

The Catholic Record.

Published Weekly at 451 and 453 Richmond Street, London, Ontario.

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

REV. GEORGE H. NORTHGRAVER, Author of "Mistakes of Modern Infidels."

THOMAS COFFEY, Publisher and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY, Messrs. Luke Kiso, John Noye, P. J. Neve and Wm. A. Neve, are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transact all other business for the Catholic Record.

Rate of Advertising—Ten cents per line each insertion, acute 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.

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

London, Saturday, July, 25, 1896.

THE RESULT IN QUEBEC.

The anti-Catholic journals of the province are very persistent in maintaining that the result of the late elections, especially in Quebec, is a death-blow to the influence of the Catholic clergy. Thus in the Canada Presbyterian of the 1st inst. it is said:

"The hierarchy of Quebec have manifestly lost their hold in things political. They did all in their power to make the people vote against Laurier, and the people voted for Laurier in much larger numbers than they ever voted for any political leader. . . . The hierarchy have been taught a lesson that should do them for the remainder of their lives."

"Elsewhere in the same issue we are told that the episcopal mandement was intended to coerce the people in matters of opinion, but that the people would not be coerced, and great credit is given to the people of the province for having thus asserted their freedom from ecclesiastical control in politics. The Toronto Globe of the 3rd inst. also says:

"There all the powers that seek to trammel thought, to prevent free inquiry, to destroy the liberty of the press, to forbid the elector from marking his ballot according to his own judgment, were against Laurier and Liberalism. The people were on the other side, and the people won."

We have already pointed out in our columns that the episcopal mandement had no such meaning as these journals attribute to it. The Bishops in the exercise of their duty warned the electors against bribery, perjury, intemperance, lying, calumny, violence and party spirit; but there is not a word in the document which can be tortured into meaning an attempt to coerce their votes for one party rather than the other.

It is true their Lordships state that "A grave injustice was committed against the Catholic minority in Manitoba," in depriving them of their Catholic Separate schools and forcing them to send their children to schools that their consciences condemn. This is a subject on which the Bishops have certainly a right to speak, and they have the right to advise Catholics to support only those candidates who bound themselves to vote in Parliament in favor of remedial legislation. They did this in the mandement, but as the supporters of Mr. Laurier throughout Quebec, equally with the supporters of the Government, declared themselves to be in favor of such legislation, it cannot be said truly that the Bishops took part against Mr. Laurier. So far is this from being the case that they state in the mandement itself: "Our intention is not to bind ourselves to any of the parties that are combatting in the political arena. On the contrary, we desire to preserve our liberty." It is, therefore, not true to say that the advice of the Bishops was disregarded, or that the people of Quebec have gained a victory over clericalism. Clericalism was not an issue in the elections at all, and it is our belief that Mr. Laurier's Government will settle the Manitoba school question in as satisfactory a manner as that of Sir Charles Tupper would have done. Possibly the settlement will be made by the Manitoba Legislature itself. We hope this will be the case, but Mr. Laurier has himself said repeatedly that if Manitoba itself will not act in the matter by granting redress, his Government will use its constitutional powers in order to do so. We believe that he was sincere in making this statement. At St. Roche, in the province of Quebec, he was especially explicit, as he said there: "Should the means of conciliation fail, I shall have recourse to constitutional means, and these I will use fully and in their entirety." We have confidence that Mr. Laurier will keep his word, and, indeed, in our opinion, it will be found that the Manitoba Government will itself settle the matter in order not to embarrass the new Government of the Dominion.

While on this subject we must not omit to enter our protest against the course pursued by the Mail and

Empire in endeavoring to raise a race cry against the people of Quebec because they have so decisively sustained Mr. Laurier. The Mail asserts that the elections were a victory for Quebec. Even if this were the case it would not be justifiable to raise such an issue. The people of Quebec have as much right to make their influence felt in Parliament as those of any other Province, but there is no reason to believe that any race issue was the cause of Mr. Laurier's victory there. The people of Quebec are not as a rule influenced by race or religious issues in elections, and the large number of English-speaking Protestants who are always elected by the most Catholic constituencies is sufficient evidence of this. A racial and religious cry has always much more effect in Ontario than in Quebec, and the proof is the readiness with which Ontario candidates both for Parliament and the Provincial Legislature raise such issues. They would not do so if they were not convinced that such a cry would have weight with the electors.

But it is not true that Mr. Laurier's victory is specially a victory for Quebec. Ontario itself gave a majority of 7 against the Government, though it is true that the 7 who constitute that majority do not proclaim themselves supporters of Mr. Laurier. The truth is that there was a widespread defection from the ranks of the supporters of the Government in every Province. It has been pointed out by the Ottawa Journal that the Conservative losses in Ontario amounted to just one seat less than in Quebec. The Journal says:

"At dissolution the Conservatives had 29 seats in Quebec. Now they have 16, showing a net loss of 13 ridings in the general election. At dissolution the Conservatives had 56 seats in Ontario. Now they have 44 showing a net loss of 12 ridings on June 23."

There was also a loss of five seats in Nova Scotia, three in New Brunswick, three in the North-West, and four in British Columbia. It is, therefore, perfectly clear that whatever may have been the causes that brought about the defeat, they were not sectional, but general. Sir Charles Tupper himself said a few days ago in an interview with the Ottawa correspondent of the Toronto World, that when he came to Canada he found the Conservative party "utterly demoralized," and that he "reluctantly consented to become its leader as the only hope of avoiding defeat."

We do not pretend to know to a certainty the reasons which operated to bring about the result, but it is certainly unfair to attribute it to any race cry in Quebec. It is far more likely that the internal dissensions of the party which were so markedly manifested last January contributed greatly to the result, and it may well be believed that, whether rightly or wrongly, there was among the people generally a feeling that a change of rulers was desirable. We may add that at the elections five years ago the Government was sustained only by a narrow majority, so that even then it narrowly escaped defeat. The Government majority became large only through the bye elections. It is not very surprising, therefore, that there should be a change now in view of the fact that the popular will is proverbially changeable.

"PLUNDERED PROTESTANTS."

Under the above sensational heading the Montreal Witness of the 3rd inst. has an article complaining anew of the treatment of the Protestant rate payers of the parish of St. Gregoire le Thaumaturge, near Montreal.

One would imagine on reading the headlines that there is a regular conspiracy on the part of the Catholics of Quebec to plunder the Protestants by forcing them to contribute to the Catholic schools of the Province.

We will remind our readers here that in the parish mentioned a new school district was legally established, apparently with no opposition, and as the Protestants of the district took no steps for the establishment of a school of their own, or even to become supporters of the Protestant schools of Montreal, they were by law subject to the Public school tax, and it is because the school authorities have sought to collect this tax that the cry has been raised that the Protestants are being plundered.

We are by no means in sympathy with any effort to impose a tax upon Protestants for the support of the Public or Catholic schools where they have their own schools, yet we must say that in the case of St. Gregoire district we think there has been an unjustifiable exaggeration of the grievance

under which the Protestants labor, if there is a grievance at all.

Appeal was made to the Government to exempt the Protestant residents from the Public school tax, and this has been done for the present half-year and future years, but a considerable sum was paid to the Protestant Commissioners of Montreal during the last three or four years, and the Commissioners claim that the district school was entitled to this amount, which is claimed as arrears. As the payment of rates is a matter settled by law, the Government has informed the rate payers that it has no power to exempt them from payment of the arrears, and they are now held liable for them.

It is to be presumed that the courts which will settle the payment of these arrears will deal justly according to the law; and we know that there is no school law in any Province of the Dominion so favorable to the minority as the school law of Quebec. In fact Ontario is the only other Province in which a Separate school law exists, and in Ontario the Catholics who neglect to give the legal notice that they are Separate school supporters are always assessed as supporters of the Public schools, and it is held by the Protestants generally that this is a most just provision. At all events, Catholics have submitted to it without raising any outcry that they have been plundered.

The Quebec school laws afford every facility to Protestants to establish Separate schools, with school districts to suit their own convenience, independent of the Public school district boundaries. The St. Gregoire residents might have done this if they had so desired, and their neglect to do so seems to show that they were quite content to remain Public school supporters, until for some cause or other they desired to create a grievance. Perhaps the object is to excite the minds of the Protestants of Ontario against the Catholic school system of Manitoba.

We are aware that the excuse given for not having taken the legal steps to become Separate school supporters is that the notice of the proposed establishment of a new school district was placed on the church gates, and so were not attended to by the Protestants, but as the law prescribes that there should be three notices, that is but a lame excuse for their supposed want of knowledge of the matter. There must, therefore, have been other notices besides the one on the church gates, and the complaints about plundered Protestants are evidently fabricated for a mischievous purpose.

STRICKEN ITALY.

Pope Leo XIII. has petitioned Menelik, Emperor of Abyssinia, to liberate the 2,600 Italian soldiers he holds as prisoners of war. A section of the Italian press regards the action of the Pontiff as emanating from a selfish source, but by the majority it is hailed with joy and admiration. It has stricken off the eyes of even his enemies the scales of prejudice and made them see the nobility of the action. The name of Leo has been pronounced with respect within the walls of the Italian parliament, and Rudini has declared that the act was due to a Christian sentiment, a humanitarian sentiment, belonging wholly to his sublime mission and a sentiment of affection towards the Italian fatherland.

And the action of Leo XIII. was sadly needed if for no other purpose than to infuse life into the drooping hearts of the Italians. They are today a pitiable sight amongst the nations. Bankrupt in money and public respect, divided in aim, having no resources of national strength save what comes from infidelity, they need some man to guide them on to the way of prosperity. Ever since the day the walls of Rome were battered down by the cannon of the invading Italian, the nation has been struggling against decay and degradation. It raises its impotent hands to heaven and shrieks forth blasphemies which the future race will find hard to forget. Perchance the time is coming when, chastened by suffering, it will cry out in humility for aid, and the Pontiff of the Vatican will take it and plunge it into the cleansing, strengthening waters of a pool of Bethesda. It may be the culminating point of the glorious monument of Leo's life. The wasted hands that tremble as they mark the sign of the cross o'er prostrate pilgrims may bind his countrymen to the old faith. It will be a grand sight—the marriage of the Italian monarchy to the Catholic Church, with Leo XIII. as minister and the Christian world as witness.

THE TWELFTH OF JULY.

The 12th of July was celebrated in many parts of the Province with the usual parades and denunciations of Rome, the Pope and Catholics generally. In Toronto, the stronghold of Orangism, the parade was on an unusually large scale. There were a number of speakers, the principal of whom was Mr. John Ross Robertson, M. P. for East Toronto. Mr. Robertson, who represents the Orange, P. P. A. and McCarthyite elements of his constituency, gave utterance to the usual rhodomontade that he and his brethren of the lodges want no special privileges, but equal rights for all. We all understand what this means in an Orangeman's mouth—it is an equal right for all Orangemen to persecute and calumniate Catholics, and this he showed even by the character of the historical events he placed before his audience as illustrating his meaning.

He declared his great pleasure in celebrating the 12th of July. It is usual to prate about the battle of the Boyne as having secured civil and religious liberty, whereas the nearest tyro in history knows that it was the proclamation of religious liberty that brought upon King James the II. the anger of his Protestant subjects, and led to his deposition from the throne.

Mr. Robertson made the usual pretence, styling the (Orange) lily "the freedom flower of Britain" and the song of the Boyne water "the anthem of civil and religious liberty." But he gave the true reason for his enjoyment of the day also along with these pretended ones. It was because the Catholic Irish were defeated in the battles of the Boyne and Aughrim.

He boasted that the Orangemen of Canada will prove true to the traditions of the order. Those traditions are well known. They are traditions of violence, bloodshed and hate. We do not doubt they will be adhered to by the lodges as far as they are able to do so, but the day is past when they can put them into practice. The power of Orangism is shattered, and the broken pieces cannot be welded together.

THE REV. DR. CARMAN ON THE SCHOOL QUESTION.

A letter from the Rev. A. Carman, General Superintendent of the Methodist Church of Canada, appears in the Globe of the 14th inst., treating of the recent elections, with reference especially to the Manitoba school question.

It is always pleasant to observe a change for the better in the disposition of a rancorous adversary, and at first glance we thought we could see a gratifying change in the present attitude of the doctor toward Catholics.

For the first time in his public utterances, as far as we remember, the Rev. Mr. Carman sets his face against the attempt in which several journals are now engaged, to raise a cry against "French domination" and the Catholics of the Dominion, as a result of the recent elections. He writes:

"The body of our Roman Catholic fellow-citizens, especially in the Province of Quebec, have vindicated their right and dignity as British subjects and independent electors." But the effect of this is spoiled by the malicious addition of the following:

"Though not half so much of good may be said of their hierarchy."

We were at first prepared to believe that the Ethiopian was becoming white, and the leopard changing its spots when we read the first sentiment, and we rejoiced at the change, because we desire to live at peace with our Protestant fellow citizens, but the last quoted clause, and the remainder of his letter, proved to us that the writer of this letter is the same Dr. Carman whom we have known for several years.

If the doctor has any special characteristic it is a fondness for endeavoring to browbeat the Government of the day, and to intermeddle with political matters. It comes from him with an especially bad grace to make accusations against the Catholic hierarchy on this score.

It will be remembered that he was during several years past one of the most venomous of all the ministers of Canada in endeavoring to stir up a crusade against Catholics on every possible pretext. During the anti-Jesuit crusade the Rev. Mr. Carman furnished to the press an almost inexhaustible supply of letters of the most violent character, filled with ridiculous false accusations against the learned, pious, and devoted Jesuit body, with the avowed object of driving them out of Canada.

The Methodists have not a hierarchy at all that we are aware of, and so we cannot retort Rev. Mr. Carman's charge

against any Methodist hierarchy, but we can say that the Methodist conferences and the Methodist clergy have for years shown themselves to be among the most intolerant and domineering classes in the Dominion. There have been some honorable exceptions among them, such as the Rev. Dr. Shaw, the present principal of Montreal Methodist college, and member of the Protestant school council of Quebec province; but we are sorry to have to say that Dr. Shaw stands almost alone among the Methodist ministers in the endeavor to bring about a spirit of Christian charity among his brethren in the ministry. Indeed so great is the gulf which separates Dr. Shaw from Dr. Carman, and the majority of the cloth, that we wonder how it came to pass that he was ever appointed to succeed the late Dr. Douglas, who maintained his reputation chiefly by means of intolerant political addresses delivered at the various district conferences, especially in Ontario, year after year.

We do not wish to recall the unmeritorious acts of the dead, but we are compelled to do so by Rev. Dr. Carman's wanton remarks; and certainly the predecessor of Rev. Dr. Shaw would not have been invited to perform the office of conference lecturer if the conferences had not desired pabulum of the sort; and however rabid were the utterances of that controversially bellicose gentleman we have good reason to believe that not a single voice, much less a single conference, ever repudiated those utterances as being alien to the sentiments of the Methodist Church of Canada.

One of the late Dr. Douglass' most virulent attacks on the occasions referred to was his addresses at Tilsonburg conference, when he denounced the Ottawa Government because its head, Sir John Thompson, was a Catholic.

We hold that by silent approval of such an address, and by the renewal of the invitation to Dr. Douglas to repeat the expression of his extreme views a second time at the next annual meeting of the same conference, the whole Methodist ministerial body became responsible for them; and they are to some extent responsible too for the inflammatory part taken by Rev. Dr. Carman during the so-called Equal Rights agitation. The public cannot easily forget the Rev. Dr. Carman's appeals on that occasion to overthrow both political parties because they did not respond to the demand made by the Methodist ministers to interfere with Quebec legislation whereby the Government of that Province made a profitable bargain for itself by getting rid of a just claim of the Jesuits on property of which they had been violently robbed, for one-sixth of its value. And, after all, the transaction should not be regarded at all as a payment to the Jesuits; for it was nothing more than a grant for educational purposes, and the Protestants of Quebec shared in it fully in proportion to their population.

After taking such a stand it ill behooves the Rev. Dr. Carman to maintain now, as he does in his letter to the Globe, that the Parliament of Canada has no right to intervene to restore the rights of which the Catholics of Manitoba have been unjustly deprived, the right to educate their children freely in accordance with their conscientious convictions. Thus he says in his letter:

"The coercion policy has been smitten with a decisive veto by the electors. The Privy Council has decided that Manitoba is within her rights in the abolition of Separate schools. Let us stand by the constitution. Whatever settlement is made under the guise of grievance must be made in harmony with the abolition and absolute non-existence of Separate self-re-enact them. It will not do to her by concession what was sought by coercion, but denied by a free people. Conciliation, even compromise, there may be, but no surrender of the vital principle on which Public schools are based."

After this dictatorial laying down of the principle by which the Manitoba school question is to be settled, we presume that we shall soon again be told that the Catholic hierarchy are not to be allowed to utter a syllable on the matter of Catholic education, which concerns them so deeply. The whole thing must be left to Dr. Carman and the Methodist conferences to settle, though it does not concern them at all!

As Dr. Carman says, "Let us stand by the Constitution;" and if we so stand Catholic schools will be restored; for the constitution guarantees their continued existence, and the Catholic minority is not to be cheated out of them because such is the will of the Methodist General Superintendent of Canada. The doctor also misrepresents

the case when he says that the Privy Council declared Manitoba to be within her rights in abolishing Separate schools.

We admit that it is difficult to reconcile the two judgments of the Privy Council—one in favor of Manitoba, and the other for the Catholic minority—yet we think it will be admitted that the Privy Council knew what it was about in arriving at both conclusions. With all respect for the authority of the Privy Council, we are of opinion that it did violence to the intention and spirit of the Manitoba Act in its first decision; for it was undoubtedly the intention of the Canadian Parliament to assure the future minority in the territory that its existing educational rights would continue permanently. It may be that the intention was not framed in words sufficiently binding. That this is the case, we presume the first decision of the Privy Council means. But the second decision declares that the "Parliamentary Compact" was violated by the Manitoba school laws of 1890. The Catholics were aggrieved, and they could not have been aggrieved unless there was a wrong done to them, and it is folly to say that Manitoba was "within its rights" in inflicting that wrong.

We assure Doctor Carman that this matter will not remain as it stands. It is not to be settled by his dictum. The Catholics of Canada will have something to say in the matter, and so will all lovers of justice and equal dealing. It will be found that the constitutional guarantees are just as sacredly to be observed where Catholics minorities are concerned as when they have reference to the Protestant minority of Quebec.

OUR EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM.

We are inclined to doubt oftentimes of the advantages of the so-called "High Education," because we do not, in our humble opinion, get satisfactory results from it. True, its favored recipients, or victims, have a lot of scientific and literary bric-a-brac, but all this is no factor in improving the fashion of the world. It disturbs the mental machinery or makes the brain a kind of phonograph that has no sound of its own. It can grind out any amount of information, but always in the same tone—the one it was taught. Who will call this education? The filler of the ground who can express an original opinion—ungrammatically though it be—is more educated than the man or woman who can tell you all about Confucius and Buddha, and yet have never learned to think for themselves.

We shall touch upon this subject again. It is of absolute importance to us, because we believe that our educational system is defective. It frustrates its end in too many instances, and we hope that some educationist, strong enough to battle against faddists, will place it ere long on a rational basis. We want men and not repeating machines.

CHURCH UNION AND CATHOLICITY.

The refusal of the Anglican Synod of Toronto to convey fraternal greetings to the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church while both bodies were in session in that city, is still being sharply discussed in the daily papers by correspondents of all shades of opinion, and the organs of the Church of England itself hold most contradictory views on the subject. The Evangelical Churchman, which is the organ of the Low Church party, says that the Rev. Dr. Langtry's objection to the greetings was "as ungracious as it could well be." It adds:

"It exposes his real opinion on the subject of Church reunion, which is undoubtedly absorption. In his zeal for the catholicity of the Church Dr. Langtry reduces her to the level of a sect, and a very narrow one at that. Dr. Langtry's action says, as plainly as words: 'We cannot wish Godspeed to any body of Christians who do not hold to Episcopal Church government as an article of faith.'"

The views of the Evangelical Churchman accord perfectly with those generally held by various denominations outside the Church of England in regard to the nature of ecclesiastical orders. Most of these denominations hold that ordination is not essential in order to authorize a man to become a minister of the Church, much less that he should be ordained by a Bishop. In fact Presbyterians, Methodists, Baptists, Congregationalists, etc., hold that there was no distinction between the Episcopal and Presbyterian orders in the primitive Church; but they generally go even further than this, practically maintain-

ing that the office of be assumed by any himself moved by the grace to take it upon sects necessarily tak they would otherw ministry, whereas if short period we find clergy had not even u of ordination which adopted. With this ever, the case is The ordinal in us prescribes that none to the ministry with dination, and this Ep is traced back to Ma first Archbishop of t land during the reign

How it is that with in view Low Church maintain that the cl denominations stand a validly-ordained m show difficult to a what of consistency maintaining that the ordinal constitute Church rule of adm an essential law of Christ. It is, nev able that the author maintain the essen

Episcopal ordination have pronounced un all, and it is to this able that negotiat cans and Presbyteri of the two Churches ceremoniously brok both the Anglican B definitely that the pate" is so essen that no union can unless the episcopat the other party to t Episcopalians of the followed the same v

It, therefore, app Langtry's action w ance with the spiri England's authori than is the course r Evangelical Chur ecclesiastical party It is a curious Churchman takes r ing of catholicity a of the Church of imply that real c readiness to admi bers of all sects, or with those of the was certainly not S case when in his e cious he pronounced who preached any that which he had where enumerated schisms among th demned by God.

It appears to u lowering the Chur sect which has no the catholicity is to be mai the preaching trines of the one where, and by pre the Church every Supreme Head. what Christ inclu when He made Pe which He built th mandated the Apos where all things manded. It is by Christ that the m ity of the Church and not by the fr Churchism. Dr. the nature of the body, instituted open to admit far man-made minist correct than the man. But taking as far as they are of England is su schism for aban Church as the n in abandoning he

EDITORIAL.

FRANCE is ge commemoration Clovis. Perso the globe will assi the ceremony as

AUBREY DE V Contemporary M Manning, quot of the deceased needless tear is earth."

It would requ just what Mr. G Leo XIII. to O Orders. It has though old he h we believe it.

THE NEW YORK