

The Catholic Record.

Published Weekly at 444 and 446 Richmond Street, London, Ontario.
Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

EDITORS:
REV. GEORGE R. NORTHERAVER,
Author of "Mistakes of Modern Infallibility,"
THOMAS COFFEY,
Publisher and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY,
Messrs. LOCK, KING, JOHN NICH, P. J. MEYERS and Wm. A. NEVIS, are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transact all other business for the CATHOLIC RECORD.

Rates of Advertising—Ten cents per line each insertion, advance measurement.
Approved and recommended by the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa, and St. Boniface, and the Bishops of Hamilton and Peabody, 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.
Articles must be paid in full before the paper can be stopped.

London, Saturday, April 24, 1897

OUR SCHOOLS.

In our last issue we called attention to certain facts which tend to dispel the illusion which some entertain, that Catholic schools generally are of an inferior grade.

A correspondent, L. K., calls our attention to some further recent occurrences at our doors which serve to prove again the same thing. There are, it is true, some Catholic schools in which the progress of the children is not what it should be, but it must be the case with everything human that there are defects somewhere. The Public schools are certainly not without defects, as is evident from the many complaints which we see from time to time in the press concerning some of them. Nevertheless it cannot be said that the Public school system is a failure, for though there are some inefficient teachers, and sometimes a lack of progress is to be observed among the pupils, it must be said that, taken as a whole, the school system of the Province is an admirable one, and in saying this we include the provisions made for the establishment of Separate schools as among its best features. In reference, however, to those parents who are fond of finding fault with the Catholic schools which their children have been attending, we have to say that we are aware that their complaints are often most unjust. They frequently blame the teachers because their children do not progress, either because they are unwilling to admit that their children have not great capacity to learn, or they are themselves to blame because they keep their children from school on the most frivolous pretences, and thus they make progress in their various studies impossible. Every educationist knows that children cannot make satisfactory progress unless they be sent regularly to school.

Our correspondent relates certain recent facts in reference to the success of some of our Separate schools.

The Separate schools of Lindsay have long had an excellent reputation for turning out good scholars, and the last High School Entrance examinations show that they still hold a high rank among the educational institutions of the Province.

At the examinations referred to which took place in July, the boys' school under Mr. McAuley sent up fifteen candidates, of whom thirteen passed creditably. The girls' school, under the Sisters of St. Joseph, made a showing quite equal to this, or we may say even better, as nine out of ten of their candidates passed the Entrance examination, and in addition four girls wrote for second, and four for third class teachers' certificates, all eight being successful. It will be seen how great was this achievement when we mention that the Collegiate Institute sent ten candidates for first-class provincial certificates, of whom only three were successful, and these three had previously been Separate school pupils.

The Catholic population of Lindsay is considerably less than one third of the total population, so that the large number of successful Catholic children indicates that the Catholic schools occupy a high position.

L. K. very appropriately exhorts Catholics to rally to the support of our Separate schools, in which, while secular education is by no means neglected, there is an atmosphere of religion, wherein the noble Christian virtues are instilled into the hearts and minds of the pupils. This is especially true where the schools are in charge of our teaching Sisters, whose example and precepts alike serve to make the children under their care worthy citizens and practical Catholics.

We are furnished also with a copy of a letter written for the Toronto World by "Khan," the liberal-minded and talented editor of the Dundas Banner, who made the following remarks on the education given in Quebec and Ontario respectively. "Khan" says,

under the heading "Going Backward."

"We have scriptural authority that man shall not live on bread alone. That's sensible. Let us apply it indirectly to our schools. The Public schools of Ontario are frequently compared to the schools, religious or otherwise, of Quebec, and always to the disadvantage of the latter. We are all given to bragging in a loud tone of voice that our children learn more, study more, get loaded up with useful information more, are 'smarter,' etc., than the offspring of the seventeenth century Quebec.

Let's see, now: There is one thing that the children of Quebec, especially those taught by the Sisters, are head and shoulders over our hopefuls, and that will be made plain as you read on, my Christian friend.

I was down in Quebec not long ago, and was out in the country trying to find the residence of an old friend of mine. On the road I met a little lad on his way to school. As he passed me he lifted his cap and his face lit up with a winsome smile as he bade me, 'Bon jour, M'sieu!' I took heart of grace and hailed him:

"Can you tell me where Col. Boucher lives, my little man?"

"Pardonnez, moi!" he said, frankly, with another lift of the cap. "I spik not the English how you call heem—with 'lence, I go wis you. I show you where he live."

I protested that he would be late for school and might be punished.

"Ah, no!—non, no!" gesticulating eloquently with his little brown hand. "Non—no! Viola! Zs good Sisters they will be charm—zay will be ecazees ven zay learn zat I haf bin os som service to an stranger!"

He then conducted me to the top of a hill, pointed out the house, and left me with a bow that would do justice to a duke of blood royal.

A week later I am in an Ontario village and meet a "smart" looking youth in the road.

"Could you kindly inform me where Mr. John Smith lives?"

"Wia-a-t?"

"Where Mr. Smith lives?" I repeated.

"Which Smith? Old Smith, or big Smith, or fatty Smith, or gangrene Smith, or ole Sis Smith—she's the grey nixie. What you want with him ennyhow?"

I walked on in disgust.

Passing an Ontario schoolhouse in the summer you are liable to be stoned. In the winter snowballed, and you will be gazed and yelled at at all seasons, and if you visit the school they will never take their eyes off you in a curious stare while you remain. The boys are never taught to show a chivalrous and high-bred respect for the girls, and the art of lifting the hat to a lady, a clergyman or an old person, is altogether lost; in fact, some of them have to be told to take their hats off in church.

Oh, yes, we teach the children a lot of stuff, and they get to be very smart, and it is not uncommon to have them take out certificates and diplomas before they have shed their milk teeth, but if we would throw some of the text-books out of the window and teach the girls the old-fashioned curtsy and how to cross a room as if they were not going over plowed land, and teach our boys to lift their hats and treat their elders with respect, it would be better for us and them. The Khan.

Our correspondent continues:

It may be said that mere politeness will not secure one a living; but as Lord Chesterfield said: "Politeness is like a bag of wind. There may be nothing in it, but it helps one wonderfully in his voyage down the sea of life," and all must admit that the boy or girl of whom the little French Canadian above referred to is a type, and who is obedient to the good Sisters in so apparently trifling a matter, is not likely to be less so either in regard to the moral or the secular instruction imparted in the school room.

ANGLICAN ORDERS.

The Anglican Archbishops of York and Canterbury and the Bishops of the other dioceses of England have written a reply to the Pope's decree declaring Anglican Orders invalid. They maintain that their orders are valid, and the Holy Father did not sufficiently examine the question before making his pronouncement. The Holy Father made a thorough investigation, and he had more than all the sources of information at command of the Anglican Episcopate, but, of course, the point of view of the Pope is very different from that of the Anglican Episcopate. The Pope, in declaring Anglican orders invalid, declares the Anglican ministry not to be validly ordained with the powers and authority of the priesthood of the Catholic Church, or the Church of Christ. The Holy Father does not contend that they are not a State organized and humanly constituted body of teachers; but this is the only thing to which the Anglican Episcopate have endeavored with any success to prove their claim. But this does not make them the authorized successors of the Apostles to preach the gospel and administer the sacraments instituted by Christ.

We insert in another column a letter from "Innominate" which describes graphically the points of difference between the Catholic and the Anglican view of ordination, and which will be read with interest. From "Innominate's" letter it will be seen, on carefully studying the matter, that the Holy Father could not have come to any other conclusion than that at which he arrived, that Anglican Orders are valueless from a religious standpoint. The Anglican Bishops and clergy are nothing more nor less than a body of civil functionaries.

THE MANITOBA SCHOOL QUESTION.

To the Editor of the CATHOLIC RECORD:

Dear Sir—In your issue of the 3rd instant you add another article to the many admirable contributions we owe you on the "Manitoba School Question." There is, however, in your editorial of the 3rd, one paragraph referring to Sir Charles Tupper with which, I fear, many fair-minded men of all denominations will find it difficult to agree. The paragraph I mean is this:

"While we are willing to give Sir Charles Tupper credit for his Remedial Bill, and for his good intentions expressed in our behalf during the debate upon it, the stand he has now taken seems to us to be indefensible. While he appeared to be our champion on the eve of the election, now that the election is over and the battle of the ballots went against him, he declares that 'the position now was that he discharged what he thought to be his solemn duty to his country, and thought he had completed all he had to do in connection with the question.' If the honorable gentleman had been battling for justice to Catholics previous to June last, why should an adverse verdict at the polls lead him to pursue a course of masterly inactivity? We could admire the noble baronet had he kept up the good fight, but now that he and some of his colleagues have declared that they will have nothing to do with the School question we must take it that they are no better than those occupying seats on the ministerial side of the House."

All candid men will admit that Sir Charles Tupper, while he was Premier and leader of the House of Commons, and had a majority in Parliament, worked hard, and worked well, and did all that mortal man could do, to secure for the Catholics of Manitoba, according to his conception of the constitution, the restoration of their educational rights. His great effort in Parliament in that connection will go down to history and be judged, perhaps more justly and correctly, by coming generations. That effort, as we all know, was frustrated by the action (some would call it the obstruction) of the Opposition—an Opposition led and incited by a brilliant orator of the Roman Catholic faith. The life of that Parliament then expired, and Sir Charles Tupper became powerless to aid the Catholics of Manitoba or any other Catholics in respect of their educational rights, unless and until the attitude he had so distinctly assumed in Parliament on that "School Question" was sustained by a majority of the Canadian electors. With a fearlessness and a frankness that could but command the respect of his bitterest foes Sir Charles submitted the question to the electorate, knowing well that this was the one issue, above all others, which jeopardized his chances, and the chances of his party, at the polls. He made the issue as clear as noonday; he exposed it in the same light everywhere, he traversed the whole Dominion, in the seventy-fifth year of his age, presenting and expounding his scheme to the people with a power and a perseverance supremely remarkable.

In the appeal to the sovereign tribunal the case was decided against Sir Charles; and you will pardon me for reminding you, sir, that the preponderating weight of that decision was given by the very men for whom Sir Charles and his party risked and lost their political lives. Thus "the noble baronet," in a noble cause, and after a noble fight for that cause, "was slain in the house of his friends."

It now behooves those friends—shall I say false friends?—to show that they themselves have undergone, or are undergoing a change of heart, before they begin to find fault with Sir Charles Tupper for his change of attitude, assuming that his attitude has changed. Some portions of the public press abuse him because, they say, he did introduce the School Question into the debate on the address, and was, to use their own elegant language, "dragging a corpse" across the floors of the House of Commons.

It is the common fate of all distinguished leaders who undertake the carriage of large public measures, to be reviled by some for going too far, and by others for not going far enough. Whether Sir Charles Tupper went too far, or not far enough, in his proposed remedy for the school grievances of Manitoba, certain it is that he went as far as he could. If he failed to achieve what he wished, and fought for, it was not his fault. And I want to ask you, sir—and I know you will give me the answer of an honest, able, and impartial Roman Catholic—whose fault was it? Was it not peculiarly the fault of Catholics themselves?

I am a Roman Catholic, and I am not afraid, though I am ashamed, to say that if ever a leader, brave and true, had reason to regret ingratitude of the base kind, that leader was Sir Charles Tupper, and the ingratitude that was shown to him by a large section of the Catholics of Canada in June last,

and since. Yet the aged statesman evinces no spirit of resentment. Even according to your own complaint, he simply says to those Catholics: "Since you have shown, by your ballots, that you do not want what I was trying to get for you, I shall cease my efforts to get it." Surely, that should not surprise any reasonable man!

Take, again, this view of the situation. Under the constitution we are bound to believe that the *fact* of the majority is right. At all events we must abide by it. That *fact*, with a rather rude emphasis, told Sir Charles Tupper that his proposed solution of the school problem was wrong. It is his duty to yield to this constitutional dictum—the verdict of the commonwealth. Sir Charles believes in observing the constitution of his country. The power to pass any necessary legislation is taken from him. No sensible man will try to effect reforms, be they never so useful and just—particularly, reforms which the people have declared against—when he knows he is not able to effect them. But it does not follow that a man has abandoned a good cause, because his position, for the time being, requires him to hold his peace. If I see your mind on this point, you hold that no matter what one's position is, he should continue the clamor for justice. I am quite unable to share that view with you. In my humble opinion, the surest means of defeating and delaying justice is to try to get it in an impossible way. Mr. Laurier is now in the saddle. He must take the pains with the gains of his position. He told the people he would get justice done to the Catholics of Manitoba in the sweetest and swiftest manner. The people believed him, and have placed in his hands the power to do what he promised. Let his be now the glory of settling this vexed question as becomes a statesman, or the shame of reducing it to a national farce.

Under these circumstances I think your criticisms of Sir Charles Tupper's present attitude on the "School Question" are ungenerous. In fact I think your censure, and that of all influential Catholics, would be better applied if directed to very different quarters. What about the "famous Forty-five" who signed the memorial read in the House of Commons the other day by Hon. Mr. Tarte? The spectacle of these five and forty murmuring Israelites holding out the right hand to bless the Pope, while the left is drawn up, Fitzsimmons-fashion, to smite their own priests and bishops, ought to convince any man that bad Catholics, and not good Protestants, are responsible for the unhappy position of the Manitoba school question today. Let us be manly enough to place the blame where the blame belongs, and give grateful credit to whom credit is due.

With assurances of my high esteem for the RECORD, as an able Catholic newspaper, I remain, dear sir, Yours very truly,

J. L. McDougall.
Strathlone, C. B., April 7, 1897.

The letter of our correspondent is a courteous and able one, and his presentation of the case for Sir Charles Tupper is as strong as it could be made. We still think, however, that the course pursued by the late premier is indefensible. It will be remembered that the Liberal party, prior to the late election, made a promise to the electors of Quebec that they would bring in a better Remedial Bill than that of Sir Charles Tupper; that, in fact, if elected, they would restore the Catholic schools of Manitoba, which had been swept out of existence by the Greenway Government. This promise has not been fulfilled. Instead of giving us the whole loaf, the Liberal party have not even given us half of it. If the Hon. Mr. Laurier and his colleagues had promised before the election to give us no more than that miserably insufficient concession which was the result of the conference with the Greenway government, and the electors of Quebec by their votes on polling day had testified to their perfect satisfaction with this concession, there would be some faint show of reason in Sir Charles Tupper's washing his hands of the whole affair; but we take it to be the duty of a statesman, and especially of a leader who may be supposed to expect to hold again the reins of power in his hands, to adhere to right and justice, whether through victory or defeat. We believe this would be his duty even if, for the time being, the electorate of Quebec had really shut their eyes to their duty toward Manitoba, but as they undoubtedly relied upon Mr. Laurier's and his party's promises, they cannot be said to have given up the cause of the Manitoba minority.

Sir Charles Tupper should have kept up the fight, instead of showing the white feather. He would thus have stood in a better position with the Catholics of the whole Dominion. It is not the custom of real statesmen to give up a just cause, merely because they have sustained one or two or three defeats at the polls. They battle till they win; and the fact that Sir Charles Tupper gives up the fight after a single defeat does little credit to his statesmanship, and proves

that his boasted determination to die in the breach, rather than allow the Catholic minority of Manitoba to be downtrodden by the Government of that Province, was mere buncombe to make a bid for Catholic votes, on the plea that he had battled bravely for them.

But Sir Charles, evidently, had another object in view than to do justice. He knows very well that the right arm of the Conservative party in Ontario—the Orange association—is bitterly opposed to the concession of Catholic rights, and that he would alienate from himself their friendship had he continued to champion them; and so, at the first onset, he yields the cause.

We have already witnessed a similar game played when Catholic rights were at stake. Before now, a Conservative Government for many years professed to be desirous of granting Catholic school rights in Ontario, but, for just such reasons as influenced Sir Charles Tupper, these rights were never granted until there was in power, in 1893, a Reform Government, that of John Sandfield Macdonald.

It is true that on the occasion we here refer to many Conservative votes were cast in favor of Catholic schools, and many Reform votes against them, but the fact remains that as a party the Conservatives did not grant Separate schools while they had the power to do so, and there is good reason to believe that, as regards even the Remedial Bill, the game was so played as to ensure its defeat, not, indeed, by Sir Charles himself, but by other members of his party.

There is no excuse, at all events, for Sir Charles Tupper's surrender now, for if the cause of the Catholics was a just one before the last election, it is a just cause now, and no matter how much opposition he might have to encounter from the anti-Catholic element among the Conservatives, he should continue to battle for the right.

COTTON MATHER.

A letter written from Boston by Cotton Mather, under date Sept. 3rd, 1682, has recently been made public, which throws some light upon the intolerance of the Puritan rulers of New England at that early date. The original letter is in possession of Mrs. Juliet Riley of Munice, Indiana, and its purpose was to ensure the capture of William Penn, the celebrated Quaker who led a party of colonists to the New World and succeeded in making a settlement in Pennsylvania, the land being obtained by purchase from the Indians, an unusual method of obtaining a foothold in America at that time, as most of the early colonists took possession of the territory they acquired, either by force, or under pretence of trading, with the ulterior view of keeping forcibly the land which at first they proposed to occupy only for a time.

It will be seen from the letter that Cotton Mather proposed to sell the honest Quaker and his colonists as slaves in order to kill two birds with one stone: to punish the Quakers, and to make gain for the New England ministers and people. The letter is as follows:

Boston, Sept. 3, 1682.
To ye aged and beloved John Higginson: There be now at sea a skinker, for our friend Esaias Holderott of London did advise me by the last packet that it would sail some time in August, called ye "Welcome," (R. Green was master), which has aboard a hundred or more of ye heretics and malignants called Quakers, with W. Penn, who is ye scamp at ye head of them. Ye general court has accordingly given secret orders to Master Malachi Huxell of ye brig "Tortoise," to waylaye ye said "Welcome" as neare ye coast of Cold as may be, and make captives of ye Penn and his ungodly crew, so that ye Lord may be glorified and not mocked on ye soil of this new country with ye heathen worshipers of these people.

Much spoil can be made by so doing, and taking ye whole lot to Barbadoes, where slaves fetch good prices, in rumme and sugar. We shall not only do ye Lord great service by punishing the wicked, but shall make gayne for his ministers and people. Yours in the bowels of Christ, "Cotton Mather."

The Puritans who settled in New England were driven by persecution to seek a home on this continent, and Cotton Mather's grandfather, Richard Mather, was one of those who were thus compelled to flee to America. He was ordained as a minister of the Church of England, but being tainted with Puritan ideas he refused to conform to the ceremonies, and was, in consequence, finally deposed in 1634. He landed in Boston in 1635, and became afterwards pastor of the Church in Dorchester, Mass. His son, Increase Mather, was the father of Cotton, the writer of the above letter.

Cotton Mather assisted his father, Increase Mather, in the pastorate of North Church, Boston, and took a prominent part in maintaining the ecclesiastical rule of the colony, being virtually, though not nominally, Governor, and it was under this rule that the burning of witches became so common a practice in Massachusetts, especially in Salem.

The beloved John Higginson mentioned in Cotton Mather's letter was the minister at Salem, and the witch-burnings there were perpetrated under the special authority of Cotton Mather. It was undoubtedly the unity of feeling between Mather and Higginson which made the two so intimate that the former thought the latter would assist in an enterprise so pleasing to the Lord as the capture and sale into slavery of a band of heretical and heathenish Quakers.

It might have been expected that the persecutions for conscience' sake which were endured by the "Pilgrim Fathers," and which banished them from their native land, would have made them more tolerant of those who differed from them in religion, but the result was quite different from this, as their advent to America was the beginning of an era of persecution in the New World, Quakers being the chief victims to the blue laws established in the New England States, and which were carried out most barbarously under Cotton Mather's regime.

One of Mather's discourses pronounced witchcraft to be "the most nefarious high-treason against the divine Majesty," and his book entitled "The Wonders of the Invisible World" was written in 1692 to prove the reality of the witchcraft of Salem, and the just punishment of the witches. The people, however, became tired at last of the cruelties practised upon the victims of Puritan superstition, and a reaction set in, though Cotton Mather endeavored to keep up the anti-witchcraft agitation. He admitted that there had been "a going too far in that affair," nevertheless he still maintained that the victims were the agents of the powers of darkness and were justly executed. Mather's influence was finally destroyed by the publication and dissemination of a work published by Robert Calef, in 1700, in which the truth of Mather's narratives was disputed. This work was entitled "More Wonders of the Invisible World."

THE UNSPEAKABLE TURK.

The Turkish Government has ordered the arrest of two hundred persons at Tokat, in the Sivas district of Armenia, for complicity in the recent massacre of one hundred Christians in the Church of that town. Among those arrested are the mutazir or mayor, the chief of police and the chief of the gendarmarie.

It is a new departure on the part of the take-it-easy Sultan to show such interest in the preservation of the lives of his Christian subjects, and having in view his past conduct on this matter we cannot but think that his imperial sublimity is influenced more by his fears of what might happen, or by his desire to throw wool over the eyes of the rulers of the Christian European powers, than to inaugurate a new era of justice and humanity towards the Christians of the Turkish Empire.

We cannot close our eyes to the fact that even during the last two years a hundred and fifty thousand Christians have been inhumanly massacred by the orders or connivance of this crowned assassin, and we place little reliance on his promises to govern in the future with a view to the welfare of his subjects, especially of those who are Christians, so our sympathies go out freely to those Christians of Crete, Macedonia, Thessaly, and Epirus, who wish to throw off the Turkish yoke forever.

Abdul Hamid is merely playing upon the jealousies of the Christian powers, which he is using with great skill to his own advantage. The powers have certainly not appeared to advantage in their dealings with Turkey, especially during the last two years. Their investigations into the Armenian massacres left no doubt that the guilt of them rested on the Turkish Government, and for a few days, or a few weeks, they made a great show of insisting upon good government for that unfortunate province, but their whole display of force, under the name of a "naval demonstration," was a ridiculous fiasco. But, at least, it was not expected that the Christian powers would actually sustain Turkish rule, where the Christian inhabitants would make a serious effort to rid themselves of it, yet this they have actually done.

Hungary, Greece, Bosnia, Serbia, Montenegro, Bulgaria, Cyprus, and Roumania, have all thrown off the Turkish yoke within the latter part of the present century, and we would be glad to see the Turkish Empire still further reduced in its European possessions; but the Christian powers

have disappointed actions by their maintaining. To while the Sultan palace at Constantinople to do his duty he is to reap all.

Much has been concerning the Crusades which first in 1094 and the purpose being from the Holy which led to those similar to those tyranny exercise and notwithstanding the Crusades, the spirit of chivalry the Crusaders, which they won not for the courages of soldiers.

But the chivalry faith seems to have the establishment of the establishment of war, reaching so as Turkey, have for Christian purposes felt there, tian chivalry has is not a govern pathizes practice Christians of though it must of several Eu gladly go at th brave insurgen Liberty.

There is one eant situation w balance the dis ernments have tianity by upho the name of I Europe by pres the Turkish Eu freedom loving tries openly pr with the Greek present contest England, Fran and many Ita volunteered in spite of the pro their Governme

Despotic Ger to be especial Turkey, and th has even sent of izing the Turk Christian camp gret to see th of European pr is very likely to wish little Gree courageous tas though from p likely to be ov forces which T field against it hope, however, the struggle po aid to Greece finally bring efforts they are more the limit in Europe.

EDITORIAL.

The daily pe formed us tha homes," or soch in the various this city. Good commemorate Blessed Redeem ing themselves hit a boiste take part in homes," on suc we cannot com esty Queen have died on homes" would suitable decoru served, and ha have been ex ings and cru Redeemer were day by peop Christians!

Rev. C. A. I popular pastor church, in To visit to Boston turn to the Qu gregation an impressed h He was very s what he termes and he expres magnitude of ing been aske Separate, or C said that the American peop their desire schools, and th be n made up Catholics. He