

The Catholic Record.

Published Weekly at 484 and 486 Richmond street, London, Ontario.
Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

EDITOR: REV. GEORGE E. NORTHGRAVES, Author of "Mistakes of Modern Infidels," THOMAS COFFEY, Publisher and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY, Printer, 484 and 486 Richmond street, London, Ontario. Rates of Advertising—Ten cents per line each insertion, agents measurement.

Approved and recommended by the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa, and St. Boniface, and the Bishops of Hamilton and Peterborough, 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. Advertisers must be paid in full before the paper can be stopped.

London, Saturday, May 18, 1895.

INGERSOLL AND HIS PRINCIPLES.

Bob Ingersoll recently lectured in Detroit on his usual theme. The lecture was directed against the truth of the Bible, the inspired exponent of Christian truth. A synopsis thereof was published in the *Detroit Evening News* and was ably refuted in the next issue by a correspondent over the signature "Naylor." It was currently reported that the defender of the truth was a Protestant minister, but the *Michigan Catholic* has made it known that the vindicator of truth in this instance was one of the priests of Detroit.

The real refutation of Col. Ingersoll's blasphemous has been from the beginning the work of Catholic priests. It is true that several Protestant ministers have written replies to the Infidel, but not one of these has been satisfactory to any degree. The truth is that Protestantism is too vague in its estimate of inspiration to afford any sure ground on which to base a reply to the attacks of infidelity upon religion, and so the task of replying to Ingersoll and other blasphemers of his ilk must fall upon Catholic priests well acquainted with the nature of the work to be done, or the Infidels will remain unanswered. The Catholic Church is the only bulwark against infidelity.

The Colonel is well aware of this, and in his Detroit lecture he practically requested priests to pay no attention to his vagaries. He said:

"I ask ministers, not priests, how they can be wicked enough to defend the book which has made the world a practical slaughter-house."

Naylor answers this very caustically: "You exclude 'priests,' perhaps because you remember the logical skinning you received from priest Lambert. Dost remember how you dared not meet him before the Nineteenth Century Club? The practical slaughter-house evidently didn't catch all the calves. One at least has escaped, for he does not know that the Bible records that God's people put an end to the human sacrifices which in groves and mountain fastnesses were daily offered in thousands to Satan by infidels—enemies of Jehovah."

Ingersoll has not been able to answer Father Lambert's scathing reply to his carefully composed attacks on the Christian religion which appeared in the *North American Review*, nor the more full work of Father Northgraves of this diocese, entitled "Mistakes of Modern Infidels," in which every argument of the godless author of "Mistakes of Moses" has been answered squarely without any beating about the bush.

The quondam bellicose colonel has been remarkably silent for some years, and we had entertained hopes that he was reconsidering his position; but within the past year he has resumed the labors he laid out for himself years ago, to overthrow Christianity, and to substitute for it Islamism Buddhism, or Confucianism.

We have not far to seek to find the motives which induce the godless colonel to follow the course he has taken. Five hundred dollars for a lecture pay him well; but do the public receive benefit from him to that amount?

He claims in his "Mistakes of Moses" that he is a destroyer of weeds and the like—and so is entitled to public gratitude. But it is a fact that, since his advocacy of suicide last summer, suicides became more numerous; and a few days after his remarkable letter on this subject was published, two poor dupes poisoned themselves together in New York Central Park, one of whom had in his pocket a copy of that letter. No doubt the miserable couple were induced by the colonel's letter to destroy themselves. It is; thus the colonel's principles prove whether or not he is "the benefactor of mankind" he claims to be, and whether he is sowing thistles or strawberries.

FANTASTIC STATISTICIANS.

When fiction rises pleasing to the eye, Men will believe, because they love the lie. —CHURCHILL.

One of the points urged most strongly by Mr. Dalton McCarthy in his Pavilion speech on the Manitoba school question was that the Russian Mennonites of that Province, who were said to outnumber the Catholics by two to one, are also seeking for Separate schools, and that they could not reasonably be refused their demand if the Catholic claims were admitted.

His audience, too, being disposed to accept any statement of the champion of intolerance, applauded this most vociferously, as if it were an argument decisive of the question in debate, and papers favorable to Mr. McCarthy style it "a powerful argument."

We pointed out at the time the absurdity of the statement. The Catholics of Manitoba number 20,571 by the last census, and the Mennonites should number about, or over, 40,000 if Mr. McCarthy's statements were correct, even "in round numbers."

We pointed out that there are only 1,156 whose specific religion is not given in the census.

The Baptists are set down at 16,112, and adding to these two classes the Lutherans and Brethren, we obtain a total of only 19,740. We admit that the Mennonites may have been generally included by the enumerators under some of these names; but of the Baptists, at all events, it is known that many are Canadian, and not Russian Mennonites. The German Lutherans would also indignantly repudiate their being classified under this name. It is clear, therefore, that Mr. McCarthy's figures are grossly exaggerated for the purpose of making a point; but Mr. Sifton in his recent Toronto speech has thrown more light on the subject by asserting that the 15,000 Manitoba Mennonites are asking for schools of their own.

It was cruel of Mr. Sifton thus to explode his ally's most powerful argument; but his figures are certainly nearer the truth than Mr. McCarthy's, by at least 25,000, though we are of opinion that they are still exaggerated, and our reason for this opinion is to be found in the census returns as quoted above. It is probable that Mr. Sifton, who ought to be able to give a pretty accurate estimate on the subject, wished to let Mr. McCarthy down without hurting him badly.

The case of the Mennonites is quite different from that of the Catholics in other respects than on account of their comparative numbers; for it was at a time when the Province was nearly equally divided between Catholics and Protestants that provision was made as a condition of its entry into the Dominion, that the system of Separate schools should be a fundamental institution; and for this purpose the Protestants certainly regarded themselves as one body, not desiring among themselves any further distinction than that they should be classed as Protestants for educational purposes. The Catholics, therefore, had Separate schools guaranteed to them in the basis of union, but the Mennonites, who were strangers from a foreign country, had no such guarantee. Making their homes in Canada, it was to be supposed that they should accept the situation existing in the country on their arrival into it; but the Catholics are children of the soil, entitled to all the privileges of British subjects, and especially to those which were made a constitutional basis for their entering into the Canadian Confederation.

It is proper also to remark here that Mr. Sifton announced to the people of Toronto that the real Bill of Rights, which was the basis on which Manitoba entered Confederation, did not contain any clause guaranteeing the permanency of Separate schools. He asserted that this clause was an interpolation—a forgery in fact—by the late venerated Archbishop of St. Boniface and Father Richot.

This accusation proves that impudence is no small element in Mr. Sifton's make-up. Even if it were true that the Bill of Rights contained no such clause, the accusation against Archbishop Tache and Father Richot is an unjustifiable impertinence. But in regard to the Bill of Rights there is no doubt. The original has, it appears, been mislaid—perhaps stolen—from the Dominion archives, and it cannot now be found; but there is ample evidence as to what it contained. It was produced at the trial of the Manitoba case before the Canadian Supreme Court, and there is a certified copy of it in the Department of Justice, and we have the pronouncement on its authenticity by the Canadian Supreme

Court, and the Judicial Committee of the British Privy Council, all attesting that the Separate school clause is genuine.

In addition to all this we have the Manitoba Act, which was passed by Parliament to carry out the promises of the Canadian Government to Manitoba, and we were assured that the Separate school clause was inserted in that Act for the purpose of fulfilling the pledges of the Government to the people of that province.

It has recently been stated that the original Bill of Rights has been rediscovered, and that it does not contain the Separate school clause. As it is known that there were several drafts of this Bill, only one of which was the one approved by the people of Manitoba, taken to Ottawa by the delegates of the territory, and accepted by the Canadian Government, it is quite possible that the parties who succeeded in making away with the original document have managed also to produce one of the spurious ones which they wish to substitute for it now; but there is too much evidence, proving what the original contained, to make any such plan as this successful. In addition to the evidence we have already mentioned, we have the positive statements of Father Richot, one of the Manitoba delegates, and of the late Archbishop Tache, who was chosen by the Dominion Government as an intermediary to bring about a peaceful settlement of the troubles of 1869-70, that the Bill of Rights agreed to by the two contracting parties contained the Separate school clause, and no spurious copy of that document can now be substituted for the original. At all events, even independently of the original Bill of Rights, the Constitution given by the Canadian Parliament to Manitoba, and accepted by unanimous vote of the first Manitoba Legislature as the basis of the rights of the new Province, should be sufficient to convince any intelligent observer of events that it was the intention of the inhabitants of the Province that minority rights should be placed beyond control of the majority, whether the unknown future would make that majority Catholic or Protestant. It is only because the minority has proved to be Catholic that the Manitoba Government is bold enough to set aside those rights; but it is evident that it is the duty of the Government and Parliament of the Dominion resolutely to maintain them.

In maintaining their rights, the Catholics of Manitoba have calmly but firmly adhered to what is guaranteed in the constitution of our country. The agitation against the constitution has been confined to those who have always professed that they are bound by their oaths to maintain the constitution and the constitutional rights of British subjects of all classes and creeds; but we have never been deceived by these professions. We knew them to be a delusion and a snare.

GAMBLING.

Some may wonder why we do not leave such topics to the pulpit, where they could be treated more convincingly and earnestly. But a Catholic paper is but the echo of a Catholic pulpit, and we make no apology.

Our young and old men gamble; and if there are any who doubt this statement they may enquire at the Customs houses and discover from the number of packs of cards that find their way weekly into Canada that it is an indisputable fact. There are many who spend their Sundays in the fascinating work of card-shuffling. You will see them in hotels, in club-rooms, etc., anxious and careworn, bending every energy to the task of endeavoring to make a little money. Gold is their god, and gambling is the short way to his temple. And who can estimate the irreparable damage done to character by such uncautious recreation! Far from us to play the role of a fanatic on such a subject. We have no censure for the family party where to while away an hour cards are resorted to, but we condemn unreservedly the assemblies of young men who know no nobler species of recreation than gambling. It is the beginning of ruin. It is the origin of unhealthy and feverish thoughts that deprive him of manhood and make him oftentimes a thief and drunkard. Many an absconder dates his downfall from the pleasant poker party. He gets into the habit of providing himself with a little money from the strong box of his employer. He returns it, of course. But luck fails him, and he must needs pay another visit to the cash box. And so it runs on, and his

indebtedness to his employer becomes larger until suspicions are aroused and he finds himself dismissed, branded with the stigma of theft that years of faithful labor will be powerless to efface.

And if such does not happen he becomes, sooner or later, bereft of the high endeavor. Persistent toil has no charms for him. He becomes a failure, and joins the ranks of those young men who are fond of ascribing their non-success in life to their Catholicity. Poor infants who expect coddling, and who imagine that they can stand idly and win the prizes of life! Bigots there are who will not employ a Catholic, but they are few in number compared to the vast army of men who look only to integrity and business qualifications.

Unflagging toil never failed yet, and never will, and if our young men are hewers of wood and drawers of water, they owe it to themselves, to their want of energy and endurance. We should advise them in the first place to shun the innocent game of poker. We indeed feel diffident in uttering this warning, but we know that our interest in their welfare will do much to condone our presumption and to impress upon them that our words are prompted by sad and inglorious careers of many from whom we expected much.

Let them shut their club-rooms against gambling of any kind. They will, of course, be opposed by "the croakers and kickers," but they can, without any detriment, efface their names from the roll of membership. They are always stumbling-blocks to the progress of any organization. It is sometimes alleged that the money gained by gambling parties is employed to defray the expenses of a club organization. This is no palliative, and better far there should be no clubs, no societies, than that our young men should be ruined.

THE PROSPECT FOR HOME RULE.

The question whether the Liberal party of England will shelve the question of Home Rule for Ireland is being constantly discussed by the Tory papers, and the opinion is freely expressed by them that Irish Home Rule is a dead issue. In this conclusion Mr. Smalley also concurs; but there is no doubt that in every case the wish is father to the thought.

The fight against Home Rule has been carried on with great bitterness, and Mr. Arthur Balfour persists in asserting that the advocates of Home Rule are aiming at the dismemberment of the Empire. This is a cunning presentation of the case, as the people of Great Britain, and especially of England, are jealous of any movement which might result in the weakening of Imperial power and prestige; but that it is a misrepresentation of the case is clear from the undeniable attachment to the Empire of the Liberal politicians, who have pledged themselves without reserve to the granting of Home Rule.

No one can doubt the sincerity of Mr. Gladstone, Lord Rosebery, Mr. Morley, and Sir William Harcourt, in their professions of attachment to the Empire, and their desire to see its prestige remain undiminished. Yet these all have assured us over and over again that, instead of weakening the power of the Empire, a Home Rule measure satisfactory to the people of Ireland will consolidate its strength, by making a contented people, who will feel that their interests are irrevocably bound up with those of the people generally. The strength of a State is necessarily dependent on the good will and loyalty of the people, all of which cannot be assured if they feel that they are governed, not for the purpose of making them prosperous, but for that of enriching a few landlords at the expense of their hard toil. Home Rule is the only means of securing that Ireland will be properly governed; for experience has shown that Ireland's grievances cannot be removed, in the House of Parliament at Westminster, that attention which is necessary that the measures needed for the prosperity of the country may be passed. The great Liberal party has become thoroughly convinced of all this, and thus they have bound themselves most solemnly to pass a good Home Rule measure. The question, therefore, is not dead, and it will be passed certainly if the Liberals remain in power. If they are defeated at the next election, of course the passage of Home Rule will be deferred, but not indefinitely. We have every confidence, however, that the Liberals will win, and that the question of

Home Rule will come to the front again, and that even the Lords will yield obedience to the renewed mandate of the people.

The unfortunate division of the Irish Nationalist party into two camps has undoubtedly delayed the gaining of Home Rule, but it has not destroyed its prospect. Time will certainly heal this breach, though there is still a considerable amount of bitterness existing between the two Nationalist parties. The bulk of the Irish people, however, are determined on carrying out the true Irish policy. They are not tied to factions, and they will rally around the National party more and more resolutely till it become, once more a unit.

That the Liberals have not abandoned Home Rule has been made evident by very recent pronouncements of Lord Rosebery, Lord Spencer, Sir William Harcourt, Mr. Morley, Mr. Shaw Lefevre and others. Mr. Morley said, only a few weeks ago, that the Liberals are still determined to give a Home Rule measure "which shall not fall short of Mr. Gladstone's bill of 1893."

In the meantime the people of Ireland are more content than ever to wait peacefully till the natural course of events shall bring about the final result on which they have set their hearts. Legislation has been secured which has greatly ameliorated their condition, though it has not assured to them all they desire. This will only be when Home Rule will be established, but they have the firm conviction that this will certainly come.

A recent letter from Mr. William O'Brien to the *Chicago New World* expresses this conviction, or at least that even if the next general election should result in a not very decisive victory for the Tories, the victory will be ultimately with the Liberals, and Home Rule will become the law of the land. "The extent of the defeat or victory of Home Rule will depend," he says, "upon the suppression of personal revolts in the ranks of the Liberals, and the gradual approximation of all sections of Nationalists toward the common platform contemplated by the Archbishop of Dublin."

The Ulster Unionists are, on the other hand, making every effort to carry on the war against the Nationalist proposition. The various Unionist Leagues have issued a joint appeal to the public to contribute £10,000 to enable them to fight against Home Rule, and to propagate their principles in preparation for the coming election.

On the occasion of their last similar appeal, not a tithe of the money they demanded was forthcoming; and it can scarcely be expected that the present begging circular will be a whit more successful. The Irish landlord party know by this time that their star is no longer in the ascendant, and they have grown discouraged at the prospect, and hampered as they are by the diminished incomes they are receiving in consequence of the partial recognition of tenants' rights which has already become law, they are not disposed to throw away good money as bait for fishes that will not bite.

There has been recently some dissatisfaction in the ranks of the Tories, owing to the want of success which has followed the union of their party with the dissident Liberals, or Liberal Unionists, under lead of Mr. Joseph Chamberlain. They feel that the alliance has not given that strength to their cause which they hoped in the beginning to derive from it, and they are freely expressing their dissatisfaction.

Lord Salisbury and Mr. Balfour have both spoken lately on this subject, the tenor of their remarks being the same. Lord Salisbury's desire is expressed as follows:

"The mass of the Conservative voters, and certainly the leaders of the party, are desirous that the alliance between the Conservative and Liberal Unionist parties shall be confirmed and strengthened."

Mr. Balfour said: "The Unionist Alliance aims at the greatness of the Empire alone, has the right to subscribe itself the Imperial party to promote social reform, to maintain industrial liberty, and to resist socialist schemes."

That it should be now deemed necessary to argue thus in favor of continuing the Alliance, indicates that feeling must be very strong among the Conservatives toward breaking it up; and it may be broken up at any moment, in spite of the efforts of the leaders on both sides, to preserve it. Should this be the case, the hands of the Home Rulers would be strengthened; however, the latter should rely upon their own energy and determination, rather than, Micawber-like, to wait till something like a discussion turn up in the

Tory camp which will strengthen the Liberals.

A reunion of Irish Nationalists would be sufficient to turn the scale in favor of the Liberals, and we may still hope that such a union will be effected before the general election.

A ONE-SIDED EQUAL RIGHTER.

Mr. Robert Sellar, the editor and proprietor of the *Huntingdon Gleaner*, in the issue of that paper of May 2, addresses an open letter to Sir Mackenzie Bowell, Premier of the Dominion, in reference to the Manitoba school question.

The Protestants of the Province of Quebec, for the most part, are imbued with the spirit of good-will toward their Catholic neighbors. The Hon. Mr. Joly de Lotbiniere, Mr. Pope, and other prominent Protestants, have frequently told the public that the Catholic people of Quebec are anxious to live in friendship and peace with their Protestant neighbors, and that they are tolerant and friendly toward them. This is manifested in an especial manner by the system of Protestant Separate schools which has been willingly granted by the Catholic majority, giving Protestants full control over their own system of education.

This system of Protestant schools was not forced on Quebec by any Protestant majority from other Provinces, but was granted solely by the Catholic Legislature of Quebec, and the Protestants generally appreciate this proof of Catholic toleration, and endeavor to reciprocate it by being tolerant themselves.

This is not the case, however, with Mr. Sellar, who has been always ready, through the columns of the *Gleaner*, to take a prominent part in every anti-Catholic agitation which has originated among the fanatical factions of Ontario. On the Manitoba question, as might be expected, Mr. Sellar pronounces himself opposed to the granting of justice to the Catholic minority—though he is most decided in favor of the continuance of the Protestant schools of Quebec.

He argues that "There is only one ground upon which the interference of the State with education can be justified, and that is for the protection of society. Were it not for that, the State would have no more right to provide schools for the youth of the country, than it would to arrange for giving them food and clothing."

This is his reasoning when he maintains that the Protestants of Quebec have the right to their own schools. But when the question is to deal with the Catholic minority of Manitoba, his wish is that they should be treated as a conquered race, and his reason is: "Quebec is British, not foreign soil: it is under British law and custom, etc."

This is language similar to that which has been used by Mr. Dalton McCarthy before now, but these gentlemen must learn, what they do not seem to know, that the rights of citizens of Canada are equal, no matter to which race they may belong. Even though the Quebec majority are of French origin, they are full British subjects, and the fact that their ancestors of many generations ago were natives of France, and subjects of France, the present generation are British subjects, not only by treaty, but also by birth, and their title to this position has been sealed by their loyalty to the British flag in times when they shed their blood in fighting to maintain Canada as a British dependency.

Mr. Sellar thinks that the Catholic minority in Manitoba must educate their children according to the views of the Protestant majority, while the Protestant minority in Quebec must continue to have all the rights they enjoy at present. He is very much mistaken if he really imagines that Canada is to be governed on any such one-sided principles. The Catholics of Canada are not here on toleration, but by a right which dates further back than do the rights of Protestants; for they were the first settlers of the country.

Mr. Sellar complains that where Protestants in Quebec are not numerous they are obliged to attend Catholic schools. It is true that the Catholics are taught their religion in the schools of Quebec; but in these cases, the law provides every safeguard that no child shall be obliged to receive religious education to which its parents object.

Here we may point out another serious error into which Mr. Sellar falls. He declares that we are to be governed as British subjects, and infers thence that the Catholic minority are to be over-ridden on the question of educa-