

The Catholic Record.

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

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

EDITORS: REV. GEORGE R. NORTHGRAVES, Author of "Mistakes of Modern Infidels," THOMAS COFFEY.

Publisher and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY, Messrs. LUKE KING, JOHN NICH, P. J. NEVIN and W. A. NEVIN, are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transact all other business for the CATHOLIC RECORD.

Rates of Advertising—Ten cents per line each insertion, separate 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. Advertisements must be paid in full before the paper can be started.

London, Saturday, Feb. 27, 1897.

THE HON. E. BLAKE AND THE SCHOOL QUESTION.

A strange despatch from Quebec is published to the effect that the Solicitor General of the Dominion, the Honorable Charles Fitzpatrick, wrote to the Hon. Edward Blake under date January 19 that "The Roman Catholic Bishops of the Province of Quebec have stated to the Cardinal Prefect of the Propaganda at Rome, that the effect of the judgment rendered by the Privy Council was that the Roman Catholic minority in Manitoba are entitled to their Separate Schools as they had enjoyed them previously to the Manitoba Act of 1890."

In view of this Mr. Fitzpatrick wished Mr. Blake to state whether or not this is a fact, and asked him what, in his opinion, the judgment means, and what are the powers of the Dominion Parliament under it.

In reply Mr. Blake states:

"I think it is an entire misapprehension of the judgment of the Judicial Committee to say that its effect was that the Roman Catholic minority in Manitoba are entitled to their Separate Schools as they had enjoyed them previously to the Manitoba Act of 1890."

We entertain great respect for Mr. Blake and a high estimate of his legal opinion, and we have no doubt that his interpretation of the law on this subject is correct. In fact there is nothing in the opinion given by Mr. Blake differing from what we have always held in regard to the judgment of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. We have never imagined that the decision by itself restored the rights of Catholics. We have all along been quite aware, and have frequently stated in our columns, that its effect was to constitute the Dominion Government and Parliament the judges of the nature and extent of the redress which should be given to the minority in any Province when their rights were interfered with by the majority, whatever might be the religion of the minority and majority respectively. Besides: the judgment does state distinctly what rights belong to the Catholic minority, and there is certainly a moral obligation to restore these. Mr. Blake keeps this fact in the background.

This view of the case is confirmed by Mr. Blake's answer to Mr. Fitzpatrick, for he goes on to say:

"The gist of that judgment was that, contrasting the state of things under the laws prior to 1890, the rights or privileges which the Roman Catholics had enjoyed under the former had been affected by the latter laws, thus rendering admissible an appeal to the Governor General in Council under the Manitoba Union Act, and giving the Governor General jurisdiction to proceed under that Act."

The Manitoba and British North America Acts define this matter very clearly. In regard to Provinces where Separate Schools existed at the time when Confederation took place, the right of interfering with privileges already enjoyed by law before Confederation was expressly reserved from the Provincial Legislatures. Regarding Manitoba, the intention of the Dominion Parliament was undoubtedly to make a similar reservation, not only where there were laws, but even where there was a custom under which Separate Schools were in existence.

We cannot shake off the belief that, even under the provisions of these Acts, justice demanded the legal recognition of Catholic Separate schools, but the Judicial Committee decided otherwise, and we are compelled to suppose that the Canadian legislators did not frame their Manitoba Act with sufficient care to express properly their intention.

But the rights of minorities were not left dependent solely on the original provisions of the Manitoba Act. A law was enacted unanimously by the first Legislature of Manitoba to establish Separate schools, and the fact of its doing this brought the Separate school system of the Province under the jurisdiction of the Federal Govern-

ment, for there is a provision in the constitution which protects the minority even when Separate schools are established in any Province, after its admission into Confederation. It was under this provision that the Judicial Committee made its second decision that Catholics had been aggrieved by the legislation of 1890.

Now it is to be remarked that the Dominion would have no jurisdiction unless an injury or injustice had been inflicted. This is specially laid down in the Manitoba Act, as well as the Act of Confederation. We say, therefore, that in pronouncing that the Dominion Government has jurisdiction in the Manitoba case, the Privy Council virtually pronounced that the Catholic minority has the right to have its schools restored, though it did not pronounce that there is any power which can force legislation by the Dominion Parliament. It is a matter of right and not of might.

We must say that we believe Mr. Fitzpatrick to be mistaken in his statement regarding the Bishops of Quebec. It cannot be denied that Archbishop Langevin in the first place was fully aware of the situation, and it is scarcely credible that the Bishops of Quebec were less acquainted therewith, or that if their understanding of the matter were somewhat less complete than that of Mgr. Langevin, that he would not have advised them to correct any wrong statement of the matter in their communications with the Propaganda.

We have no doubt that if the correspondence of the Bishops were to be seen, it would be found that they stated the case correctly, and in all probability somewhat in the same manner as we have done in this article.

Mr. Blake says also of the duty of the Dominion Parliament: "It is a political matter, and the court did not prescribe the steps to be taken." We admit the court did not decide on this point, but the principles of justice point out what ought to be done when an injustice has been perpetrated. It should be remedied, and the only remedy which can be applied is to restore Catholic Separate schools and to place them on the same legal basis as the Public schools of the Province.

We do not mean to say that the old system ought not to be improved. Every human institution is capable of improvement, but the abolition of the system was an outrage, and the matter must remain in Dominion politics until the outrage be repaired.

Mr. Blake says in conclusion that "Having considered the provisions of the (Laurier-Greenway) settlement, I think them infinitely more advantageous to the Roman Catholic minority than any Remedial Bill which it is in the power of the Parliament of Canada to force upon the Province of Manitoba."

We have no doubt that Mr. Blake is honest in this expression of opinion.

We cannot, however, much as we respect Mr. Blake, look upon him as the proper judge of what Catholics need as an effectual mode of giving religious instruction. It is very possible that Mr. Blake does not consider it of much importance whether or not children should have any specific religious instruction in the schools. Mr. Blake is a Protestant, and he naturally views the importance of religious education from his own standpoint. But Catholics have very decided views on this question, and we cannot be satisfied until the rights of Catholics to a real Catholic system of education be recognized.

THE NEW PRESIDENT AND THE A. P. A.

It has been announced as highly probable that Judge McKenna, of California, will be appointed Secretary of the Interior in the Cabinet of President McKinley, which will enter into the duties of office on March 4. The judge is a Catholic, and his fitness for the position is universally admitted, though there is no doubt that many non-Catholics, Protestants or non-descripts in religion, could be found who are also quite competent.

It would be a graceful act on the part of President McKinley to appoint Judge McKenna, especially as the spirit of the Constitution of the United States is that religious belief must not be a bar to promotion to any civil position. For forty two years down to the present time no Catholic has held any Cabinet position in the Federal Government, but the profession of the Catholic faith ought, certainly, not to be an obstacle to such appointment; still it is strongly to be suspected that successive Presidents have been influenced by this consideration, and have passed over Catholics, either through personal antagonism to the

Catholic religion or because they feared to face the opposition which fanatics would offer to such an appointment.

The fact that Judge McKenna has been named as likely to obtain the position now is an indication that President McKinley is above the bigotry of Apaism and kindred societies, notwithstanding the fact that the Apaisms made an effort to make the world believe at one period that the colonel was their favorite candidate, and not only their favorite, but actually their nominee.

This pretence was exploded by the refusal of the new President to recognize Apaism in any way, and the A. P. A. were so indignant at this that they formally declared their opposition to Colonel McKinley's nomination on the Republican ticket, and it was only because within a few days after they had thus committed themselves to an act of idiocy they discovered that the colonel would be nominated in spite of them, and would most probably win, that they thought it advisable to withdraw their opposition, and they did so with reluctance.

The A. P. A. cut a sorry figure in the whole transaction, and it is a piece of superlative impudence on their part now, that they are deluging President McKinley with letters and petitions remonstrating against Judge McKenna's appointment, and they lay stress upon the fact that there has been no Catholic in the Federal Government for so long a time, as if that were a just cause for perpetuating an ostracism which ought never to have existed.

We do not imagine that President McKinley will pay any attention to the representations of the fanatics. He has already shown himself superior to their influence, and we believe he will continue to be so, and that Judge McKenna will be his nominee in spite of A. P. A. protests. President Cleveland paid no attention to these bigots who on every occasion endeavored to prevent the appointment of Catholics to prominent, or even honorary, positions, their representations having been in every case disregarded, though the positions were not of such importance as that which it is expected that Judge McKenna is to attain.

Catholics assisted greatly in the establishment of the American Republic, and George Washington publicly thanked the Catholics of the country, Irish and English, for their patriotism during the Revolutionary war, and to the French and Polish Catholics, Lafayette and Kosciusko, the United States are greatly indebted for their existence as a nation. Indeed it was admitted by Washington that without their help the independence of the country would not have been achieved. A Catholic won the first naval victory for the United States in the war of 1812, and many Catholic regiments and Catholic generals distinguished themselves in helping to preserve the union during the civil war. It would be an act of the basest ingratitude now to ponder to the bigotry of the A. P. A. by ostracising Catholics in the selection of members of the Cabinet.

We may add here the secondary consideration that many Catholics, and notably Mr. Bourke Cockran, of New York, contributed by their means, their oratory and active work toward Col. McKinley's election. The new president is not the man to show ingratitude, and the A. P. A., who are now busying themselves by sending in petitions against the appointment of a Catholic to any high office, are simply beating their heads against a granite boulder.

The latest intelligence as we go to press is to the effect that Judge McKenna's appointment is decided upon.

THE BIBLE AND PROTESTANTISM.

The Rev. Lyman Abbott of Plymouth Church, New York, appears to take great delight in the notoriety he has gained by his eccentricities in doctrine and especially by his repeated attacks upon the truth and inspiration of the Bible. Two weeks ago he read in his pulpit a travesty on the book of Jonah, and last Sunday he followed this up with a denial of the inspiration of Ecclesiastes and its authorship by Solomon. He said that it is the work of a poet who identifies himself with Solomon as the wise man whom he idealizes.

Carrying out this idea he said that it has been usual with poets in all ages to assume the names of great men, and it was "to set forth his sentiments on the subject of true wisdom more graph-

ically that he treated the problem of life in the assumed character of Solomon, but the book is not inspired; it is the truth of human experience, larger and deeper than the truth of verbal inspiration."

It is almost needless to say that such sentiments are subversive of the foundation of Christianity, and the most remarkable thing about them is that they should be preached in a so-called Christian church by one who claims to be a Christian clergyman. The fact that such a teaching is given Sunday after Sunday shows beyond dispute to what Protestantism of the present day is tending. If further evidence of the fact were needed we have it in the frequency with which Protestant ministers create a sensation by enunciating similar views. Thus at a meeting of the New York ministers held on the 16th inst. in the Methodist Book Room, a paper was read by one of the ministers combating Dr. Abbot's contention in regard to the books of Jonah and Ecclesiastes in particular, and maintaining the authority and authenticity of the Bible as a whole. But one of the most prominent of the ministers of the city, the Rev. W. J. Buckley, editor of the New York Christian Advocate, the official organ of the Methodist body, boldly proclaimed that he does not believe unreservedly in the infallibility of the Bible and especially of the English version, and he added emphatically, "I think there are scarcely four men in this meeting who do."

It is true that the majority of those present vigorously protested against Dr. Buckley's statements, but there is no doubt that his views are entertained by a rapidly increasing number of ministers in all the denominations, and this being the case, what becomes of the very foundation of Protestantism, which has constantly proclaimed that the Bible is its bulwark and only rule of faith?

It is not a matter of much surprise that the Protestant system should thus degenerate into infidelity, for the rejection of the authority of the Church naturally ends in the denial of all Christian truth, and this tendency has manifested itself in Protestantism from its very beginning. Thus we have Luther speaking disparagingly of the very book of Ecclesiastes which is the most recent object of Dr. Abbot's attacks. Luther said:

"The author of Ecclesiastes seems to ride without boots and spurs, but only with sandals. Ecclesiastes, like the Talmud, is patched up from various books, and Solomon's table-talk having been at first heard as he spoke by word of mouth, and then arranged into books."

It is in fact on the authority of the Catholic Church that the whole Scripture canon rests, and without that authority we may expect just such confusion as now exists among Protestants in regard to the authority of the Bible.

We may add that the book of Ecclesiastes itself attests its authorship, for it opens with the declaration: "The words of Ecclesiastes (the preacher), the Son of David, King of Jerusalem." It is full of that true wisdom which leads to eternal life.

THE FINANCIAL ASPECT OF THE MANITOBA QUESTION.

Senator Landry has a communication in the Courier du Canada commenting severely on Mr. Edward Blake's legal opinion on the Manitoba school question, which is treated in another article. He disputes the contention that the Dominion Parliament cannot make any grant or dispose of public moneys for the support of Separate schools in Manitoba, and cites the Revised Statutes of Canada—chapter 54—whereby two sections of land have been reserved in each township of that Province and the North West for educational purposes, the lands to be sold at auction, and the moneys accruing therefrom to form a fund in the hands of the Canadian Government, the interest of which is to be paid annually to the Provincial or Territorial Government for the maintenance of schools in said townships. Mr. Landry maintains that the Government which made the law can amend it and devote the moneys thus set apart to Separate school purposes. This appears to us satisfactory reasoning, but it is a matter of law on which we shall not venture to give a decided opinion. We must remark, however, that as we understand Mr. Blake's letter, that gentleman does not assert that the Dominion has not the power in question. He merely says that there are "a limitation of power as to money" and "overwhelming difficulties" as to the appropriation of public funds.

We have always thought that the jurisdiction given to the Dominion Parliament to intervene to remedy injustices inflicted on provincial minorities implies the right to apply public funds for the purpose. When the law authorizes a governing body to do a work it seems a necessary consequence that it confers the power to do that efficiently. Still it must be admitted that the late Government appeared to be doubtful of their powers in this respect, as the Remedial Bill made no provision for the maintenance of Separate schools from public funds. We believe there was a difference of opinion as to the powers of the Dominion Government in this regard, but we have no doubt that if the Manitoba Government had persisted in refusing to appropriate a suitable share of the Government grant to the Separate schools which that Bill proposed to establish, there would be at a future time Dominion legislation to do justice in this respect also.

We are inclined to believe that Mr. Blake purposely abstained from stating it to be his opinion that the Canadian Government has power to place the finances of the Separate schools on a just and proper basis.

A PRETEXT FOR DELAY.

We must not be over-sanguine that Ireland will at once obtain redress for the over-taxation to which she has been subjected ever since she ceased to have a Government of her own. It is true that even when there was an Irish Parliament, it was representative only of the minority of the population, nevertheless on financial questions it had in view the best interests of the nation as a whole; but as soon as the Legislative Union took place all this was changed, and Ireland was governed only for the benefit of England as the most powerful partner to the Union, and the one which was able to impose her will upon the weaker one.

It was to the interest of England that the landlords who spent their money in England should be coddled, and made able to dominate their tenantry in the fashion of Carleton's magistrate, Periwinkle Crackenfdudge, who "had no favorite who did not frequent his court," that he might "put the fines into his own pocket."

An Irish Parliament truly representative of the people would legislate for the real good of the nation in all matters, but this is not what Lord Salisbury and Mr. Balfour want and so they are bitterly opposed to Home Rule, and they are equally determined to delay as long as possible any rectification of the inequality of taxation.

The Tory and Unionist Irish members of Parliament from the North who made recently such a show of insisting upon justice to Ireland in the matter of taxation have been silenced for the present at least by Mr. Balfour's promise to appoint another Royal Commission to examine into the whole question. His pretext for thus putting off the difficulty is that it is necessary to include Scotland in any investigation of this kind. The Commission will probably require some years to investigate, before it can give its report, and it will then be an easy matter to invent some other pretext to delay the granting of justice. It is to be seen whether the fiery landlords who spoke so threateningly a few weeks ago unless some measure of justice should be given at once, will be satisfied with Mr. Balfour's policy of delay on this troublesome question.

The appointment of a Royal Commission is a very convenient method for a Government which is desirous of getting rid of troublesome questions.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

We are delighted to learn that, after a protracted period of absence, granted under medical advice, the Rev. E. Boubat, who is now in the fortieth year of his priesthood and pastorate in the Diocese of London, and who is the only surviving priest of all those who were with us in the days of his ordination by the late lamented Bishop Piusoneault, in 1857, has returned among us and is now in charge of the English parish of Raleigh, in the county of Kent. His many friends throughout the Diocese, which is dotted with the monuments of his long and devoted services, will join with us in extending him a hearty welcome back to the fields of his former labors, and in wishing him health and a long period of further usefulness.

IMPORTANT news comes from the scenes of Turkish outrage. Mr. John Morley, the British Liberal statesman, graphically describes the position by

saying: "The pigmy power of Greece has done what the great powers of Europe are powerless to accomplish." The Cretans, who have been long struggling to throw off the atrocious Turkish yoke, earnestly sought for the annexation of Crete to Greece, and while the great powers in their anxiety for the "European concert" were debating what ought to be done to settle the Cretan difficulty, and were fearful of hazarding any action, Greece boldly sent a torpedo fleet to the Island and took possession, not withstanding threats from the Admirals of the other powers, who are as numerous there as blackberries, that they would use force to keep off the Greeks. Prince George is in command of the invading force, and King George leads in person the land forces on the Turkish frontier to defend his country from Turkish invasion. The Greeks are enthusiastic for this war, as they claim that Cretans are Greeks by race and language. It is scarcely possible that the European fleets will actually interfere with the Greeks. The people of France and Great Britain openly sympathize with them, though the Governments do not desire to see Turkey dismembered.

GERMANY seems very desirous to restrain the Greeks, and the Kaiser proposed the bombardment of Athens and the Piræus by the combined powers for this purpose, but Lord Salisbury refused to consent to this, and Lord Salisbury's course is universally praised in England. It seems very inconsistent with this action that the two British men of war, lying near Canea, together with one Russian, one German, and one Italian ship, opened a bombardment on the Cretan and Greek position where the Greek flag was raised. Seventy shells were discharged, but little damage appears to have been done, and the Greek flag is still flying over the bombarded camp. The Greeks express their determination to adhere to their aggressive policy even though all Europe should combine against them. The Emperor William is said to be displeased with Greece, because his sister abjured Lutheranism for the Greek Church when she married the Crown Prince of Greece six years ago, and this is the unworthy reason why the Kaiser would now curb the aspirations of an oppressed people for freedom from the grossest of tyrannies.

SOME members of the Utah Legislature have proposed that a statue of Brigham Young be presented to Congress to be placed in the statutory hall in Washington, as it is a standing rule of Congress to thus honor distinguished persons whose statues are presented by the State Legislatures in memory of important services rendered to the States, entitling them to be regarded as worthy of public honor. We may be sure that if the intention be carried out, the A. P. A. will make no objection against placing the polygamist's statue in the hall, nor will they take pains to deface it, as they succeeded in doing to that of Father Marquette, whose services to the whole country were beyond calculation. But if the author of the diabolical Mountain Meadow massacre is to be honored by being given a place in Statuary hall, the statues of the eminent persons which have already a place there would, if they could act and speak, be disposed to protest energetically and to move away from such companionship.

FREDERIC TAYLOR, a wealthy New Yorker, died recently and on his will being read it was found that he had left conditionally a sum of \$25,000 to his niece, Miss Jewell, as a bribe to induce her not to become a nun. Miss Jewell is an inmate of the convent of the Sacred Heart at St. Louis, and it is expected that she will soon be a professed religious. Her friends say that she will refuse the conditions made in her uncle's will, which is to this effect: "One of my nieces has embraced the Roman Catholic faith, and is soon to become a Sister of the Order of the Sacred Heart. Should she not become a Sister and sever her connection with the religious orders, then a sum of \$25,000, which is to be set aside by my executors, is to be held for her in trust, and the income paid to her."

MR. GLADSTONE is preparing a book on the Pope's Bull declaring the invalidity of Anglican orders. He has said concerning the character of the volume: "I leave to properly qualified persons the exposure of the Pope's feeble arguments. I offer a few comments upon the strange want of forethought, courage and prudence which he exhibited." We can understand that from Mr. Gladstone's point of

view, he finds apathy for thinking that showed a want of dance, for the expressed his declaration would cause in the put obstacles in. But we fail to see the decision, which would displease, gileans, whom (tainly desired) ness. But the is the mission of the world from e (very desirable) know their re might not conti selves with the priesthood with offering sacramen tery sacrifici act was one of the reasons for frangible instead Gladstone says.

The appeal of Governor-General come to the aid lions in India ha cess, and from a ion contribution increase the fun saries of life to are starving. they are our though charity all in distress, nationality an selves, yet the e as that between sovereigns make ings the more joined to see that in this matter, British press ma the apathy of G deed be confessed apathy before L appeal, but the Canadians to s tions is an evid necessary to cal ly to the presi cure a generou

Rev. James Me good work in a Press Association has greatly reduced books. The Cath for 80 per copy, acquired control has reduced the price of Catholic to their more gene receive every clergy. His ad New York city.

It is to be re some Catholic p States who v enormous pris they hold the of some excell are practically cause of the charged by the of things as th nished by the Facts for is supplied by of New York fourth the price fishers for w

CATECHISM.

All Catholic Apostleship of tial obligation ers, works an for the intentio for the genera for the month all the membe One half min fulfil this oblig bian.

A clerk in t J. Ingersoll v successful att by means of person related lecturer or emp in practi lawfulness of the past eight ing on this m kind Mr. Inge wonder to me, there is, that themselves." without God Heaven." know them."

The man world and for time and for wealth by fai subject of se gelist Moody taph, he said, for such a ma "We should trary," he ad always hurri world, wheth or of him, as Gospel, "The right: there preparation f