

The Catholic Record.
 Published weekly at 484 and 486 Richmond street, London, Ontario.
 Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.
 NOTICES:
 REV. GEORGE R. NORTHERAVES,
 Author of "Masters of Modern Ireland."
 REV. WILLIAM FLANNERY,
 THOMAS COFFEY.
 Publisher and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY.
 Messrs. LUKE KING, JOHN NICH and P. J. NEVIN are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transact all other business for the CATHOLIC RECORD.
 Agent for Alexandria, Glennevis and Lucan.—Mr. Donald A. McDonald.
 Rates of advertising—Ten cents per line each insertion.
 Approved by the Archbishop of Toronto, St. Boniface, Ottawa, Kingston, and the Bishops of Hamilton and Peterboro, and leading Catholic Clergymen 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 stopped.
 Persons writing for a change of address should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Catholic Record.
 London, Sat., March 29th, 1890.

SEPARATE SCHOOLS IN ONTARIO AND QUEBEC.

L'Electeur, comparing the treatment accorded to the Protestants of Quebec and the Catholics of Ontario respectively, states that whereas the 400,000 Catholics of Ontario have only 235 Separate schools obtaining state aid, the Protestants of Quebec, numbering 185,000, have 973 Dissected schools.

As at the last census taken in 1881 the number of Protestants in Quebec was 188,300, and the number of Catholics in Ontario 328,839, it is clear that the *L'Electeur's* figures on this point are somewhat astray. In fact they were merely intended as an approximation; but from the number of Separate schools in each Province it may be clearly seen that the Quebec minority is treated with much more generosity than the minority in Ontario.

The *Mail* of the 18th inst. declares, however, that this inference is incorrect. It says: "Assuming that *L'Electeur's* figures are approximately correct, they merely show that the Separate system of education is taken advantage of to a greater extent in proportion to their numbers by the English-speaking inhabitants of Quebec than by the Roman Catholics of Ontario."

Precisely. The Protestants of Quebec take advantage of the Separate school laws to a greater extent than the Catholics in proportion to their numbers. Could they do this were it not for the fact that every facility is afforded them by the Catholic majority to keep their schools in as efficient a condition as possible? Could they do it if the Protestants were subjected to the petty annoyances which the Equal Righters and Mr. Meredith would wish to subject the Catholic ratepayers? Could they do it if the taxes of Protestants were *prima facie* to be legally appropriated to the support of the Public schools, as is the case with the taxes of Catholics in Ontario as the law stands at present?

The Quebec law places all Protestants on the Protestant school roll, and all Catholics on the Public school roll. The Public and Protestant schools are placed on a footing of perfect equality.

What is the state of the case in Ontario? Catholics are in the first instance regarded as Public school supporters. Not until they declare their adhesion to the Separate school can they be rated as Separate school supporters. Protestants, on the other hand, cannot become supporters of the Catholic schools, even when they send their children to them. Thus all school taxes levied on Protestants, together with the school taxes not only of recalcitrant Catholics, but likewise of those Catholics who have overlooked their duty of declaring their wish to support the Separate schools, go for the support of the Public schools.

In the face of these facts the *Mail* has the audacity to assert that the school taxes of Quebec are inequitably divided. In proof of this that journal says that "the non-Catholic settlers own or control the manufacturing and other corporations in Quebec, yet the taxes paid by these institutions are divided between the Separate and Public schools in proportion to school population. That is, if a mill owned by a non-Catholic pays \$50 in school taxes and the school population stand as nine to one in favor of the French Catholics, then the Public or Catholic school gets \$45 of that sum."

This injustice does not exist in Quebec. It exists, however, in Ontario, and to a more gross extent. In such a case in Ontario, if the Catholic owner of property taxed \$50 for schools, either through non-residence or neglect, fall to make the necessary declaration that he desires to be rated as a Separate school supporter, not \$45 alone, but the whole sum of \$50 will be taken by the Public school. As to corporations in Ontario, unless they actually decide by resolution that their taxes shall be divided to Public and Separate schools, in proportion to the amount of stock held by Catholics and Protestants respectively, the whole of the school-tax is also given to the Public schools. But seldom or never do the

Protestant corporations pass such a resolution. In Quebec the arrangement of corporation taxes is made as equitably as it is possible to imagine. There are three panels of taxed property. Panel No. 1 is taxed for the support of Catholic schools, and contains the property of Catholics. Panel No. 2 consists of the property of Protestants, and is taxed for Protestant schools. Panel No. 3 comprises companies which wish to be placed thereon, and those which express no desire to be placed upon either of the other two. Only the tax levied on panel No. 3 is divided in proportion to population. In Ontario in the corresponding case, all the tax would go to the Public schools. If then the *Mail* finds the Quebec law unjust towards Protestants, what words can we find in which to express the injustice inflicted on Catholics in Ontario?

The fact is that the school laws of Quebec were framed by a generous Catholic majority with the express desire of giving the Protestant minority full justice in every respect. The school laws of Ontario were passed in quite a different spirit. We do not, at all, wish to depreciate the liberality with which the Ontario Legislature during the past few—very few years—made the working of the Separate School Act easier and more effective. But we all know what a noise has been made in the Province on account of these few paltry concessions. If the whole of them were repealed to-morrow the repeal would scarcely take \$10 annually from the Catholic Separate schools of any county. They would entail more trouble on Catholic school trustees and supporters. That is all. And for this object the whole country is agitated with a noisome cry. We are told by Mr. Meredith and the *Mail* that the Catholics are the public enemy against whom all Protestants should unite. The Orange lodges and the Equal Rights Association re-echo the cry, and we are threatened with the repeal of these clauses. The hope is that every obstacle which these bigots will throw in the way of Catholic education will pave the way towards the future annihilation of the Separate school system.

There is no such agitation as this against the Protestant schools of Quebec. The Protestants there have their schools in peace. The *Mail* is, therefore, unfortunate in instituting a comparison between the treatment of the minorities in the two Provinces.

But there is more to be said on this subject. The Protestant Separate schools were established in Quebec by the Catholic majority; whereas it is the boast of the bogus Equal Rights Association that the Catholic Separate School Law of 1863 was forced upon the people of Ontario by a Quebec majority. And it is true. The two Provinces were legislatively united with the express hope that Upper Canada would dominate. The Province smaller in population was, at the time of the union, Ontario, and Ontario had in Parliament a representation equal to that of Quebec, yet both Provinces had an equal representation in Parliament. Ontario, however, grew more rapidly than the sister Province, and when the Separate School Law of 1863 was passed, though Ontario recorded a small majority against it, it was carried by the Quebec majority, which was resolved that the Catholics of this Province should have some measure of the equity which was enjoyed by Protestants with them. Now, the Separate school system of Ontario cannot be destroyed without destroying the whole Confederation compact, and without submitting, once more, the Protestants of Quebec to the will of the Catholic majority there. We doubt very much whether our Ontario Catholic schools would be safe if they depended merely on the will of an Ontario majority, but as the Protestants of Quebec value their Separate schools as much as we value ours, we are inclined to think that the good sense of Ontario will accept the situation and will not attempt to interfere with them. Even the late Hon. George Brown, than whom no more determined champion of Protestantism has existed in Canada, thought it a good bargain to secure the status of the Quebec Protestants by incorporating into the Confederation Act a clause which would secure both to them and to the Ontario Catholics their then existing educational privileges.

It is a foolish supposition which the *Mail* fosters that Ontario Catholics can be deprived of their rights while the Quebec Protestants shall retain theirs. The people of Ontario understand this perfectly, and thus we are led to believe that the efforts which are being made in the Ontario Legislature to cripple the Separate schools will be of no avail. It is a ridiculous pretence to say that the Public schools of Quebec are religious schools, and that therefore the Quebec Legislature could not touch the Protestant schools of the Province, and that, therefore, the bigots of Ontario can do as they please, without the possibility of retaliation. This is the mean ground taken by the *Mail* and also by the Equal Rights Association in their recent manifesto. But these people may rest assured that there is some astuteness in Quebec,

as well as with themselves. We do not think indeed that the people of Quebec would stoop to adopt their disreputable methods; but they have already proclaimed over and over again that the Quebec people have always hitherto overreached the Ontariofolks in political tactics. It was so (they say) in the Act of Union. It was so in the Act of Confederation. We have no doubt that in the proposed revision of Confederation, should it occur within our lifetime, the people of Quebec will hold their own as securely as ever. They are not so noisy in raising race and religious discussions; but they have not in the past submitted to the domination of bigots, and we may rest assured they have no intention of doing so in the future.

THE CONVENTION OF BIGOTS.

The Third Party—of Equal Rights for all Bigots and no mercy for any body else—held a convention in Toronto on Thursday last. The *Globe* says that Rev. Dr. Sutherland, with "the banner of truth and righteousness behind him and about fifty men and women before him, took the chair at the third annual convention of the Equal Rightists." When the reports of the different committees were handed in Mr. Bangough suggested that something should be added to the platform on the labor question. He desired to see a plank on free trade introduced: "There were not many intelligent voters who did not believe prohibition to be a humbug and a fraud of the first degree." This declaration caused no little commotion among the lovers of truth and righteousness. Mr. Sbarrow suggested that the proposed plank should be narrow and have a soft side. Rev. D. L. Brethour hoped that a plank on the labor question would not be quite so thin nor one "needing a microscope to discover its meaning." Rev. Principal Austin, of the Alma, moved that the report be referred back for the addition of a plank—let it be large or small or slippery—on the labor question. The same rev. gentlemen read the resolution, sent down by the Committee on Political Action, viz., "that as neither the Conservative or Liberal party has declared in favor of prohibition, but rather the reverse, we cannot regard either party as entitled to the confidence of the friends of temperance and prohibition."

It is surprising how slow to learn the fauults have proved themselves to be. By their furious agitation on the Scott Act and by the many evils of debauchery, drunkenness and perjury immediately resulting from the operation of that arch-hypocrisy, the Scott Act, the cause of temperance has suffered immensely and prohibition, with all its attendant evils, is set back for at least fifty years, if not indefinitely forever.

Rev. T. A. Moore, on the part of the "Miscellaneous Committee," which means no doubt the Committee on *mizum ytherum*, moved a resolution "deprecating the course pursued by both parties in the Dominion Parliament in regard to the Jesuit Estates and dual language debates; also expressing sympathy with those in Manitoba and the North-West who are contending for Equal Rights against exclusive privileges and clerical domination."

Farther down we find the Rev. C. Webber suggesting that an "effort should be made to induce the Dominion Government to secure such an amendment to the *British North America Act* as would give the Provinces the power of passing prohibitory laws."

Here is the astounding spectacle of Methodist preachers actually legislating for the whole Dominion. They are not even satisfied with the Provincial machinery for making laws. It is not sufficiently broad and elastic to enable them to force their notions of morality on the rest of humanity. They must involve heavier weapons of warfare and call for an amendment to the constitution, which means asking Queen Victoria to give them power to make laws in Canada which she would veto and condemn were they passed in England. Her Majesty the Empress of India does not favor prohibition, neither does, by all accounts, Prince Von Bismarck or Emperor William. But why should not Rev. Principal Austin and Rev. C. Webber know more about moral principles and the way to attain legal righteousness than sovereigns or statesmen in Europe or Dominion politicians in Canada? By clerical is meant priestly domination in the North-West. Does it ever occur to these preachers who meet in Toronto that they themselves are guilty of clerical domination? If they cannot see the beam in their eye, the outside world can discover it without microscope aid. Here they are attempting to make laws and upset the constitution for the purpose of exercising clerical domination, and at the same moment and on the same platform they accuse the priests of the North-West of "clerical domination." The priests of the North-West, if they had the will, cannot afford time to go travelling round the country hold-

ing meetings and lecturing in every village school on the coming elections. They need all their time to attend to the spiritual wants of those confided to their care and save them from the snares of the proselyting agents sent out from Ontario with Exeter Hall money to make them seven times worse children of the devil than before. If the Rev. Dr. C. Webber, Rev. T. A. Moore and Rev. Austin would stay at home and attend to the duties of their calling and ministry, it would be much more satisfactory to the children and parents they are training, and there would be less trouble and rumors of trouble in their schools and parishes. The Rev. Dr. Sutherland spoke sensibly when he said that he should retire from the presidency of the council and of the council of one hundred for the reason that "he occupied an important position in the Methodist church requiring all his time." It seems to us the other rev. gentlemen can as ill afford to squander the time which belongs to their flocks. Rev. Mr. Austin especially should learn a lesson from the President and devote more of his precious hours to the vigil and overseeing of the tender lambs entrusted to his ever watchful solicitude than to be scamping over the country dictating to politicians, in the exercise of that stupid arrogance styled "clerical domination."

We should have mentioned that among the fifty people who were gathered before the rev. chairman several ladies were present, whose names, if not their conduct, indicate them to be strong-minded women. There was Mrs. J. E. Seels, Mrs. A. Mills, and Mrs. James G. Strong. Whatever is the distant future of our history may be the outcome of the Third Party scheme it is certain that the two great divisions of politicians that now contemplate a party that has no greater or stronger backing than a few dozen fanatical preachers and some well-intentioned ladies who would be better employed in the nursery or in mending their husbands' or brothers' stockings.

BISMARCK'S DOWNFALL.

The Iron Chancellor has succumbed at last. His downfall has been foreshadowed for some time. Ever since the death of the late Emperor Frederic people who watched closely the independent conduct of the young Emperor William could easily foresee that under him Prince-Bismarck's reign, as Chancellor of the Empire, would not be of long duration. During the eventful career of old Wilhelm nothing of importance was undertaken without Bismarck's initiation, consent and approval of every detail. During the wars with Austria and France all the credit of Germany's victories was universally given to the diplomacy and audacity of the Man of Blood and Iron. From being a second-rate power Prussia, at a bound, went to the front rank, and held the loftiest and most definite position in the councils of European diplomats. From being a small kingdom and a mere state in the Germanic confederation Prussia assumed the imperial sceptre, and virtually took possession of all the many little states and kingdoms that, now combined as one, form, under the sway and at the beck of young Emperor William, the most powerful and to all opponents the most formidable empire in the world. To Bismarck history must assign the glory of achievements so vast and so portentous for the balance of power in Europe. Emperor William's fame, as the originator and creator of all these changes so important to Germany, however great and brilliant, must remain forever overshadowed by the towering genius and influence of Prince-Chancellor Bismarck's diplomatic and iron determination to humble France and Austria and make Prussia the envy of nations.

The young Emperor, however, is determined to strike out for himself. He belongs to a new generation. He is desirous of carving a name and a fame in history without the adjunct of Bismarck's bulky shadow hanging over his humane or military projects. In his efforts to improve the standing and promote the comforts and honor of every private soldier in the army he found Bismarck in the way; in his anxiety to cultivate friendly relations with the Pope and earn the love and veneration of his Catholic subjects, he found Bismarck the only obstruction; and now, when he is devising plans for the solution of the labor question, and endeavoring by means of a European conference to lighten the heavy tasks and increase the pay of the common laborer, the old Bismarckian tycoon confronts him. But the young Emperor has made up his mind on all these necessary ameliorations, and Bismarck must step down and retire into private life.

It is very strange, and looks providential, that Bismarck, who, at one time, held Catholic influence in such contempt should in the end have to yield to its power. He established the Falk National Church, so that the Emperor would equal the Russian Czar in being

Vicar of Christ and ruling over both the spiritual and temporal interests of the empire. To this end he banished Bishops from their sees and priests from their parishes and he took under his fostering care the schismatical Old Catholic Church, founded by the late Dr. Dollinger of unhappy memory. The Jesuits were expelled from the New German Empire, although many of them had contributed to its elevation and glory and some of them were decorations won on the battle-fields of Woerth and Sedan. It looks indeed providential that Catholic influence should be the straw which broke the camel's back. All the accounts, cabled from Berlin, state that Bismarck has been unhorsed and made to bite the dust, by Herr Windthorst, the Catholic leader in the German parliament, so that now all the grand schemes of the Iron Chancellor about a National Church and a Caesarism of spiritual authority have not only vanished but have been the cause of his retirement from public life and the secret of his downfall. The Catholic leader, Windthorst, was the Murdoch who would not "bow down to Human."

Despatches from London, March 29, are as follows:
 "The immediate cause of Bismarck's resignation is reiterated to have been over the terms for the support of the Clericals, and that the Chancellor drew the line positively at the concessions and the Guelph revenues. Herr Windthorst, the leader of the Clericals, can congratulate himself on his victory over his ancient foe. Bismarck and Windthorst have waged bitter warfare upon each other for a generation, and Windthorst is the only foe whom Bismarck has ever treated with respect as a foe man worthy of his steel. In stature Windthorst is almost a dwarf, but intellectually he is a giant. At the present time he holds the balance of power in the Reichstag, and the Ministry of a strange party is, too, the center party of which the chief doctor is the despotic leader. To say that it is heterogeneous is to but feebly describe it. There are in its ranks clergyman, landed proprietors, Poles, Hanoverians, feudal princes and lords, and even Socialists. But all acknowledge the supremacy of the dwarf-like old politician, who, in his time, was Prime Minister to King George of Hanover, but who, despite his war with Bismarck, is patriotic in his support of the German Empire."
 "The excitement over Bismarck's resignation has somewhat subsided in Berlin, though the subject continues the chief topic of conversation in all quarters."

BISMARCK'S SUCCESSOR.

General Von Caprivi, commander of the 10th Army Corps, has been appointed Chancellor of the Empire to succeed Prince Bismarck.
 The *Tagblatt* says: "The world without Bismarck cannot easily be imagined. It was the great writer and philosopher Goethe who said: 'Rome without the Pope would be no Rome, the world without Rome would be no world.'" Goethe understood human fallacies and the world's requirements much better than the Vienna *Tagblatt*.
 The *Neue Freie Press* of the same date says: "History begins a new page." Certainly, something new to modern ideas is happening when the Queen's daughter, Princess Louise, is on a visit to the Vatican and when the Emperor of Germany is writing every second day autograph letters to the Pope. There must be some very great change for the better about to occur when such despatches as the following are sent over the cable from London: "A Rome correspondent says he is authorized to state that the Pope (being consulted no doubt by the sovereigns of Europe) declares that he is willing to act as mediator in negotiations for a general disarmament of the European forces." This would mean the disarmament of ten or twelve million soldiers all ready for action and equipped for mutual slaughter.

Another despatch says: "The Pope has received a second autograph letter from Emperor William asking his moral cooperation in the Labour Conference. The Pope replied graciously." If the rev. gentlemen, Mr. Vicar of Montreal and Principal Cavaa of Toronto and others, could reach the ear of Emperor William they would teach him a lesson that he could not forget in a hurry, on the danger to his empire of Popish interference and also on the insult offered to His Majesty's prerogatives and the supremacy of the crown by a foreign potentate. No doubt His Holiness was requested very politely, not once, but in a second autograph letter, to come to the aid of the Emperor in the settlement of a very important question. But the question would remain, Why complicate under the circumstances of the Pope's interference? The Equal Rights men would reply: "For the very same reasons that we complained when Hon. Mr. Mercer sent autograph letters to Rome for a similar purpose. Why should Mr. Mercer, who is a Catholic, or Emperor William, who is a Protestant, send letters to a foreign potentate who is looked upon as the Vicar of Christ, and obeyed, as such, in things moral and spiritual, by three hun-

dred millions of average good, sensible and respectable people? We, Equal Righters, can't see why it should be done, and, whether done by Mr. Mercer or by Emperor William, we are equally vehement in our protestations against such questionable conduct."

THE SCHOOL QUESTION IN THE HOUSE.

A number of bills on Separate schools have been brought before the Ontario Legislature by different members. One by Mr. Ross proposes to make it the duty of clerks of municipalities wherein there are Separate school supporters, to keep an index book in which will be kept the names of all persons who have given notice that they are Separate school supporters, with the date of their declaration to this effect. This book will also contain the date of any withdrawals by which Separate school supporters desire to transfer their names to the list of Public school supporters. It is also provided that on the assessment notices there shall be a clear statement as to which school any taxpayer is assessed for, so that it may not occur again that taxpayers are assessed unwillingly for one school while it may be their desire to support the other, whether they be Catholics or Protestants.

It is very proper that every precaution should be taken that no name be placed upon the wrong roll, and should Mr. Ross' bill effect this he will deserve great credit for putting an end to what has been frequently a source of annoyance to persons who by their own oversight or that of the officials have been wrongly assessed.

Mr. Meredith has also proposed a bill which, it is pretended, has in view the same object as that of the Hon. Mr. Ross; but there is this difference, that the Opposition leader proposes to entrap unwary Catholics into becoming Public school supporters against their will. There are cases which have come under our notice where the municipal clerks have pretended to have lost, or have really lost, the notices which have been given in past years that they are supporters of the Catholic Separate schools; and of course, in such cases, those who have been for years Separate school supporters would become at one sweep Public school supporters. To bring about this state of things Mr. Meredith introduces into his Bill the very offensive clause that the assessment roll shall not even be accepted as evidence "whether such ratepayer is a supporter of the Public schools or of the Roman Catholic Separate schools."

Inasmuch as both Public and Separate schools are mentioned in this, it might seem, at first sight, as if it were the purpose of this clause to deal fairly and in accordance with the principles of really "Equal Rights," in regard to Catholics and Protestants alike; but when it is remembered that the law already provides that the Public schools shall have the tax in every case where such notice has not been given, it will be understood that the object of Mr. Meredith is to take advantage of every oversight, whether of the Catholic ratepayers themselves, or of the municipal officials, to divert the taxes of Catholics from the Separate to the Public schools. In fact an appropriate title to Mr. Meredith's Bill would be "a Bill to educate Protestant children at the expense of Catholic ratepayers;" for it must be remembered that in the localities where it will have application, as the Catholic children all attend the Separate schools, the Public schools which are to benefit by this high-handed robbery proposed by Mr. Meredith are attended by Protestant children only.

We are quite sure that this measure will be cordially approved by all who favor the bogus Equal Rights movement, for the oppression of Catholics is exactly their conception of what constitutes Equal Rights, but we are curious to observe whether Mr. Meredith's following in the Legislative Assembly will support this obviously dishonest legislation.

There are several other Bills before the House proposing to deal with Separate schools, all of which are brought up by the Opposition, and all of which have in view the one object which Mr. Meredith so plainly proclaimed in his speech in the Opera House in this city, to harass the Separate schools, in order to make Catholics get tired of them. Thus, there is a bill to deprive Catholic Separate schools of representation on the High School Boards. This is a provision which has never been done, and which cannot do harm to the Protestant majority. It was introduced in order to give Catholics confidence in the management of the High schools, to which they contribute their taxes, just like other citizens. As the Municipal Councils ordinarily do not place on the High School Board a Catholic representative, it was thought advisable, for the sake of the High schools themselves, to give Catholics a representative in this way. But there is an opportunity afforded by the provision to display some anti-Catholic bile, so Mr. Meredith's zealous followers must be given a chance to display their eloquence on this paltry matter, in order that Equal Rightists may be induced