

The Catholic Record.

Published Weekly at 481 and 483 Richmond Street, London, Ontario.
Price of Subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

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

Masters: Luke King, John Nigh, P. J. Neven and Miss Sarah H. Neven are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transact all other business for THE CATHOLIC RECORD. Agents for Newfoundland, Mr. James Power of St. John's.
Rates of Advertising—Ten cents per line each insertion, space measured.
Approved and recommended by the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa and St. Boniface, the Bishops of London, Hamilton, Peterborough, and Oshawa, N. Y., 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 Monday morning. When subscribers change their residence it is important that the old as well as the new address be sent us.
Subscribers who change their address should notify this office as soon as possible in order to insure the regular delivery of their paper.
Agents or collectors have no authority to stop your paper unless the amount due is paid. Matter intended for publication should be mailed in time to reach London not later than Monday morning. Please do not send us poetry, obituary and marriage notices sent by subscribers must be in a condensed form, to insure insertion.

LETTER OF RECOMMENDATION.
UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA.
Ottawa, Canada, March 15, 1905.
The Editor of THE CATHOLIC RECORD,
London, Ont.
Dear Sir: For some time past I have read your estimable paper, THE CATHOLIC RECORD, and congratulate you upon the manner in which it is published.
Its matter and form are both good; and a truly Catholic spirit pervades the whole. Therefore with pleasure, I can recommend it to the faithful.
Blessing you and wishing you success,
Believe me to remain,
Yours faithfully in Jesus Christ,
D. FALLOON, Arch. of Ottawa,
Appt. Deleg.

LONDON, SATURDAY, MAR. 18, 1905.

THE "TRUST THE PROVINCES" CRY.

The Toronto Globe, some Orange Lodges and a few extra loyal and valiant ministers of the Gospel of peace and good will all unite in solemn protest against the granting of Separate schools in the new Provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan.

Provincial rights, Canadian nationality, encroachments of the Pope of Rome, and the British constitution, are invoked to terrify the innocent members of Parliament in Ottawa and to enlighten them on the course they must pursue in this important matter. Resolutions and petitions that cost nothing are being forwarded to the Capital, and one brave and bold member got his courage worked up to boiling point and declared that guns and bayonets and bullets must be used to shoot down nearly half the population of Canada for having the audacity to believe and to assert that they want their children to learn in the schools the great and eternal truths of Christianity.

Even the official organ of the Methodist Church swells the volume of disapproval and becomes eloquent and indignant at the very idea of Separate schools receiving public money; and yet only a few months ago the Methodist College for Ladies asks and receives from the city of St. Thomas a grant of \$15,000 to keep the institution alive.

On that occasion the official organ and the Methodist ministers of London possessed their souls in patience. They uttered not a word in protest against a whole city—Catholics included—having to pay the \$15,000 for sectarian purposes. They nursed their wrath to keep it warm until something Catholic asked for public help; and, lo! the Separate school question comes to their aid, and their souls are moved into virtuous indignation and they rise in their might and hurl trenchant attacks against Papal aggression and the violation of the British Constitution.

How different the St. Thomas grant would have been if a Catholic convent asked for the \$15,000! And yet we are told "consistent wisdom ever wills the same."

The whole question might become serious, but to the honor and glory of Canada we have a large number of honest and fair-minded and intelligent men on both sides of politics who look at this question of Education in a rational manner and act accordingly.

Many non-Catholics are anxious to have religious truths taught in the schools and admit the importance and necessity of it, but the trouble is to work the principle into practice. This difficulty has been solved to a great extent in the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec. In Quebec, the Protestants have not merely their elementary schools, but are freely granted High schools and Normal schools and their fair share of all public money spent for educational purposes.

This manner of treating the Protestant minority is either right or wrong. If wrong why is it not condemned by the Globe and the Lodges? If right, why not treat the minority in the same way in Alberta and Saskatchewan?

Are we to have one law in favor of the Protestant minority and another persecuting the Catholic minority?

All sensible men must admit that if the Protestant minority has a right to Separate schools in Quebec, the Catholic minority in the North West has the same right.

We are not living in Ireland or Po-

land, but in Canada—free Canada—where the rights of both majorities and minorities are respected and protected, and where we expect and demand British fair play.

Even Jews and Infidels, who object to any form of Christian teaching in school, have no reason to object to Separate schools, as the formation of such schools do not interfere with them in any way.

If the Jew and Infidel object to pay taxes to a Christian school surely a Christian has the same right to object to support a godless and anti-Christian school!

Then we hear the bugbear cry of no union between Church and State!

As a matter of fact all churches in this country are free of taxation and are given protection; and what is this but a union of Church and State as far as it goes?

Since Separate schools give the same standard of secular education as Public schools, why should the State refuse to pay for the same results? Supporters of Separate schools are at least as loyal, as intelligent, as virtuous, as generous, as the supporters of Public schools, and are entitled in justice to the same treatment by the Governments. Any other conclusion is sheer hypocrisy. Catholics form nearly half the population of this Dominion and they claim the right of educating their own children with their own money. They are not asking Protestants for anything. On the contrary they say to the Protestants go and do likewise.

You would imagine the Catholics of Canada were a lot of fools or serfs not capable of educating their own children and that they must apply to the Toronto Globe and the Orange Lodges for light and guidance on this question. Indeed it would be a great consolation to the Globe and the Lodges if the Catholics would simply disappear and never return; but the fact is that while Catholics are charitable and accommodating, they are not of the disappearing kind, and they are here to stay and will insist on being treated as Christians and citizens of no mean country.

Now, what crime has Sir Wilfred Laurier committed to arouse the indignation of our over-sensitive citizens? He simply brings in a bill guaranteeing to Protestant and Catholic minorities the right to continue Separate schools in the new provinces. He explains in a clear and able speech his reasons for so doing, showing that vested rights, justice and the keeping of the Constitution demand the stand he has taken.

The whole question is whether the Premier and his colleagues are acting in the best interests of Canada, and, like true statesmen, making laws for peace and harmony and good-will and justice and progress in this new country.

In this case there is no experiment. The laws granting Separate schools have been in existence in the new Territories and have given the best satisfaction to the people living in that country, and there is no desire for a change on their part.

Under these circumstances it would be a sad day for Canada if a Premier with the reputation for ability and stability that Sir Wilfred enjoys, allowed himself and his supporters to be bulldozed and stampeded by a number of fanatics and bigots who are ever ready to howl whenever anything right and just should be done for the minority.

Let the Premier and his colleagues remain firm and fair and even generous to minorities, both Protestant and Catholic, and a large number of Canadians on both sides of politics will always be ready to endorse such legislation; and let Canada be a free country, not merely in name, but in reality.

AN AWAKENING.

In the matter of non-religious schools our Protestant neighbors are beginning to suspect that there is something wrong. The small attendance at their churches puzzles them and causes them no little uneasiness. Do any of them ever think that the Public school system may be the cause of this condition of affairs? We do not desire to shake the confidence of our ministerial friends in the excellence of the Public schools. It is one of their idols. Let them worship it undisturbed. Many non-Catholics of bright minds and mature judgment are beginning to agitate in the United States for the introduction of religious education in the schools. The following extract will show the trend of thought in this direction:

Boston, Feb. 14—While the first general session of the religious education convention will not be held until evening, several of the departments of the convention were scheduled to begin their work today. Chief among those was the council of religious education, the president of which is Prof. Frank Knight Saunders, dean of the Yale divinity school. The president's annual report was to be followed by the presentation of various papers, among them two with reference to the possible cooperation in religious education between

Roman Catholics and Protestants. The general alliance of workers with boys planned to meet during the day for a general discussion.

A MISCONCEPTION.

In the minds of many of our Protestant fellow-citizens there seems to be an impression that Catholics have unfriendly feelings towards the Public schools of the Province. To our minds it is not the ideal system; but, so long as it suits our Protestant neighbors, we feel that it would be out of place on our part to interfere with it. Our Protestant friends have the schools they want. By all means let them go ahead and make the most of them. We Catholics have our Separate schools, and we are quite satisfied. In carrying on their educational system our Protestant neighbors wish to be let alone. Well and good. Why should they find fault with their Catholic neighbors if they demand the same rights? "But your schools are inferior," say some. This assertion is made by men who know not whereof they speak. We say fearlessly that our Separate schools are quite equal to the Public schools in the matter of secular education. Those who really wish to find out the truth in this respect should consult the inspectors.

Perhaps one of the most villainous acts in connection with this agitation must be laid at the door of the Toronto World, a paper which is conducted on the same lines as are the yellow journals of New York. It printed an illustration of the Catholics starting a conflagration with a view to destroy the little red school house. It is humiliating to have a member of Parliament assuming the role of a "Sim Tappertit" or a "Hugh," as recorded in Barnaby Rudge. During the unholy P. P. A. regime many of our fellow-citizens made sorry exhibitions of themselves. History is repeating itself. Good citizens will, however, remember the firebrands. They will never by the voice of the people be placed in positions of honor or trust.

FANATICISM AND INCONSISTENCY.

Ever since the agitation began in regard to the autonomy of the two new provinces in the North-West, we have almost from day to day been assured by the editor of the Toronto Globe that Provincial rights is a very sacred thing and should not be in the slightest degree infringed upon by the Dominion Government. Our contemporary seems to forget that there are other than provincial rights which are just as sacred, and should be guarded in like manner. "Leave education to the Provinces" is the cry of the majority of our Protestant neighbors, but may we not ask what guarantee have the Catholics that their educational rights will be respected if the legislatures of the provinces are permitted to have full power? The Catholics of the Province of Manitoba were given to understand that their interests would be quite safe in the hands of the legislators of that province. What has been the result? Fanaticism, fanned for the most part by men who pretend to be ministers of the Gospel of Peace, swept over the country, and Catholic schools were abolished. In the province of Ontario, where Catholics have been solemnly guaranteed their educational rights by Dominion enactment, an attempt was made twenty years ago to destroy the Catholic schools. The agitators went so far as to demand a revision of the British North America Act. Finding that this could not be done, a great political party went to the polls a couple of times with the cry: "Down with the Separate schools." Finding that they could not abolish them they promised, if returned to power, to make them unworkable; or, in other words, to harry the Catholic people in various ways with a view to compel them to give up their schools. With all these facts before us, how can the editor of the Globe ask us to trust the provinces? The reply might be made: "We are living in different times. People are now more tolerant, and there is no possibility that the non-Catholic cry will be again raised." This, however, would not hold good in view of the fact that during the agitation of the past month all the old weapons of bigotry have been brought into use. Ministers of the Gospel and an unlovely class of politicians are vying one with the other in exhibitions of bigotry and narrowness. "Trust the Provinces," says the Globe. Will the editor please read this?

Warton, Ont., March 8—A mass meeting of the citizens was held last night at which a resolution, moved by Rev. Dr. Clark, and seconded by T. Carlton, was unanimously adopted, protesting against the legislation that would establish a Separate school system in the two North-western Provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan; and demanding that the new Provinces should be left absolutely to themselves, both in originating and carrying into effect their own educational system; and also demanding such constitutional change in the B. N. A. Act as shall

abolish Separate schools in the Province of Ontario or place the Catholic minority in this Province simply on equal footing as relates to educational advantages with the Protestants of Quebec.

With such exhibitions of unblushing bigotry staring us in the face, is not our contemporary unreasonable in asking us to place our confidence in men who might be induced at any time to inflict injustice upon us at the behest of some of the so-called ministers of the Gospel of peace—but who are in reality promoters of discord.

THE NORTH WEST SCHOOL QUESTION.

The ministers of various denominations, the Orangemen, and that portion of the press from which hostility to Catholics is always to be looked for, have entered upon a crusade for the purpose of preventing the incorporation of a clause into the autonomy bill of the new provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan securing to the Catholic and Protestant minorities of the various school districts the right to establish Separate schools.

The Baptist Convention of Manitoba and the North West Territories through its Executive Board, which met at Winnipeg on or about March 1st, gives the following three reasons why no such right should be granted, and in sending its protest to the Dominion Government declares that it represents the Baptists of the West. The reasons it advances are:

1. It is an invasion of provincial rights. In matters of education, every province should be free to legislate for itself.
2. It is a violation of the principles conscientiously entertained by Baptists, the principle of equal rights, and the principle of separation of Church and State.
3. It is a scheme which will provoke discord and defeat one of the great purposes of Public school education, which is the unification of all classes. A confederation cannot be sound in which the elements lack the first essential of harmony.

Several other bodies of ministers, presbyteries, Evangelical alliances, and even the Church of England House of Bishops of Rupert's Land, as we noticed in our last issue, have passed similar resolutions, and, for once in its history, the Toronto Ministerial Association on the 6th inst. identified itself with the Orange Lodges by appointing a committee to act with the committee of the York County Orange Lodge to take united action to prevent a Separate school clause from being inserted in the autonomy bill. The reasons advanced by all these bodies for their opposition to Separate schools are always the same, and by showing the fallacy of those given by the Baptists, we show the fallacy and unreasonableness of all.

1. Is it true that the Separate school clauses in the autonomy bill violate provincial rights?

We maintain that the first duty towards children, the duty of nurturing, educating and rearing them, is due by parents and not by the state, whether we regard the State as being the province, the Dominion, or the British Empire as a whole. The children are given by God primarily to their parents, and it is primarily the duty of parents to fulfill the duties of rearing their children in the way they should go.

This is taught by the law of nature itself, and is confirmed by Holy Scripture, wherein we read:

"You fathers, provoke not your children to anger; but bring them up in the discipline and correction of the Lord." (Eph. vi. 4.)

Elsewhere we find the same principle asserted under the Old Law:

By command of God, Moses spoke to the people of Israel: (Deut. iv. 10.)

"Neither is there any other nation so great that hath God's so high them as our God is present to all our petitions; for what other nation is there so renowned that hath ceremonies and just judgments and all the law, which I will set forth this day before your eyes? Forget not the words that thy eyes have seen and let them not go out of thy heart all the days of thy life. Thou shalt teach them to thy sons and to thy grandsons. . . . Call together the people unto me that they may hear my words and may learn to fear me all the time they live on the earth, and may teach their children."

From this it will be seen that by God's command and by the law of nature it is the duty of parents in the first place to educate their children, and to educate them religiously.

But the Baptists tell us in their second resolution that there must be a separation of Church and State. We shall not argue this question here. Let this be conceded for the present. Then it is not the business of the State to give religious education, but it is the duty of parents, and the State has no business to throw obstacles in their way.

Now it is well known that parents generally have either not the time or not the inclination, or not the ability to teach their children personally, and they certainly have the right and duty

to employ competent teachers for this purpose.

We willingly admit that it is well for the State to assist in the work of education, but when it does so, it should be rather to help the parents than to put an intolerable burden upon them. The State may help education, and it is advisable that it should do so; but in this case it should give, at least, the same encouragement to schools in which religion is taught as to those in which it is not allowed to tell the children there is a God Who will reward the good and punish the wicked. According to the Baptist principle, the only religion which should be taught in the school-room is Atheism, for it is a real Atheism if the mention of a God is to be prohibited.

We do not desire that the State in our much mixed commonwealth should undertake the teaching of religion, but we do desire that the teaching of religion in the schools should not be visited with a penalty, as would be the case if, besides supporting schools to which parents can conscientiously send their children, these parents are obliged also to educate their neighbors' children in godless schools.

But we are told, "leave this matter to the provincial authorities to settle. They may be trusted to do justice."

There was a different story when the British North America Act was being prepared. The Protestant minority of Quebec had been treated justly by the Catholic majority without any demur. But even then, that minority desired that the rights they had obtained should be secured to them permanently by a clause in the Act which would bar the province from ever repealing them. If the Protestant minority in Quebec was entitled to such protection why should not the Catholic minority in the North West be similarly protected in the enjoyment of the rights they possess?

When the Confederation of Canada was about to take place, the Protestants of Quebec stated that some improvements to the Separate school laws of the province were needed in order to make them fully satisfactory, and the Catholic majority consented at once to make these improvements before Confederation, so that the Confederation Act should make them permanent. Why should not the Protestants of the North-West, and of all Canada, consent now to give the Catholic minorities in the two new provinces a similar permanency of rights? And there is no justice in saying this is a matter for the province to attend to, for the very strongest of assurance is due to the minority, and this can be had only from the highest authority in the Confederation, in which Catholics are fairly well represented. This assurance cannot be had except from the Government and Parliament of the Dominion, as the Catholics of the Dominion are about 42 per cent. of the whole population.

2. We are next told that the educational provisions of the autonomy law as proposed are contrary to the Baptist conscience. The Baptists and other interfering sects need to be told that other people besides themselves have consciences which are to be respected as well as theirs. Now, as there is no question of forcing them to send their children to Separate schools they may make their consciences easy, and at the same time allow the consciences of those who are really concerned in the matter to be satisfied.

There is no union of Church and State if the same aid be given by the Government to Separate schools which is given to Public schools. The Government in such case does not aid the religious teaching, but it aids the secular teaching which is given in both classes of schools.

3. The Baptists must have a very low conception of what religion teaches if they imagine that discord will be promoted if Separate schools be established. Religion, at all events the Catholic religion, teaches love for all mankind without distinction of nationality or creed, and the promotion of such teaching cannot lead to discord.

In proof of this we refer the Winnipeg Convention to the nineteenth chapter of the Catholic catechism in which all our children are instructed. We are to love our neighbors as ourselves, and our neighbors are "all mankind," "without any exception of persons, even those who injure us or differ from us in religion."

moment. The Baptists are only 61 per cent. of the population of Canada, and they will find it a difficult matter to unify the population in accordance with their standard.

UNIFICATION.

The Baptist Convention of Manitoba and the North West Territories has resolved that "one of the great purposes of Public School Education is the unification of all classes," and that "a confederation cannot be sound in which the elements lack the first essential of harmony."

If perfect unification is really the object of Public school education, would it not be advisable for the Baptist denomination to give the example by unifying themselves with the most numerous Church in the Dominion, which is the Catholic Church? It would be so much easier for a small denomination consisting of 61 per cent. of the population to join a Church which numbers 41 per cent. to let itself be absorbed, than for the most numerous body to be absorbed into the little Baptist sect. And, besides, which of the Baptists sects has the greatest powers of absorption? Should all the Churches of the Dominion allow themselves to be absorbed by the Free-will or Calvinistic or Seventh Day Baptists, or the Mennonites?

Would it not be advisable for the executive committee which declares that it represents the whole Baptist body of the North-West to learn to give their thoughts in intelligible English, before they try to enforce their educational theories upon the whole Dominion?

The Catholic and Protestant Separate schools of Ontario and Quebec do not interfere with the Baptist body, and neither would Separate schools in the North-West interfere with their religious convictions. Why, then, do they persist in making themselves odious by endeavoring to force their opinions upon others who do not see things in the same light with them? Unfortunately as it is that there are religious divergences in Canada, they must be borne with, and instead of endeavoring to do away with them by force, the greatest toleration should be exercised, unless where pretended religious convictions endanger the welfare of the whole community, and the greatest liberty of conscience should be allowed by permitting parents to educate their children in the schools they prefer.

MR. GOLDWIN SMITH SPEAKS.

Goldwin Smith, who has always shown himself to be irreconcilably hostile to Catholics and to Irishmen, has come forth from his retirement to issue a dictum on the question of denying to the people of the North-West the right of establishing Separate schools.

A letter appeared from him in the Globe a few days ago which as usual exhibits his undying opposition to Catholics, and in it he makes it known that it is because these schools will chiefly affect Catholics that he opposes them. He says:

"I should be borne in mind that the term 'separate' in this connection practically means Roman Catholic, and that what is proposed is that the new Provinces shall be bound forever to recognize, maintain and propagate the Roman Catholic religion."

This is where the shoe pinches. It was all right for the Protestant minority in Quebec to insist on their protection against any possible interference with their vested rights by the Catholic majority, which never manifested any desire to trespass upon them; but it is all wrong to protect a Catholic minority from possible oppression by similar provisions in the law which regards them.

Mr. Goldwin Smith has one measure for a Protestant, and quite a different one for a Catholic minority. We are much mistaken if the Dominion Government will look at the matter through Mr. Smith's spectacles. We cannot see why Mr. Smith went to the trouble of writing his letter at all, unless he imagined that the magic influence of his name would decide the question. He evidently overestimates the weight of his opinion on school matters.

We congratulate our esteemed friend, Chevalier John Heney, of Ottawa, on the mark of respect recently shown him by the Board of Trade of that city. The occasion was a most festive one, and the complimentary references made to this distinguished gentleman, who will attain his eighty-fourth year on the 16th of April next, were richly deserved. Chevalier Heney takes rank amongst that large number of Irishmen who have, by industry, integrity and perseverance, reflected honor upon their native country and who have likewise been a distinct benefit to Canada. We hope he will live many more years to enjoy the esteem of his fellow-citizens. He is one of those estimable characters who exude sunshine about him wherever he goes.

The Toronto its old work of exaggeration at excite the elect that portion of relates to Separ new provinces w ated into the l which propose t ate schools are security that a alike shall be were accorded

The Orangemen wherever Catho are concerned, authority of t announced in that on the "Orangemen we No doubt it Orange flame temporary has times that the Antonomy Bill Sir Wilfred La gate at Ottawa at one time as yet been appr iminating the son for any d the House of b be laid finally Whence did its information so deep in itsi Lawler as to him, and we get it from either.

It was evide tion manufac Empire's staff of fanning Ore

HOW PU MAN

The young arrival in M dred English the issue of t 7th inst. cert Being desiro the new arriv the question o he singled o blank asked immigrants f ally take of they in favor system? Of answered a and said opposed to principle. M said, they with the sch having been rates for the signed to p contrary to t will certain free from sec very well i man failed that he had the question no man is ca to call upon the propag contrary to is the use word "raci know about only an hou Such is th lie opinion

This is th separated b appear to b misrepresent Surely some the exera justifies th statement fr the respect Church, T Empire to along this

"I have and Empire reporting to Archbishop the Separa and statin a thesis co Separate s

"So far article ref Walsh the nephew, ar his execut ments are Mr. Hu Archbisho the statem say he tak are not ju was made.

A very theory is fellow citi class of se in which o up to man side. If ou wedded to give Cath ity by Protostan Province