

The Catholic Record.

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

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

REV. GEORGE R. NORTHGRAVE, Author of "Mistakes of Modern Liberals," THOMAS COFFEY, Publisher and Proprietor, Thomas Coffey.

Measrs. Luke King, John Nigh, P. J. Neven and Joseph S. King, are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and to transact all other business for the CATHOLIC RECORD.

London, Saturday, October 14, 1899.

THE ALLIANCE AND DIVORCE

The Pan-Presbyterian Alliance has elected the Rev. Principal Caven, D. D., of Toronto for its President till its next meeting, which will take place in Liverpool in 1904, notwithstanding the opinion of Rev. Dr. Macdonald of the Toronto Westminster that the meeting should be deferred till 1910, inasmuch as it has no serious business to transact.

The Alliance did pass one resolution, however, which may have some beneficial result as pronouncing a condemnation of divorce. It was resolved before the close of the council that

SECULAR EDUCATION IN JAPAN.

The Japanese Government has adopted the American system of purely secular or godless education, and has withdrawn sanctions and privileges hitherto extended to schools in which any religion is taught.

The Protestant missionaries find themselves in a peculiar dilemma in consequence of the law, for though in America they have always been the advocates and upholders of purely secular education, in Japan they have given religious instruction in their schools, and if they now make secular schools of them they will lose the support of the home boards, which refuse to appropriate funds for schools in heathen lands which do not teach the doctrines of their denominations, and without this support their schools, it is said, are sure to languish and die for lack of native attendance.

RABBI FRANKLIN ON ZIONISM

The Rabbi Leo M. Franklin of Detroit is not a believer in the advisability of the Zionist proposition which has been advocated by many prominent Jews of Germany and other countries to establish a new Jewish nationality in Palestine, with Jerusalem as the capital. In an address delivered before the Jews of Detroit on Friday, Oct. 6, he said:

"The Jews realize that nations are the result of gradual development and are not ready made. Such a heterogeneous class of people as the Jews, with nothing but a common foundation of religion and a memory of the past, would be poorly equipped for the complex affairs of government. But suppose that all the thousand obstacles to the promotion of the movement were taken away, we still would perceive a walled country, a nation without commerce, and without the culture that comes from contact with other nations. Not in Palestine lay the scenes of the greatest achievements of the Jews. Not until they were scattered among all the nations of the earth were knowledge and growth most evident."

A STARTLING STATEMENT.

An associated press despatch appeared in the Toronto Globe of the 5th which contains information that will be received with astonishment by those people who think the Philippine Islands a good field for Protestant missionary effort. Army Secretary Peyton, who went to the Philippines under commission from the Episcopal Bishop of Albany, stated, in an interview, that there is no chance for Protestant missionary work until such time as the United States troops depart or reform. "The United States has," he adds, "at this moment forty five thousand drunks, rakes or gamblers, and when the American troops landed at Manila there was only a saloon or two in the whole place, but to-day Manila is a hell hole, with four hundred and thirty saloons, typical places of the western frontier, or worse, and the saloons are more respectable than are many of the other places within the city which Americans have either planted or kept alive by their support." The "Tagalos," one of the races inhabiting the islands, are, he further

states, "without any qualifying exceptions, the most moral and the most religious people I ever saw." And yet these are the people the missionaries are sent out to convert. Would it not be more in accordance with the fitness of things were all the power of the missionary bodies devoted to the work of making Christians of Uncle Sam's soldiers?

A GOLDEN WEDDING.

On 3rd October Sir John and Lady Carling celebrated the fiftieth anniversary of their marriage. Sir John Carling has for nearly half a century been identified with the affairs of our Forest City, and, also, in a broader field, as member of Parliament and as Minister of the Crown. In civic as well as in political life he has had his friends—hosts of them—and he has had his opponents also, but this can be said, by all who know him, that he has at all times and under all circumstances been imbued with a sterling honesty of purpose. Would that all our public men deserved what can be truthfully said of Sir John Carling!

The writer has known him from the early days of London's history, and, both as a young man, and as one now advancing into life's autumn, always recognized him as a model for our youth. Genuinely, courteous, obliging—and this to all creeds and classes—are and have ever been the chief characteristics of Sir John Carling. That he and Lady Carling may be given many more years of life is the heartfelt wish of all, and in a particular manner is it the prayer of those who have felt the heavy hand of want. God alone has kept count of the many noble deeds of charity to be placed to their credit. Their gifts have had the true ring of charity. They are not to be ranked amongst those philanthropists who call from the house-tops to all men to behold their generosity. Their home has ever been a bright spot in the memories of the poor. For a generous helping hand and a kindly smile and an encouraging word always accompanied their bountiful gifts.

THE WINDSOR SCHOOL QUESTION.

The Toronto Globe, in two editorial articles which appeared in its issues of the 29th of September and 4th October, takes exception to the course of the Right Rev. Dr. McEvay, Bishop of London, in insisting on the establishment of a Catholic Separate school in Windsor, to take the place of the arrangement under which two Public schools of that city are now managed as Catholic schools. The article of Oct. 4 is in the form of a reply to Mr. D. J. Donahue, Q. C., of St. Thomas, who wrote to the Globe deprecating the attack made upon His Lordship the Bishop on account of his insisting that a Separate school should be established instead of the present system, which is contrary to the school laws of the Province.

Mr. D. J. Donahue very properly points out that the Bishop is within his right when insisting that Windsor should have a Separate school under the Separate School Law, like the other cities and towns of Ontario. We might here remark that excommunication is not a common ecclesiastical penalty, as one might suppose from reading Mr. Donahue's letter. It is inflicted only in extreme cases when persons are contumacious in the commission of grievous sins.

In reply to Mr. Donahue, the Globe says: "Our opinion is that there is oppression if the people of a community desiring to have their children educated in one way are faced by a threat of excommunication to have them educated in another. On the other hand, if they really desire the establishment of the schools, then there is no need of the Bishop using this threat. And whether his action is necessary or not, and whether it is effective or not, it is an abuse of his power and an abuse of the privileges conferred by the Separate School Law. The Separate School Law is intended to enlarge, not to restrict the liberty of the Catholic ratepayer. The Bishop's action is calculated to deprive him of the liberty of choice which the law confers."

In dealing with this matter, we have not a word of blame to say against either the Catholic or Protestant people of Windsor for the arrangement which they made many years ago, and which in practice has worked fairly satisfactorily so far, so that through the liberality and tolerance of the Protestants of the city the Catholics have had the substance of what they have always contended for—a Catholic education for their children—though not having their schools conducted under the Separate school law.

Here it has been said by those who wish the present arrangement to be continued:

"If the schools are working satisfactorily, why should the arrangement not be continued?" The Bishop has answered this question in a way which must commend it-

self to every thoughtful person. The arrangement is contrary to the laws of the Province, which, however, afford a legal means whereby the Catholics may secure their object of giving a suitable education to their children without breaking any law, and the Bishop desires that this means should be adopted.

The Windsor school system has this radical defect, that it is illegal, and for that very reason the time will certainly arrive when it will not be tolerated any longer, and when that time comes the difficulty of changing it into the Separate school system will be greatly increased, as the Catholic claim in equity for a share of the school property will be greater than at present in proportion to the growth of the population; and it is a matter of course that the obstacles to an equitable settlement will also be greater.

The Bishop wishes that this difficulty be met without unnecessary delay, and his decision is undoubtedly a wise one. The interests of the Catholic children attending the schools should be the chief consideration in the matter, and those interests demand that the school system should be made permanent, instead of being left in the present precarious position, which can be upset at any moment by any ratepayer. Surely the contention of the Globe that the present illegal arrangement should be continued is a strange one for a journal which is supposed to have respect for the law; and it is equally strange that the Globe should call the Bishop's course an act of oppression of the Catholic people, whereas His Lordship has done nothing more than to ask the people to conduct their schools in accordance with the law.

His Lordship is certainly within his right in insisting that a character of permanence be given to the Catholic school system of Windsor, and he deems it not only his right but also his duty to do so, and there are other good reasons for doing so beside the fact that he wishes to respect the law. The Protestant trustees of the city very fairly allow the Catholic trustees a large liberty to conduct the Catholic schools on Catholic principles; yet there are some matters wherein they have not full liberty, and cannot have it until the schools are conducted under the Separate school law, by Catholic trustees elected by the Catholic ratepayers. At present the Catholic trustees are not at liberty to select the Catholic text-books which have been approved by Government for the use of Catholic schools, if the Protestant trustees object to their use. Surely it is not a desirable state of affairs that Catholic schools should be entirely at the mercy of a Protestant majority in regard to the curriculum of studies, however tolerant or well-disposed they may be habitually. It is far better that the schools should be subject to Catholic control, that they may be truly and really Catholic.

The Catholic education of Catholic children is a matter of much obligation, and it is the right and duty of the Bishop to see that it is properly carried out. He has, therefore, the moral right to direct his flock to fulfil this obligation, and it is no oppression to tell them how this duty is to be fulfilled, without violating the laws of the Province. This is what Bishop McEvay has done, and the Globe's effort to encourage the Catholics of Windsor to resist the Bishop will find no favor with loyal Catholics of that city. We trust, therefore, that the Catholic people of Windsor will see the necessity of carrying out the wishes of His Lordship as soon as it may be convenient.

Before closing this article we deem it right to say a word on the anxiety of the Globe to have the Catholic people free to select either the Public or the Separate school for their children as they see fit, without being threatened with excommunication if they disobey Episcopal authority.

We have already many times in our columns shown that Catholics are not at liberty in conscience to send their children to Public schools, when they are within a reasonable distance from a Separate school where they will be instructed in their religion. The law gives them this liberty, indeed, but they cannot in conscience make use of it, unless there are grave reasons approved by the Bishop for their doing so. This we expressed last week in the following terms:

"The Bishop may dispense in individual cases on account of distance or any other reasonable cause."

But while the Globe is so very solicitous that Catholics should not be threatened with excommunication if they disobey the laws of the Church, why has it not some solicitude for its own Protestant co-religionists on the same score?

We have known cases where Protestants preferred to send their children to the Separate schools, sometimes because they wished the children to profit by the moral teaching given in them, which could not be had in the Public schools, and sometimes because the Catholic schools were more convenient to them on account of distance.

Is the Globe not aware that these Protestants have not the liberty to support Separate schools under penalty of excommunication? In fact, to become legally Separate school supporters, they must sign a declaration that "We are Roman Catholics;" and thus they are subjected to actual excommunication if they presume to support a Catholic Separate school! Why does not the Globe agitate for the removal of this excommunication, if it is so anxious for the liberty of the people?

MR. CHARLES COWLEY.

This gentleman, a resident of Orangeville, has written a letter which appeared in the Toronto Mail and Empire of the 7th instant. It has reference to the so-called Windsor school trouble. Mr. Charles Crowley says: "I hope you will regard it as coming with in your province to lay the lash lightly (but stingingly) on the back of Monsiener McEvoy, the Roman Catholic Bishop of London, who is just now cracking his ecclesiastical whip so insolently over his co-religionists in Windsor in the matter of 'separate schools.'"

And the editor proceeds to lay on the whip as follows:

"This is a matter of consequence to us all; it is not, as has been suggested, merely the concern of the Roman Catholics. The Separate schools are maintained out of the general taxes, so we are all equally interested in the matter. Separate schools should have no State recognition or support, but this is not the question at the present moment, though the action of Minister McEvoy may do something to bring it again to the front. I do not suppose that the Roman Catholics of Windsor will submit to any such insolent dictation, but to strengthen them it would be as well if the citizens of Windsor generally took up this matter. This priest tells us he knows where he stands; he may know better later on."

We may here draw particular attention to the words we have placed in italics. A time there was, and not many years ago, when the Mail and Empire bent all its energies to the work of destroying Catholic schools. It was the organ of the ultra-Protestant bigots of the Province, and it carried on a violent anti-Catholic crusade for a period of twelve years. Seeing that its party could not get the reins of power by riding the Protestant horse, it suddenly dropped its agitation against Separate schools and its abuse of Catholic Bishops and priests.

We can assure our contemporary that its reference to "Minister McEvoy" will be rated by the Catholic priests and people of the Province as an unwarranted impertinence. If it ever happens that there is a little disturbance, or even the semblance of one, between Bishops, priests and the Catholic laity the good offices of the Mail and Empire editor and his constituency will be asked for when they are wanted. They have so many quarrels of their own, in the shape of heresy trials and fierce combats on the internal arrangements of their own Churches, that we fancy they should have but little time on their hands to interfere in the business of their neighbors. We may add that Bishop McEvoy's course in regard to the Windsor schools will cause no disturbance whatever. He merely wishes Catholics to avail themselves of the rights allowed them by law. He directs that the Catholic people of that town should devote their own money to the support of their own schools, in the same manner as prevails in all other cities and towns of the Province. That is all. We regret exceedingly that a prominent paper like the Mail and Empire should employ such coarse and ungentlemanly terms regarding a distinguished and most highly esteemed prelate of the Catholic Church.

DREYFUS AND CANADIAN POLITICS.

It has been in the past the fashion with some politicians to endeavor to create a race hatred on the part of the English-speaking population of the Dominion, and especially of Ontario, against the French Canadians who are, equally with ourselves, citizens of the Dominion and of the British Empire.

These efforts have always had the effect of exciting recriminations and dissensions—for, deprecate the fact as we may—it remains a truth that there is a section of the Ontario people who are ready to applaud and support any agitators who endeavor to cause discord; nevertheless we cannot too strongly condemn them as unpatriotic and malicious disturbers of the public peace.

We regret to notice that there has been recently an attempt of the same kind as those to which we have made reference. La Patrie, Mr. Israel J

Tarte's paper, has had of late several articles on the Dreyfus trial at Rennes, which do not accord with the general tone of the English press in denouncing as an outrage the verdict of the second Court-martial against the ex-captain of artillery.

The manner in which the trial was conducted is a matter of foreign administration of justice regarding which, surely, we in Canada have a right to pass judgment according to the light that is in us, and our honest convictions, without being denounced as enemies to Canada and British institutions.

We have ourselves freely expressed our opinion on the Dreyfus case, and in doing so we have not followed the lead of the Francophobists. While not presuming to pass an absolute judgment on the guilt or innocence of the accused, we have pointed out that the judges were obliged by the circumstances of the case to hear probably the most direct and important evidence of the matter in secret sessions, lest international complications should arise out of the revelations therein made. It is impossible, therefore, for outsiders to be judges of the whole case, and it is reasonable to believe that the judges to whom was committed the duty of trying the accused were the best able to form a judgment.

There is certainly no want of patriotism toward Canada in our holding this opinion, nor even if we had maintained, as La Patrie has done, that the general outcry which has been made in regard to the Rennes verdict has arisen from hostility toward France. In fact, we do not hesitate to say that La Patrie has justification for its opinion, at least in the case of those who have most frantically expressed indignation at the Rennes verdict.

From these considerations it will be seen how unjustly as well as ungenerously some parties have circulated La Patrie's article throughout Ontario, accompanied with an anonymous circular appealing to the anti-French prejudices of the people on account of the article itself, and further, endeavoring to make the whole French-Canadian people responsible for the pretended offensiveness of La Patrie's article, whereas the article is moderate and calm and not even offensive; but if it were so, the people in general of Quebec would be no more responsible for it than are our readers responsible for the opinions we have expressed on the same subject.

We have said that La Patrie's article is not offensive. It goes no further than to uphold and vindicate from the attacks made upon it the court-martial which condemned Dreyfus, to express its sympathy with France amid the universal denunciations which have been hurled at her on account of the Rennes verdict, and to condemn the absurd proposal which has been made by some fanatics that the Paris exposition to be held in 1900 should be boycotted by manufacturers because of that verdict. So far is this language from being offensive or inconsistent with loyalty to our institutions that we believe it to be quite justifiable; and even if it were a mistaken position, it would at least be not inconsistent with the duty of patriotism towards our own country.

Along with La Patrie's article and the circular of which we speak, there is also a letter of Mr. Beaugrand, formerly Mayor of Montreal, which gives expression to considerable indignation against the press which has spoken evil of France and belittled French justice in connection with the Dreyfus episode.

Mr. Beaugrand may be somewhat extreme in the profession of adhesion to French ideas, but we should remember that it is natural that even though a French Canadian is a British subject, he should remember with pride the glories of the country of his origin, and there can be little or no blame cast upon him for so doing, and for defending it with warmth, when it is being coarsely maligned, and even if this warmth be excessive, we should regard it with tolerance in view of the virulence and bitter anti-French feeling which produced it, or was, at all events, the direct cause of its manifestation. There is a chivalry which is aroused by antagonism, and it is undoubtedly this chivalrous feeling which led Mr. Beaugrand to manifest so decisively French sympathies.

The circular has, however, evidently another object in view beside arousing hostility against the people of Quebec, La Patrie, being owned by a French-Canadian member of the Dominion Cabinet, an opportunity is afforded to the anonymous writer to attack very lamely the present Government, on the

plea that its chief is also a French Canadian.

We are not, and the CATHOLIC RECORD has never been, a partisan of either the Liberal or Conservative party, but purely a Catholic journal; however, we must strongly protest against an attack upon the Government based upon the fact that one of its French Canadian members will not join in unjustly abusing a country which is at peace with us and the Empire of which Canada forms a part, even though there have been from time to time some causes which have menaced the good understanding which ought to exist between France and Great Britain; and it is still more preposterous to attempt to make the Government responsible for Mr. Beaugrand's utterances, as this gentleman has no more influence upon the policy of the Government than arises out of the fact that he has been one of its outside supporters. The Government must be judged by its declared policy on Canadian questions, and not by the impassioned utterances of one or more of its individual supporters. There never was a more dastardly and contemptible attempt at making political capital out of an event in which Canadians are not interested in any direct way, than this anonymous Dreyfus circular.

A VIRULENT ASSAILANT ANSWERED.

"RITUALISTS WERE SEVERELY SCORED." This is the heading under which in the Daily Mail and Empire of the 6th inst. an account is given of the reading of a paper by the Rev. W. J. Armitage, Rector of St. Paul's Church, Halifax, N. S., on "The Crisis in the Church of England" before the Alumni of Wickliffe College Association, Toronto, at their meeting in the college library last week.

Wickliffe College is a Low Church institution, having been established purposely to counteract the High Church tendencies which are supposed to exist in Trinity University. It might be expected, therefore, that at a gathering of the Alumni of this hostile educational institution there would be some manifestation of the hatred which exists between the High and Low factions of Anglicanism, but we were scarcely prepared for the extreme manifestation of hatred expressed by the Rev. Mr. Armitage for his brethren of the High or Ritualistic school, who, after all, are at the present time the dominant power in the Church of England in England itself, and almost the dominant power in Canada, as well as in the Episcopal Church of the United States. Yet we would not deem it necessary to make any comments on Mr. Armitage's venomous remarks, if he had not made at the same time an attack on the Catholic Church with equal venom.

Truly, the Rev. Mr. Armitage scored his brethren of the Ritualistic school "severely," if unreasoning abuse is to be accepted as argument. In his attitude toward the unfortunate brethren he reminds us strongly of Timon of Athens:

"I am Misanthropos, and hate mankind. For thy part, I do wish thou wert a dog. That I might love thee something."

The substance of the charge brought by Rev. Mr. Armitage against the Ritualists is contained in the following words:

"The cause of this crisis in the Church of England is the existence of a body of well organized laity who had as their object the Romanizing of the Church. In many cases these had succeeded in surpassing Rome itself."

On a memorable occasion Portius Festus said to St. Paul in the public hall of audience at Caesarea: "Thou art besided thyself: much learning doth make thee mad."

Notwithstanding that the learned Alumni of Wickliffe appear to have appreciated highly the Rector of Halifax's vapors, we are compelled to believe that a very much smaller amount of learning than the Apostle of the Gentiles possessed, combined with much vanity, induced him to make this surprising statement that the Church of England is being "Romanized" by "surpassing Rome itself" in Roman observances. If these observances surpass Rome, they cannot be Roman, and the Church surely cannot be "Romanized" by means of them.

A public speaker who makes the pretensions of the Rev. Mr. Armitage should be at least a little more cautious than to make such "random assertions. His hatred for Ritualism and the Ritualists evidently carries him beyond the bounds of reason.

But the Rector has much more to say in his discourse so annihilatory of Ritualism, in his own opinion. He has more to say, but we can scarcely detect a single thought of his own in his whole tirade. His entire speech is made up of the thoughts of other