

THE CATHOLIC RECORD

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

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

REV. GEORGE R. NORTHGRAVES,

Author of "Mistake of Modern India."

REV. WILLIAM FLANNERY,

THOMAS COFFEY, Publisher and Proprietor.

MEASURES, LUKS KING, JOHN NICH and

LUKE NICH are fully authorized to receive

subscriptions and transact all other business

for the CATHOLIC RECORD.

Agent for Alexandria, Glennevis and

Lothian—Mr. Donald A. McDonald.

Rates of Advertising—Ten cents per line

each insertion.

Approved by the Bishop of London, and

recommended by the Archbishops of St.

John and Ottawa, and the Bishops of

Hamilton, Kingston, 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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

Advertisements must be paid in full before

the paper can be stopped.

addition of the words, which appear to be equally vague, that "the Westminster and Heidelberg catechisms be received for substance of doctrine." This, however, was not satisfactory to the Congregational Churches, and the proposals fell through.

Dr. Imbrie, of the Presbyterians, says: "According to one of the missionaries present, the hostility to the proposed constitution finds its chief explanation in the rise of an anti clerical spirit. Some of the churches are restive under the leadership of ministers. The explanation, however, is not accepted by the Japanese. It is true that some who are unfriendly to the union have called attention to the 'aristocratic' character and ill concealed tyranny of the Presbyterian and Reformed ministry. But the real question is not one between the Churches and the ministers so much as between the older and more conservative men, and the younger and more radical."

The difficulty, in fact, is precisely the same which has cropped up both on this continent and in Europe. The tendency of Protestantism is naturally towards free thought and the elimination of positive doctrines from Christianity. This is the necessary consequence of the first principle of Protestantism, private judgment. If the Church acknowledges that the judgment of the individual is the supreme authority by which controversies of faith are to be settled, it is as well to say at once that the Church as a body has no authority whatsoever. The Presbyterians will not go so far as this, but the Congregationalists base their whole discipline on this consequence, and even in Japan they will not yield it for the sake of an outward union which has no solidity. The only true principle of unity is Church authority, and this leads directly to submission to the Pope. Presbyterianism is the least consistent of the two bodies which negotiated for union, for it wishes to assert the authority of a mock antiquity, without accepting the logical consequences of their doctrine. It is almost needless to add that the effort to both up an apparent union on so frail a basis has utterly failed, for the present, at least.

MEANNESS UNPARALLELED.

The meanness of the Mail has been frequently manifested during the course of the discussion on the Jesuit Estates Act, and on other occasions during its no-Popery crusade since 1886. That journal is in the habit of publishing anonymous letters from supposed correspondents, approving of its anti Catholic course, and at the same time suggesting to its readers measures repulsive to the good sense and love of fair play which the people of Ontario usually exhibit. It is by such means that it has succeeded to some extent in exciting the fanatical faction of the province to a degree of frenzy which is almost inconceivable. At the same time it evidently expects to be exonerated from responsibility for those communications on the plea that it is not responsible for the opinions expressed by correspondents.

It is well understood that journalists do not admit to their columns letters which propose any startling course to be pursued in the advocacy of a certain policy, without expressing their dissent from their correspondents' views, unless they approve of them. But when these views are repeated by many correspondents, so as indeed to give actually a tone to the journal, it certainly cannot shrink the responsibility, more especially when the communications are anonymous.

Under such circumstances, notwithstanding that the Mail has frequently declared that its desire is not to do anything to the injury of Catholics, nor to take from them liberty of conscience, the admission of numerous letters of which the purpose is to excite Protestant hatred against the Catholic religion and people, even to violent acts of physical aggression, undoubtedly makes the Mail responsible for the sentiments of these correspondents; and it will be denied that this course of recommending physical force to be used, especially against the people of Quebec, "for the good of the habitants themselves," forsooth, might be mistaken for courage, if that journal openly advocated it; but its advocacy through the medium of anonymous letters can be called only inoffensive cowardice and meanness.

But the meanness which we here reprobate has been surpassed, if possible, by the publication of a letter signed "Anti-Jesuit," which recently appeared in the columns of the Mail. This cowardly anonymous scribble recommends Protestants to absent themselves from—to boycott, in fact—the Toronto Industrial Exhibition on the day when it will be opened by the Governor-General, because His Excellency did not agree with the fanatics who called on him to stigmatize the Jesuit Order as an illegal and immoral association by disallowing the Act of the Quebec Legislature, which recognizes the Jesuits and the Catholic Bishops for a grievous wrong inflicted on them over a century ago. The Mail itself has repeatedly acknowledged that the only plea on

which the power of disallowance could be exercised is a plea of "public policy," which it founds upon the wicked character of the Jesuit Order. The boycotting of the exhibition is, therefore, proposed, through its anonymous correspondent, as a means of taking revenge upon the Governor-General because the latter does not agree to believe all the falsehoods which have appeared in the columns of the Mail, both editorially and in its correspondence columns. This Anti Jesuit says: "If they (Protestants) have any regard for themselves, they will stay at home on that occasion. If they attend and accord to His Excellency a reception, they will follow the example of the spaniel who, when you beat him, will turn round and lick the hand that smites him." The writer gives as an additional reason why all Protestants should absent themselves from the opening, that Sir John Macdonald is also to be present.

As the exhibition is of great benefit to Toronto, the advice thus virtually given by the Mail, if acted upon, would be greatly to the injury of that city. Still, it is as well that the Mail should exhibit itself in its true colors. The public will be able to judge by the result the amount of influence which that journal wields. We venture to say that the absence of all whom it can influence will not be felt, and that, if the weather be favorable, the opening will exceed in eclat all that has ever been witnessed in Toronto on such occasions, and that the greeting which will be accorded to the Governor-General on his appearance will be both cordial and general.

We have been accustomed to hear the assertion repeated over and over again that the bogus Equal Rights' Association is truly representative of the people of Ontario. It is nothing of the kind. We do not dispute the fact that the bigots of the Province are numerous, but we do not believe that they form a majority of the population. All who could be influenced to sign the petition for disallowance amounted to but fifty-one thousand persons in Ontario, voters and non voters. So far as these from being a majority of Ontario voters, that the Catholic voters of the Province alone are in excess of that number; and a few days will suffice to make it known whether all the Mail's influence will make the opening day of the exhibition a failure. We predict with confidence that it will be a success, in spite of the meanness effort on record to create a failure.

And this is the degrading word to which the boasted organ of the truly loyal population of the Province devotes itself! Such loyalty is perfectly on a par with the loyalty which was manifested exactly by the same class of blatant loyalists who plotted to set aside Queen Victoria's claim to the throne, who insulted the Prince of Wales in Toronto, Kingston, Belleville, Milbrook, etc., when he visited Canada in 1860, who insulted and personally maltreated Lord and Lady Elgin, who burned the House of Parliament in Montreal, and in other ways, even more infamous, exhibited their peaceful and law-abiding spirit, and their love of civil and religious liberty.

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC CONGRESS.

The Catholic Lay Congress of the United States will meet in the city of Baltimore on Monday, November 11th, at 10 o'clock a. m., and will remain in session two days. All Catholics will be admitted to the sessions. Immediately after the centennial of the establishment of the Catholic hierarchy of the United States will take place, and nearly coincidentally the new Washington Catholic University will be opened. There will be a large number of distinguished prelates, priests and laymen present for the triple celebration, which is expected to be conducted with greater eclat than any Catholic celebration which has ever taken place in America.

There are many subjects which can be treated by the Congress to great advantage. The Church has made, undoubtedly, great and rapid progress in the United States, but it has also met with many losses. In districts where Catholic settlers were spread over large areas, owing to scarcity of priests it frequently happened that Catholics became lukewarm, and practically became lost to the faith. The children, in such cases, frequently wandered away from the Church, and either joined the ranks of some of the numerous sects, or helped to recruit those of the agnostics. How is the recurrence of this evil to be prevented? How may the knowledge of Catholic doctrine be brought home to the millions of Protestants of this continent? By what means can the Catholic press do the greatest amount of good? In what way can the laity best co-operate with the clergy in promoting Catholic interests? All these are questions of great importance to Catholics, and well worthy of most careful consideration by the Congress. It has been resolved by the promoters of the enterprise not to take into consideration the subject of the Catholic press, and the Catholic Review has recommended that the press should ignore the Congress; but it is not likely that the press will act vindictively. The Catholic press will be

glad to co-operate with any good work which the Congress may recommend, provided it propose anything practical, and do not confine itself to mere wordy resolutions. The distinguished gentlemen whose names are on the committee of management afford hope that the best possible results will flow from the deliberations, and the undertaking has our best wishes that it may be a decided success.

THE SEPARATE SCHOOL QUESTION.

The question of the right of Catholics in Manitoba to retain their separate schools is one which does not affect that Province alone. With it is bound up the right of two other minorities in the two other Provinces in which separate schools exist, the Catholic minority in Ontario and the Protestant minority in Quebec.

It is the practice with those who are agitating for the settlement of this question in Manitoba on the lines of the new policy announced first by Mr. Martin, to treat this as if it were a question by which Catholics only are injured or affected. Thus treated, of course, all the fanatical provinces of a large section in every Province are aroused, and it is impossible to get them to listen to reason. "The Catholics want to retain their separate schools," they say, "but we will not let them do so."

Let us consider the matter calmly and not as a question to be dealt with merely for the purpose of giving annoyance to one side or the other. Is it a matter either of expediency, or of right, that the minorities should be permitted to have separate schools? Let us look at the matter, first, as a question of expediency. Even if a majority have the absolute right of forcing their will upon the minority, it is not always expedient they should do so; and we maintain that in the very mixed community of Canada it is not expedient that wherever there is a majority of a certain denomination, that they should force their views on the subject of religious education upon the minority.

It is well known that Catholics are very firm in the conviction that religious instruction is of even greater importance than secular. We fully appreciate the great utility of secular instruction, and we are anxious that all the children in the country should have every facility to acquire it, but we say that at the same time the great truths of religion must not be relegated to a secondary place. When the wonders of creation are explained to children, the existence of a Creator ought not to be ignored, and our obligations to Him. As God is the author of nature, the minds of children should be raised to God while secular knowledge is being imparted; and we maintain that it is not only a matter of expediency, but also of duty to educate children in this manner. But without pressing just now, the question of right, we ask, is it proper that an obstacle should be thrown in the way either of Catholics, or of Protestants, who feel similarly on this subject, so that they should be prevented from having imparted to their children that efficient religious instruction which they believe to be so important?

But we hear it said frequently, "Religious instruction is indeed important, but it is the business of the parents to impart this at home, or for clergymen to do it in the Church." Our answer to this is: 1st. The teaching at home, or in the Church, only, would have the effect of making religious instruction a merely secondary matter. It will, therefore, be viewed by the children as a subject of secondary importance. It should be taught at home truly, as far as parents are able to impart it, and by the clergy in the Church, but as we are to forget our duties to God, religion should be taught as the most important of our studies, and those studies should be taken up with religion in the foreground. If we learn, for example, the laws of mechanics, or optics, or the truths of astronomy, our mind should be led to God whenever these studies afford a peculiar opportunity of recalling Him to mind as their author. Religion cannot be too strongly impressed upon the mind of a youth, and however strongly it may be impressed, he is not likely to know more of it than he ought to know, nor is he likely either to be too moral, even if the laws of morality are impressed upon him whenever an opportunity presents itself in the school-room.

2ndly. Parents are very often and even usually either so much occupied with business, or so careless, or so uneducated that it is impossible for them to give that attention to the religious instruction of their children at home which is desirable, and it is not only expedient, but wrong, to prevent them from employing, as their children's teacher, a person who is competent to combine religious and secular instruction. By the law of nature, which is the divine law of creation, the duty of instruction belongs primarily to the parent, and the State has no right to do more in the matter than to insist that proper

secular instruction be given to the children in the school. The divine natural law is above the human law which constitutes the State; and when the State so manages matters as to impede the religious training which parents desire to give their children, it wrongfully puts the parents from their place, and if, while neglecting to make proper provision itself for the religious instruction of the children, the State impedes parents in the discharge of their duty, it inflicts violent and irreparable damage on parental rights.

We maintain, therefore, that all parents have the right to provide that the religious and secular education of their children should go together. Hence it is expedient, and it is the right of Catholic parents, to educate their children as Catholics in Catholic schools. To Protestants we willingly concede the same rights.

The Catholics of Manitoba and Ontario do not ask the State to furnish religious education, but they ask that they shall be permitted to furnish it at their own expense, and that while doing so, provided they do not neglect giving a proper secular education to their children, the State should not deprive Catholic schools of a share in whatever State aid may be given to any other schools in the Provinces, whether they be godless or not. If this be not done, a penalty is practically inflicted upon Catholics who do their full duty to their children. We say, then, that it is neither just nor expedient to refuse to Catholic schools, properly conducted, a share in whatever aid is extended by the State for school purposes, otherwise Catholics would be compelled to pay out of their own pockets for the instruction of their own children, while they would be taxed also to instruct the children of their Protestant neighbors.

To this state of affairs Catholics are subjected in most of the United States, but it is a glaring injustice. It is and it would be poor consolation to those Catholics who form the minority in Ontario and Manitoba to see the Protestants of Quebec subjected to the same ill-treatment. The three minorities should be protected in their parental rights, and it is the duty of the Dominion Parliament to protect them—Catholics and Protestant alike.

The Protestant clergy themselves advocate in Ontario the introduction of religious teaching in the schools, so that Catholics are not alone in claiming the right of having religious schools. Many Protestants, however, are satisfied with the reading of the Bible and a prayer before and after instruction. Catholics look upon this as a totally inadequate religious teaching, and we claim that these Protestants have no right to force their views upon us in this matter. Protestants are satisfied with this scanty religious teaching because they cannot find common ground beyond this, but Catholics know what their children should be taught. We claim, therefore, that if the Manitobans do violence to the rights of the minority, the Dominion Parliament should preserve the "Freedom of Religious Education" by protecting the Catholic minority of that Province.

The Mail has before now maintained that as we have advocated the autonomy of Quebec with regard to the Jesuit Estates Act, we should also maintain the right of Manitoba to legislate away Catholic schools.

There is no parallel whatsoever between the two cases. By the Jesuit Estates Act there is no injustice perpetrated on any one. It ought to have been an act of restitution simply: but by giving for Protestant education a sum proportioned to the Protestant population of the Province, it became an appropriation for educational purposes merely, on the same basis on which all educational grants are divided, and distributive justice was observed towards the minority; but in the threatened legislation for Manitoba, as we have shown, actual injustice would be perpetrated against a large section of the people. This is sufficient reason why such legislation should be disallowed.

The Oblate Annual Council assembled last week at Ottawa have appointed Rev. Father McGuckin, Rector of the Catholic University of Ottawa, Father McGuckin is now Vice-General in British Columbia and President of the Catholic College of New Westminster. He has for over twenty years labored on the Pacific coast, where he is well-known and much respected. He is an Irishman, in the prime of life and possessed of every qualification for the rectorship of the University. Archbishop Daham last winter obtained from the Pope recognition of the University of Ottawa for the English-speaking Catholics of the Dominion.

The Observatore Romano, the Holy Father's official organ, states that the numerous reports promulgated by Italian and foreign Liberal journals concerning the Pope's intention to leave Rome are totally unfounded. Reports have also been published concerning interviews between the Holy Father and certain diplomats. These are purely the inventions of those journals, as the interviews have had no existence.

THE CONDITION OF QUEBEC.

The Toronto Mail has a leading article on this subject which is fully in keeping with its insane policy of belittling the neighboring province and of keeping up the excitement and animosity it has engendered in the breasts of its fanatical supporters against everything and every body with the name of Catholic. It declares that the net sum of Quebec's indebtedness is \$13,000,000, and that the main cause of such chronic bankruptcy is the poverty of the people, which "compels the Provincial Government to undertake a variety of services which in Ontario belong to the municipalities." Compared with Queensland, Victoria, and other provinces of Australia, \$13,000,000 is not such an enormous debt as to plunge the whole province into utter bankruptcy. The Dominion Government of Canada is indebted to the tune of \$250,000,000 and yet we are not in a state of dependency nor are we going to put on sack cloth and ashes and bewail our national misfortune as beggars and bankrupts. If the Dominion is able to carry a debt of \$250,000,000, with its high five million inhabitants, surely the Province of Quebec, with its high two millions, can bear up under \$13,000,000.

While showing the superior system of Ontario the Mail explains the whole case of Quebec's indebtedness. It says that a variety of services which in Quebec are met by the Provincial Government are shouldered here by the municipalities. But the money comes out of the pockets of the people all the same. Whether the counties or the Government undertake to keep up the gulls or the roads or the drainage system or the charitable institutions, it is from the industry and the revenues of the people the money always comes. What terribly annoys the Mail is the fact that in Quebec Province all the charities are in the hands of ecclesiastics. Quoth the Mail:

"Over one hundred institutions of various kinds receive subventions every year under the guise of aid to public charities, etc., and nearly all these are controlled by religious orders."

What in the eyes of the Mail is a source of weakness and corruption, viewed by the light of experience proves to be, on the contrary, a principle of emolument to the country and a safeguard to the proper and faithful distribution of the people's money. The religious orders, whose members have made vows of poverty and who want for nothing and charge nothing for their services, are the very persons whose office and whose calling fit them, as dispensers of charity, for the work of discerning among the less fortunate classes who are deserving objects of consideration and who are not. They alone give freely and with a blessing and from the abundance of the heart. What aims they do bestow and what services they do render are gratefully received, while, on account of the contact and intercourse of the poor with those religious, a great moral work is accomplished and spiritual as well as corporal relief is afforded.

It is strange, though frequently it happens, that people contradict themselves without knowing it; and that in the very hour and on the very page that one thing is asserted its very opposite will be unblushingly maintained. In the very next column of the Mail in which charity passing through the hands of religious is reproved, charity by the hands of laymen, or, what it calls "misguided philanthropy," is also reproved. "Careless, indiscriminate charity," writes the Mail, "is an evil much greater than most people think. It is, in fact, a propagator of poverty, and it nourishes that which it ought to destroy." We have as many "paupers as we will pay for and the truth of the statement scarcely needs demonstration."

That such indiscriminate philanthropy exists in all Protestant states, and rather increases than diminishes poverty, is patent to any observer who will take the trouble of studying the ways and means which they invariably adopt in their methods of affording relief to the poor. In England and Ireland, where the poor law system prevails, a great portion of the money extorted by law as poor rates is squandered on big-salaried officials, while the poor are treated as convicts, half-starved and degraded, as though they were criminals. And it is a fact that while the deserving poor remain outside the work house and manage, as best they can, to keep body and soul together, only the idlers and the loafers or the dissolute are clothed and fed by the State. Red tape and charity cannot get along very well together. Charity, springing from the pure love of God, must be necessarily allied to religion, and no other charity can exist. To tax a Government with pusillanimity and mismanagement because of its wisdom in the proper distribution of its charities through the agency of religious orders is the same of folly and insolence on the part of any journalist. When it is remembered, however, that the writers in the Mail are self-confessed infidels, and do not believe in prayer, wonder ceases. Nor should we marvel at the

blind inconsistency which first condemns the prudent distribution of the public funds by religious orders and then condemns the alternative, for, in another column, the Mail says:

"Any State which chose to make a periodical and careless distribution of public funds by way of charity would soon make of its citizens a race of beggars."

And this is exactly what the Province of Quebec does not do. That Catholic Province, like every other Catholic State, endows religious orders, and, through them, reaches the deserving poor. Previous to the Reformation, in England there were no such establishments as work-houses. Nor were the people taxed to their uttermost stilling for the maintenance of those degrading institutions in which emaciated officials grow fat and unfortunate paupers are starved. The monasteries and convents took care of the poor. The Mail continues:

"At the present moment Cardinal Taché, as president of a committee charged with the distribution of an appropriation of \$50,000 among distressed agricultural districts. To sum up, the Church and her orders virtually direct the expenditure on education, colonization and the maintenance of asylums, reformatories and charities, a large portion of which is consumed by the orders themselves, etc."

The above admission speaks volumes for the unalloyed trust reposed in the honesty and unselfishness of priests and bishops by the people's representatives in the Province of Quebec. It must be at least two hundred years and more since this state of things has existed, and the bishops and the religious orders have nobly acquitted themselves of the grave responsibility of handing such vast sums for the benefit of the poor and of the "distressed agricultural districts." Had suspicion ever attached to the gestation of such charities by the Church long since complaints would have been made, and laymen would have been selected for the distribution of the public funds. But the same confidence in the honesty and unselfishness of the priests and Bishops exists as firmly to day as it obtained in the time of Bishop Laval and Duplessis. The French-Canadians are not such dolls as the Mail supposes. They entrust their moneys and charities to those alone in whom they have the most unbounded confidence. Probably the people of Ontario would go and do likewise if they thought it safe or advisable to entrust large amounts to the safe keeping of bishops, parsons and principals of colleges who would offer no objection to being "subvented" for such philanthropic work.

Strange it seems and inexplicable, how men or ministers, who would not be trusted with the handling of charitable donations, are yet entrusted with the "breaking of the bread of life" and with the guidance and care of immortal souls.

THE MAIL'S ABSURDITIES.

From time to time the Mail, in its zeal for the preservation of the integrity of Canada, delivers a very serious lecture to the French-Canadians, in which it attempts to prove that they are ripe to become annexed to the United States. A few days ago we were treated to one of these essays, the whole evidence that this is the case being that Mr. Bechard has said that the Province of Quebec might have recourse to this alternative if she were overpowered in any struggle which might be inaugurated by Ontario fanatics to impose upon Quebec the intolerable yoke of subjection to Ontario parsons and Orangemen.

There is little danger that such a crisis should arise. It is true there is a great deal of tall talk published in the columns of that journal, over the signatures of parsons and other fanatics in which the threats uttered against Quebec are unmistakable, but the people of that Province are perfectly well aware that the parsons have small influence over the public opinion of Ontario; and though such firebrands as Bishop Sullivan