

# The Catholic Register,

PUBLISHED EVERY THURSDAY,

AT THE

OFFICE, 40 LOMBARD STREET, TORONTO.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION:

TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM.

FOR ADVERTISING RATES APPLY AT OFFICE.

TRAVELLING AGENTS:

Messrs. Patrick Mungovan, C. N. Murphy,  
C. J. Kernahan and L. O'Byrne.

THURSDAY, JULY 12, 1894.

## Calendar for the Week.

- July 12—St. John Gualbert, Abbot.
- 13—St. Anacleto, Pope and Martyr
- 14—St. Bonaventura, Confessor and Doctor.
- 15—Ninth Sunday after Pentecost. The Octave of the Dedication of the Cathedral Church.
- 16—Our Blessed Lady of Mount Carmel.
- 17—S. Leo IV., Pope and Confessor.
- 18—S. Camillus of Lellis.

## New York State Convention.

Several weeks since in replying to an article in the *Mail* which gave an *ex parte* view of the amendment introduced in the New York State Convention by the Association for the Protection of American Institutions we promised to give the other side of the question more fully when it was brought before the committee. As Christian charity is the same everywhere, we may expect to find that the arguments advanced for and against the State's accepting the services of religious bodies in the care of its poor wards are the same in the United States as they are in Canada. Every portion of the able speeches of the two distinguished defenders of religious charity applies to the condition of affairs among us here in Ontario. The Catholics, who were the body really attacked, were singularly fortunate in their advocates. Mr. Frederic Coudert is the gentleman who drew so much praise to himself by his able presentation of the case of the United States before the Behring Sea Arbitration Committee. Col. George Bliss, who is a convert to the faith, is leader of the Republican party in New York City, while Mr. Coudert occupies a high place in the Democratic ranks. Both are zealous and undoubted defenders of the principles of the Republic, in fact, the long-named association ranked Col. Bliss among its members, so that their candid speeches will be accepted by all classes of citizens as being dictated by the best religious and patriotic motives.

The advocates of the amendment, Mr. Coudert thought, had failed to make out their case. Mr. Butler had said at the last hearing that the Catholics were getting more than the Protestants of the public money and that the distribution was unfair. If the distribution was unfair it should be abolished. Was it not a fact, however, that the Protestants were getting all they earned? The Catholic Church was always the Church of the poor.

If it were known how much it spends for charity, those not in the Church would be astonished. It supported in this State out of its own funds 7,000 indigent persons. The Protestants said: "That's right, keep on; but you must pay for it yourselves." Was it fair to accept honest service and not pay for it? If the Catholics were to be separated from the Protestants they must be separated logically, forbidden to serve in the Army, and the like. If the Catholics care for the poor they should be paid for it. The advantage taken of them was that, feeling obliged to send their children to their own schools and institutions, they were still forced to pay for these institutions themselves and their share of the others also.

George Bliss followed Mr. Coudert, answering the arguments advanced by the advocates

of the amendment. The Protestants had begun the system of receiving State aid for their institutions, and it was a number of years before Catholics received a cent. In the Convention of 1867 there was no question of stopping such appropriations as now proposed, but only of appointing a board to supervise the expenditures. Even this was voted down. The State now pays the private institutions less by a half than it would cost the State to do the same work, and less than it costs the institutions themselves. The money was all paid for work done. Attached to Bishop Potter's church in New York was a Shepherd's Home which received \$3,000 a year whether it contained a child or not. The Female Guardian Society got \$25,000 a year with no obligation to do a thing. Of course it did do much, but it was not obliged to do it. The Children's Aid Society got \$70,000 without obligations to make return.

It has been charged that the Catholics received more money than they needed for charitable work, and used the surplus in propagating their faith. After a careful examination of all the accounts of the various institutions, he could say positively that this was not so.

The Catholics, if State aid were cut off, must greatly curtail their charities. The Convention would have to make provisions at once for the 20,500 children in Catholic institutions. Mr. Bliss said:

"There are in the State of New York 18 State institutions, with 12,423 inmates. There are 58 Roman Catholic institutions, receiving State aid, with 20,500 inmates. There are about 45 Roman Catholic institutions supporting about 7,000 orphans or other dependent objects of charity, which receive no aid from the State or from any city, county, or town.

"If this amendment is passed, the State will have to care for these 20,500 inmates of the Catholic institutions. The State rate would be \$196.77 per capita, against \$52.11 which the State gives these Catholic institutions to pay for the State wards. If this amendment prevails, the cost to the State, for caring for State wards now in the private institutions would be increased \$6,821,145.

"I declare as false the statement of the amount of moneys received by these institutions last year by the advocates of this amendment. They stated that the Catholic institutions received \$604,000, the Protestants \$38,000, and the Hebrews \$148,000."

Mr. Bliss produced a certified statement from Comptroller Fitch, of New York City showing that the Catholic institutions received, in 1893, \$603,814, the Protestant, institutions \$302,729, and the Hebrew institutions \$148,000.

Mr. Bliss attacked the wording of the amendment, declaring that nobody could tell what was the meaning of the phrase "ecclesiastical control."

"What is the meaning of the word 'sectarian'? If its managers are all Catholics it is a sectarian institution of course. But how if the managers are Protestant of different sects? I charge distinctly that it is the intention of the movers of this amendment to call such institutions unsectarian. Only Protestant institutions are, in their opinion, non-sectarian."

Mr. Bliss said that if the amendment was to be clear, it must read: "Sectarian institutions wholly or in part under Roman Catholic, Protestant, Jewish or other ecclesiastical control."

We have quoted from these speeches so extensively, because the arguments fit the case of our charitable institutions so well. Here, as there, Catholics supply their hard-earned money in the cause of charity; here, as there, we open our hospitals and asylums to the distressed of every creed, and color, and clime; here, as there, we attend to the poor whom the state accepts as wards, more cheaply and more carefully than it can do so itself, and here too, as there, we are covered with opprobrium, accused of the lowest motives and insulted in language of which our well of English undefiled (1) is so full.

States and cities accept the services of various organizations in the handling of their senseless chattels and dumb animals, but when it comes to the handling of men with all their finer qualities and sensibilities, they often overlook what is the best for both sides, and hand them over to the officers with less consideration than they give to the lower things. Read the records of state charities in the Statistics or in the fiction of any country, in France, in England, in America, and you will find them

administered too frequently without regard to any feeling except the official zeal for the mighty dollar. English law in all countries where its spirit prevails, looks upon the pauper as a criminal, and the "workhouse," dignify it by what name you will, is still to the unfortunate a goal. The Catholic spirit regards the poor as "God's poor" and endeavors to make their lot bearable by the kindly influences of Christian religion. Hence the Church is known even among Protestants as the "Church of the Poor." It should be a pleasure and an example to the sects in this country to see "How these Christians love one another" instead of being a reason for offering insult and opprobrium. Governments too should adopt a liberal attitude towards even the lowest and poorest of its subjects. We are very much governed nowadays. We are "legislated" almost beyond endurance. There is an idea growing up that a government should have a grandmotherly supervision over all the acts of its children. Need we say that such an idea is wrong? If men or women broken down by old age or want or disease wish to enter into an institution where they can receive consolations and attentions fitted to their condition, and if there can be provided to the complete satisfaction of the State and at a low rate, why should objections be raised by anyone against the fulfilment of the desires of the unfortunates? It is certainly the duty as well as the right of the State to see that the conditions are satisfactory, and its own expenses moderate, but after that there can be no possible reason why it should dictate to the individual the place of his residence during the period of his trouble. This seems fair, does it not, good Protestant friends? It seems fair, because it is fair. Let authorities cease then to treat their poor human wards with less consideration than they give to their unfeeling chattels.

## Lessons of the Campaign.

It is to be hoped that all parties concerned will profit by the manifest and wholesome lessons contained in the result of last week's Provincial elections. The Conservative leaders, unless utterly blinded by prejudice, or caused by mental aberration—according to the old Pagan aphorism: *Quem Deus vult perdere prius dementat*—must have already reached the conclusion that appeals to bigotry and cries of ostracism against Catholics are not a means to success in the Premier Province of this Dominion. They must have felt the sad and bitter experience that such unmanly methods of a by-gone age are now frowned upon by enlightened majorities; and that the weapons used to stir up religious hatred and civil strife are but fatal boomerangs that recoil upon the heads of those who cast them to their own utter humiliation and disgrace.

For the third time has the *Mail-Meredith* Combination essayed to gain power and the government of this Province by misrepresentation of the standing and privileges of Catholics in regard to their schools, their churches and their charities. A solid Protestant vote was sought for, and expected,

as the only possible way to achieve a victory for the hungry incapables who have, by false issues and repeated attempts at creating a war of creeds, earned for themselves the contempt and disgust of all sensible and honest citizens. Surely, the lesson ought to be well learnt by this time, and nothing but downright madness or utter despair should ever permit the defeated and disgruntled Politicians of this Province to have recourse to such unhallowed and discreditable methods in future political contests.

The lessons we Catholics should learn from the late experience are sufficiently obvious. Although the present Administration has not done for us all that we might hope for and expect from a truly Liberal Government, yet we owe the members of the Ontario Government a debt of gratitude in that we were not abandoned to the tender mercies of the P.P.A.'s during the heat of battle, nor left exposed and unprotected to all the blows that an unscrupulous and powerful enemy rained upon our devoted heads. The infamous lies that were retailed of us by every P.P.A. stump orator throughout the country were taken up and contradicted by some friend of the Mowat Administration. The threats that were made against our liberties and Constitutional rights were treated with utter contempt in public halls by Protestants of a liberal complexion.

Our schools and our hospitals, our orphan homes and places of refuge for the aged and the destitute were the subject of public debate on many a stormy rostrum, and on all occasions did our Reform friends and allies put the Orange bigot and P.P.A. fanatic to shame and confusion. Well, have our people shown their thorough and heartfelt appreciation of such efforts in seasonable aid. Recreant would they have proved to every claim of honor and instinct of common gratitude had they not turned out *en masse* this time, and moved in solid bodies to the polls. Their influence was felt and honored in every constituency; and many a sterling Conservative, we are told, indignant at the shameful alliance of P.P.Aism, voted for the Liberal Mowat Administration. The lesson for the men in power is henceforth to treat with contempt every menace coming from the ranks of fanaticism.

Let them go on, without fear or favor, in the work of rewarding merit wheresoever found. Let them not hesitate in helping every effort to advance the general interests of the Province. The threats of the *Mail* or the P.P.A.'s should have no weight in deterring the Government from giving every possible facility to Catholics to make their Schools more efficient and their charities more abundant.

It is also most fondly to be hoped that the McKenzie-Bowell-Clark-Wallace &c., Administration in Ottawa will be convinced of the death and burial of P.P.Aism in Ontario, and that the Government which they represent will cease to fear to make a Catholic appointment to any office. Through sordid fear of the unknown quantity, the P.P.A.'s have been for some time getting the fat of the land. Now their influence is known at its full value. Let Sir John Thompson and friends be guided accordingly. *Verbum sap.*