for consistency and an honorable pride are not characteristics of the genus "the no-Popery lecturer."

An Orange platform on the 12th of July is not the place for a statesman to appear in, but it is quite a suitable place on which a narrow-minded fanatic may spout out his bigotry.

To Mr. N. Clarke Wallace, Grand Master of the Orange body of Canada, a similar invitation has been extended.

From Mr. Wallace's antecedents we could not expect much better taste than that he should accept the invitation, but it will certainly be a queer conglomeration of opposites if all these gentlemen come together—which they certainly will not do. It would scarcely work to have Mr. N. Clarke Wallace defending the Dominion remedial order, while Mr. Sifton and other speakers were denouncing it as the handing over of Manitoba to be ruled by the Quebec hierarchy, as Mr. Sifton represented the matter in his Haldimand speeches.

Mr. E. F. Clarke, ex M. P. P. of Toronto and editor of the Orange Sentinel, and the Rev. J. J. Roy are also among those invited. They are well qualified to adorn the occasion, which needs only that the speakers utter calumnies by wholesale against Catholics, to ensure that it will be the success of the season.

It is some satisfaction to see that the identity of Canadian Orangeism with Apsism is practically acknowledged by the invitation extended to Mr. Traynor of Detroit. When the Orangemen are thus compelled to lean upon such broken reeds, it is equivalent to an acknowledgement that, like its American second self, it is losing its political power.

We may add that as it has been announced that Mr. Clarke Wallace is to be present at the London demonstration it may be presumed that the Winnipeg one will be spared the incongruity of listening to addresses from him and Mr. Clifford Sifton from the same platform.

AS THEY SOW, THEY REAP.

On the subject of religious teaching in the schools our esteemed contemporary the Canada Presbyterian has certain views which it thinks should prevail above all others. Before giving its sentiments on the question it quotes in a recent issue from the Presbyterian Observer as follows: "Prayer in the Public schools is now very rarely heard: in some States it has wholly ceased. But there are not a few who see, and are ready to acknowledge, that in the exclusion of the Bible and of prayer from the schools, a moral element of much value has been lost. Perhaps its recovery is now an impossibility, but some efforts in this direction have been made at various points. The other day a committee of Protestant and Roman Catholic clergymen met in Ansonia, Conn., to confer on the subject, and the committee agreed that prayer shall be made, and that the Lord's Prayer as found in the gospel of Matthew shall be the form of prayer used."

On this the Canada Presbyterian remarks that "If professional agitators, demagogic politicians and men who are Protestants or Catholics for what they can make out of their religion, could be compelled to keep their hands off scripture selections, and a form of prayer satisfactory to all parties except Infidels could easily be agreed upon in any Province of Canada except perhaps Quebec. If every trace of religion is obliterated from the schools of Canada the people will have none but themselves to blame. Catholics and Protestants alike allow men to inflame their minds, and keep themselves before the public by stirring up sectarian strife."

We cannot allow this bold assertion to pass without entering our solemn protest. Alike! Catholics and Protestants alike! We would like to know wherein there has been any such aggressive intermeddling on the part of Catholics with the liberty of Protestants to educate their children after their own manner, as we have witnessed day after day on the part of Protestant synods, conferences, presbyteries, general assemblies, ministerial associations, secret society lodges and similar bodies in regard to Catholics.

These bodies appear to have a mania for intermeddling in a matter which does not concern them at all, and there is nothing that will please them where Catholics are concerned, unless the latter consent to such terms as every petty agitator may think proper to impose; and even if Catholics were to agree to the terms which these bodies are so anxious to force upon them, they would not be content. The itch for meddling would work upon them to make them invent something more obnoxious than they have yet presumed to propose.

What business is it to these bodies if Catholics are resolved to educate their children with a knowledge of the Christian religion? Can this harm Protestants? Will it prevent Presbyterians from inculcating the five points of Calvinism if they see fit? Surely not, or if they see fit they may banish religious teaching from their own schools, as for the most part they have done already. This they acknowledge now with remorse of conscience, else why the wailing which the Presbyterian Observer sets up in the above extract because "prayer in the Public schools is now very rarely heard and that in many places it has ceased entirely."

It was the set purpose of these bodies from the beginning to deprive Catholics of the liberty to educate their children as their consciences dictated, and as the only means of doing this, they succeeded in driving religion out of the schools in which their own children were educated, and this is the state of things they now deplore. Their eyes are now partly opened to the extent of the evil they have brought down upon their own heads, without involving Catholics in the catastrophe, as was their intention. But if Catholics were not involved, it was owing to their own watchfulness, and to the immense sacrifices they made for conscience' sake. It was not without decades of struggling that they secured a fair school law in Ontario, and then it was only through the legislative union with Lower Canada that they obtained the same rights to educate their children in accordance with their conscientious convictions, as were long enjoyed by the Protestants of the Lower Province. In the United States these rights have not been granted to this day, but Catholic education for Catholic children was too important a matter to be overlooked, and as the sects succeeded to their heart's content in making the Public school system godless, the Catholics found their remedy by submitting to the law, and helping to educate the children of Protestants in the schools of their choice, against

which the Presbyterian Observer now raises its voice so loudly; but for their own children they established schools of their own, and supported them out of their own pockets.

The Catholics have solved the difficulty for themselves. They foresaw the evil of which our Protestant friends are now complaining, that the "exclusion of the Bible and prayer," and to this should be added, the exclusion of positive religious teaching, has eliminated "a moral element of much value," and by so doing has contributed much to the spread of irreligion and the relaxation of moral sentiment.

We can assure our esteemed Toronto contemporary that we have no intention to try the compromise experiment it proposes, to break up the Catholic school system, which permits distinctive religious teaching, in order to introduce a nondescript religious teaching which shall consist merely of reading a few mutilated biblical selections without comment, and a form of prayer which will be dictated by our Presbyterian friends.

Do we object, then, to the Bible, or to the Lord's Prayer? Not at all; but we do not regard the proposition as securing a sufficiency of religious instruction; and, besides, this must be remembered, which the Canada Presbyterian seems to have forgotten, that the King James' version of the Bible which it proposes to force on all the Catholics of the Dominion, Quebec excepted, is not the version of which Catholics approve, and we have no intention to be coerced into its use.

What injury does the Catholic Separate school system of Ontario inflict upon our Protestant neighbors? We are aware that in a few instances Protestants do send their children to the Separate schools, but when they do so it is by their own choice, and through the kindness of the Catholic trustees who admit them, even though the law does not allow them to hand over their school tax to the Catholic school fund. There is, therefore, no compulsion in the matter. On the other hand, Protestants do not contribute one cent to the Catholic school fund in any shape. The Catholic schools are supported solely by the taxes of Catholic ratepayers; and this is true even in regard to the small apportionment received from the Government under the name of "the school grant," inasmuch as the Government money thus paid is simply a recognition of the fact that Government funds are derived from the whole people, Catholics and Protestants alike. We are therefore within the bounds of reason when we ask that the synods and conferences and presbyteries, and the Protestant religious press, leave us alone on the subject of education, that we may manage Catholic education in our own way.

It is not in Canada, or in America alone, that this policy has been adopted by the sects to secularize the schools, that is to say, to drive religion out of them entirely, in the hope of depriving Catholics of the liberty of having Christian schools. The same thing is happening in far-off New Zealand. The Christian Leader in a recent issue said:

"Dread of the denominationalism which Catholics and Anglicans desire has made the Presbyterian Assembly of the Northern Church in New Zealand hesitate to ask for Bible reading in the Public schools, while the Congregational Union distinctly state that they oppose any interference with the secular system in fear of the Episcopal Churches making education sectarian."

The godless school system in New Zealand is maintained through fear of Episcopalianism, as well as of Catholicism, but in Canada and the United States Episcopalianism has for the most part thrown in its influence with the opponents of religious education. It is true there have been from time to time synodical resolutions passed in favor of religion in the schools, but such action has been only half-hearted, and has never been followed by any practical steps which would indicate that the resolutions were serious—and in some instances, as in Manitoba, the action of the Church of England authorities seems to have been taken more to put an obstacle in the way of Catholics obtaining justice than to secure recognition for Anglican parochial schools. In all these cases, whether the hostility comes from Presbyterians, Anglicans, or any other denomination, as they sow so shall they reap.

The finest choir in the world is that of St. Peter's in Rome, known as the Pope's choir. There is not a female voice in it, and yet the most difficult oratorios and sacred music are rendered in such a manner as to make one think that Adeline Patti is leading. The choir is composed of sixty boys. They are trained for the work from the time they get control of their vocal chords, and some of the best singers are not over nine years old. At the age of seventeen they are dropped from the choir.

THE OUTLOOK IN ARMENIA.

The position assumed by the Turkish Sultan in regard to the Western powers is certainly a phenomenal one, reminding us of the eight crusades which from A. D. 1095 to 1291—a period of almost two centuries—agitated the Christian world.

The Turk was then perhaps even more impudent than he is now, for at a time when communication with the West was much more difficult than it is at present, and much less rapid, it was not so easy to realize that an army of Christians might possibly overrun his country, and so he could more boldly bid defiance to Christian power: and, besides, when men were more evenly matched in warfare than they are at the present day, relying solely on individual strength and courage, the result of a contest between Christian and Turk was more doubtful than it is now when the terrible machinery of war is brought into the contest. Now it is civilization which must win in the end, and of this the Turk is conscious, so that it was thought that the time of Moslem defiance of all Christendom had passed away forever. It seems, however, not to be so.

If Christendom were a unit on the religious issue, we cannot conceive that the Turk would dare for a moment practically to tell the Christian world that within his domain he would, as in past ages, maintain his right to oppress in every form his Christian subjects, whether by grinding them down with oppressive taxes, or by murdering them in cold blood: yet this is what he has done.

It was foreseen that there would be other difficulties, independently of those arising out of religious differences. Between the European powers there is such a diversity of interests that it is almost impossible to have them work together for any single purpose. It was, therefore, a matter of some surprise when it was announced that England, France, and Russia had agreed upon a common course of action, and that for the purpose of ensuring the future safety of Christians, they would hold an investigation into the circumstances of the Moosh massacre, as a preliminary to active interference.

The investigation has been held, and is now closed, the result being that the worst that has been said concerning the atrocities committed has been fully sustained. It remains, then, for the three powers—representing Catholic, Protestant, and schismatical Europe—to take action.

What the consequences will be it is hard to foresee. On the Sultan and his promises, absolutely no reliance can be placed. The demands for reform in his methods of government have been made before now over and over again with always the same result—or rather with the result that impunity in one atrocity made those which succeeded more hideous in detail than any which had occurred before.

The Bulgarian horrors were severely punished by the Russo-Turkish war whereby the practical independence of the Balkan provinces was secured. This punishment has not taught the Turk wisdom, and the Armenian horror is in this respect worse than the Bulgarian, as it has been proved to have been perpetrated by regular soldiers acting under orders from Constantinople. The Bulgarian horrors were perpetrated by irregular soldiers acting on their own responsibility.

A telegram informs us that so outrageous was the conduct of the Turkish commissioners who took part in the Moosh investigation, that the European delegates were forced to tell them at the close of the proceedings that they would have nothing further to do with them. The immediate reason for this rupture was the refusal of the Turks to examine important witnesses in regard to the Armenian outrages. The grounds of refusal are stated to have been most farcical.

As we mentioned in our last week's issue, a joint demand was made by the European powers for stated reforms in the government of Armenia. These proposals have been resisted by the Sultan, and as yet they have not been acceded to. It remains to be seen whether or not the powers will insist upon their execution. If they act in concert, there is no doubt the Turk will be obliged to accept them, or perhaps terms more humiliating still if there must be an appeal to the sword; but the trouble is that it is doubtful whether the accord of the three powers will go to the length of insisting so far on what has been demanded, that is, whether they will go to the length of

enforcing their demand by active intervention.

There is much speculation in regard to the reasons which have induced the Sultan to take so bold a stand as that which he has assumed, and it is thought that he must have some encouragement from some quarter, as yet unknown.

There was a suspicion that Russia was playing a double game, and that its desire is to induce France also to withdraw at the last moment and leave England embroiled alone with Turkey. England undoubtedly would be able to deal effectually with the matter if left alone, but unless the other powers act in unison with her, there is another danger that she might find herself face to face with Russia and Turkey in close alliance against her, in which case the relief of Armenia would be further off than ever, especially if the German Empire were also to range itself on Turkey's side.

Germany has hitherto kept aloof from joining in the demand for redress, and there is room for the suspicion that it looks with no favor upon the proposal of the other powers to interfere or that it is anxious to see them embroiled in such a way that it may step in for a share of the spoils of victory in case of their success, or that it may even induce the whole triple Alliance to range itself at the critical moment on the side of Islamism.

In evidence of Russia's good faith it must be stated that the Russian Government has already sent reinforcements of troops to Kars and other points on the Armenian frontier, presumably for the purpose of enforcing the demands which have been made in conjunction with England and France. England may be herself the power which will withdraw at the last moment, though it is not likely she will let Russia act alone in a case where the revision of the map of Asia is the stake, close upon the confines of her Indian Empire.

Taking all things into consideration there is great uncertainty what will be the real move on the political chess-board. When the Crusades were in progress, from six to eight centuries ago, it was owing to the jealousies of the European States and the Greek Empire that those great expeditions lost in the end all that was gained in the beginning. It is much to be feared that similar causes will operate similarly in the present crisis.

MANITOBA'S ANSWER.

Manitoba has at last given its answer to the Remedial Order issued by the Dominion Government on the school question—or at least Mr. Greenway's Government has done so, and that answer is just the one we have all along expected—a refusal to grant the remedy to Catholic grievances.

Mr. Greenway being too ill to be present at the opening of the Legislature, the disclosure of the Government's policy was made by Attorney General Sifton. It was in the form of a notice of motion, containing a memorial to the Dominion Government absolutely refusing to take action to restore to Catholics their undoubted rights in regard to education, and giving reasons why these should not be restored. It is scarcely necessary to say that the reasons given are simply a rehash of Mr. Sifton's speeches during the Haldimand campaign. It represents that the establishment of a set of Catholic schools might be followed by a set of Anglican, and possibly by Icelandic and Mennonite schools, a state of affairs which "we contemplate with very grave apprehension." It is said that such a measure would "seriously imperil the development of our Province."

To this we have to say that the bugbear is an imaginary one. If Catholics retain the right of establishing Separate schools, and of supporting them, they will use their right very much as it is used in Ontario. They will establish schools only where they can support them in a state of efficiency; and where they can do this, there is no just reason for throwing an obstacle in their way. There would be no good reason, even if the constitution of the country did not make provision for Separate schools; but as there is such a provision, the argument of the Provincial Government is simply a make believe of having a valid argument to offer.

It is a piece of refreshing coolness for the Manitoba Legislature or Government to inform the Government of the Dominion that while they themselves have the monopoly of knowledge in regard to the state of the Catholic schools of the Province, the Dominion Government has no information on

the subject nor the means of obtaining information on which to form a correct judgment:

"We believe that when the remedial order was made there was not then available to your Excellency in Council full and accurate information as to the working of our former system of schools. We also believe that there was lacking means of forming a correct judgment as to the effect upon this Province of the changes indicated in the order."

Then they advise the Governor-General and Council to study up the question, and they will give all possible aid toward enlightening them!

To bear them out in their position they maintain that the Catholic schools before 1890 were in a most deplorable condition of inefficiency, and that there has been no attempt made to show the contrary. This is a mis-statement. Archbishop Taché has maintained and shown the contrary in his little pamphlet on the history of the school question. Still we do not mean to say that the schools were perfect, or beyond possible improvement. With the sparse Catholic population, many of them poor Indians or Half-breeds, we could not expect the high state of efficiency which exists in most of the schools of Ontario. It was the duty of the Government to aid in establishing greater efficiency, and not to abolish the schools legally, as it has done.

Another mis-statement of the memorial is to the effect that the restoration of Separate schools as demanded by the remedial order, means the restoration of all the defects of the old system. There is nothing in the remedial order to justify such an assertion.

Some there are who interpret Mr. Greenway's memorial as meaning that he might consent to the establishment of an efficient Separate school system such as that which exists in Ontario. We do not see our way toward putting such an interpretation on his words. We take them to be an absolute refusal. We have no right to supply hidden meanings to plain words, and our inference is that Manitoba has voluntarily renounced its right to manage the Catholic school system, so that now the question is relegated to the Parliament of Canada. It is the duty of the Dominion Government to repair the evil done, by re-establishing Separate schools with the least possible delay; and as Mr. Greenway announces that the Manitoban Government will throw every obstacle in the way of the successful working of such schools, it is manifestly the duty of the Dominion to provide for them in such a way as to leave them entirely independent of local interference. If the Dominion Government neglect to bring in a measure of relief we hope some private member will undertake the duty.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

It is to be regretted that the fanatical faction still holds such prominence in the little parliaments of our separated brethren now being held throughout the country. At the Methodist Conference recently held in Strathroy the Rev. W. McDonagh submitted a resolution in regard to the Manitoba school question, the object of which was to influence the Government as against the Catholics in the settlement of the difficulty. Independent of the unfriendly sentiment conveyed in the document there is also to be found the usual reference to the "Romish" hierarchy, hierarchical assumptions, etc. We have only to say that the Rev. Wm. McDonagh is himself a striking example of the great need of ethical training in our schools, and it is indeed a most laughable circumstance to find such a man sneering at the assumptions of other people when we remember that a few years ago, while engaged in a controversy with a prominent citizen of Strathroy, he copied, and had published whole pages of "Junius" and signed "Rev. W. McDonagh" at the end of them. He has since been known as the Rev. "Junius" McDonagh. It is a noticeable fact that the no-Popery orator in all conditions of life has something peculiarly wrong in his make-up.

BISHOP W. A. LEONARD, of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Ohio, at the last annual State convention of the diocese, denounced in emphatic terms two classes of clergymen whom he styled "traitors in the camp who have done great damage to souls by their inuendoes and their interpretations of service while using such forms of expression in their sermons and teaching as to protect their authors from immediate discipline under the laws of the Church." He explained that by