

The Catholic Record.
 Published Weekly at 44 and 46 Richmond street, London, Ontario.
 Price of subscription—\$2.50 per annum.
 REV. GEORGE B. NORTHGRAVES,
 Author of "Mistake of Modern Infidelity."
 REV. WILLIAM FLANNERY,
 THOMAS COFFEY.
 Publisher and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY,
 Messrs. LUKS, KING, JOHN NICH and
 P. J. NEVEY are fully authorized to receive
 subscriptions and transact all other business
 for the CATHOLIC RECORD.
 Agent for Alexandria, Glenora and
 Lochiel.—Mr. Donald A. McDonald.
 Rates of Advertising—Ten cents per line
 each insertion.
 Approved by the Archbishop of Toronto,
 and recommended by the Archbishops of
 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.

Catholic Record.
 London, Sat., March 8th, 1890.

A STRIKING CONTRAST.

In last week's issue we drew what we considered a very striking contrast between the open handed, generous liberality with which the Protestant minority is legislated for in the Province of Quebec, and the stunted, grudging, half-hearted policy that barely tolerates the existence of Catholic Separate schools in this Province. Whatever concessions have been granted by the Protestant majority to us Catholics were obtained only after years of contention, bitterness and strife at the polling booth. From the year 1850 to the year 1863 the whole country was agitated over the question of Catholic Separate schools for the Catholics of Ontario. It was the test question put to every candidate for Parliamentary honors. Orangemen and Protestant fanatics of both the Grit and Tory factions insisted on a promise of refusal to vote in favor of Separate schools. Catholics, on the other hand, refused to vote for any candidate who would not pledge himself to vote in their favor. For some years the houses were equally divided, and the de facto Government was on more than one memorable occasion saved by a majority of one. Finally Sir John threw up the sponge and resigned, when the Sandfield M. Donald and Slocote Government was formed in 1863. The late lamented Thomas D'Arcy McGee was a member of the Cabinet of the new Ministry. He declared in his first speech to the new house that he accepted a portfolio in the new ministry on the understanding that the Catholic Separate school question should be settled at once and forever. Thereupon an Independent member Mr. R. W. Scott, stood up and proposed a bill for the establishment of the Catholic Separate schools, which he had been maturing for some time. With a few amendments, proposed by the late Dr. E. Ryerson, Chief Superintendent of Education, the Separate School Bill as proposed by Hon. Mr. Scott was carried almost unanimously. Thus, for thirteen years, ending in 1863, the country was agitated from lake to ocean by the struggles of the Catholic people of Upper Canada to obtain the same privileges for the education of their children that were freely granted to the Protestant minority of Lower Canada. The contrast was certainly very striking between Catholic and Protestant legislation for weak minorities. In Lower Canada the Catholic Government made provisions, from the very beginning, for such education of Protestant children as would satisfy the most exacting Protestant parent. In Upper Canada, on the contrary, the concessions made to the Catholic minority were gained after a long struggle, after many succeeding waves of intolerance and bigotry had passed over the Province, after the Toronto Colonist and the Toronto Globe had lashed into fury the ever-restless tide of ignorant prejudice and Protestant fanaticism, and only after the leading politicians of both Provinces saw the impossibility of establishing a stable and permanent government, under which both the majority and the minority could live contented and united under a common flag, and with proper guarantees and safeguards for the protection and loyalty of all. Yet the concessions so grudgingly yielded to the Catholic minority are away behind and very inferior to the liberal provisions made, without any contention or disturbance, for the Protestant minority in Quebec Province. Let us cite a few instances: In his London speech Mr. W. Meredith quoted the entire length of a long letter written by the late lamented Archbishop Lynch on the occasion of the election of a school trustee in which the Archbishop, among other things, stated: "The Church justly and religiously claims the right to define the bounds of her own rights and jurisdiction. Were this in the power of the State the Church would not always be permitted to preach the true gospel of Christ. Now we pronounce that the election of Separate school trustees is a religious affair, and that each elector must answer before God for his vote. 'Obey your prelates and be loyal to them, for they watch as having to render an account of your souls, that they may do this with joy and not with grief.' God will not bless those who disobey their lawful ecclesiastical superiors in sacred matters."

This teaching of Archbishop Lynch on educational matters is derided and denounced by Mr. Meredith, who said that: "No man who was not a traitor to his country would have admitted the right of the Church to define the limits of its jurisdiction, and to hand over directly to the Church the control of the educational affairs of any portion of the people of this Province. I say it would never have been assented to by any Legislature in this Province."

Most certainly it never would in this bigoted Province, but it has been assented to in the tolerant, Christian Province of Quebec. Down there they do not consider themselves traitors to their country when they place the legislation of their school matters entirely at the disposal of the Protestant Church. The Rev. Mr. Elson Rexford tells us, in his official report:

"That attached to and forming part of the Council of Education in Quebec is a Protestant committee which is composed of ten members appointed by the Government, five members appointed by the Provincial Association of Protestant teachers of the Province. The members appointed by the Government are taken chiefly from the ranks of the Protestant clergy, with the Protestant Bishops included."

And to the members of this committee the Catholic government of Quebec hands over the whole and sole control of the educational matters of the Protestant people of that Province.

Mr. W. Meredith declares that "no man in this Province of Ontario could assent to a similar line of action unless he were a traitor to his country." How differently constituted are the two peoples living under the same flag and paying allegiance to the same sovereign! It happens, too, that both nationalities are contemporaneous, and that both are surrounded with all the influences and lights of the nineteenth century civilization; yet the people of Quebec, who, every day, are tainted with medieval bigotry, held up to contempt as the inferior race, and subject to Ultramontane dictation, are willing to hand over to the Protestant Church the education of the Protestant children, and have been doing so for the last fifty years. Besides, it must be admitted that there is no Third Party or Equal Rights Association among them calling for the abolition of Protestant Separate schools or looking for any interference whatever with the rights of Protestant parents in Quebec to educate their own children as they deem fit and proper. Were Mr. Meredith to proclaim it in a public speech, when announcing the programme of his political party, that no man in Quebec except a traitor to his country could assent to the continuation of such liberal legislation, he would be denounced as a bigot by every fair-minded man in the Dominion, whether Catholic or Protestant. This, however, is what Mr. W. Meredith has done in his London speech, when he said: "That no man who was not a traitor to his country would have assented to legislation which admitted the right of the Church to define the limits of its jurisdiction and to hand over directly to the Church the control of the educational affairs of any portion of the people of this Province"

Other instances of the striking difference between Catholic and Protestant legislation for religious minorities will be shown forth in a future number. The above contrast must strike every one as glaring, if not, indeed, incomprehensible.

THROWN BY THE PROTESTANT HORSE.

Mr. Frederick J. French, M. P. for Grenville, and Mr. W. R. Meredith, member for London, have been rendering themselves ridiculous in the Ontario Legislature by raising foolish issues on the Separate school question. The school law of 1863 provides that whenever there is a municipal or provincial grant for school purposes, the Separate schools shall have an apportionment of the same proportionate to average attendance at the respective schools. In accordance with this provision, a grant of \$23,000 being proposed for Public poor schools of the Province, \$1,800 were proposed to be apportioned for Separate poor schools. On this being announced by the Government, Mr. Meredith occupied the time of the House by raising the objection that the grant would encourage the establishment of Separate schools. Our eminent legal light, who is so learned, especially in school law, was obliged to subsidize, though very unwillingly, when he was shown, what he seemed not to be at all aware of, that the law required the apportionment to be so made.

Mr. French made himself equally ridiculous by asking, amid a great flourish of trumpets, whether the pupils of Ottawa convents had been accounted on the school returns as Separate school pupils. Complaint had been made by the secretary of the Ottawa Public school board that this was the case, but Hon. Mr. Ross, in replying to Mr. French's questions, explained that there is no foundation for the statements made. The facts of the case are that the Ottawa Separate schools are crowded, and in consequence of this, two rooms in the convent were used temporarily as Separate school rooms,

the classes being inspected in the usual way.

To show the enormity of the crime committed by the Separate school trustees in thus providing for the needs of the pupils, Mr. Ross pointed out that Public schools had several times used Church buildings without any objection being offered. He instanced Kew Beach church, two Baptist mission churches, two Anglican churches or Sunday school rooms, one Methodist and one Presbyterian Sunday school room. So the Protestant horse collapsed.

WHY CUMBERETH IT THE GROUND!

The Presbyterian Witness, of Halifax, N. S., is very greatly angered by an able exposition of Catholic doctrine, and a refutation of certain doctrinal fallacies issued as a pastoral letter by His Grace the Most Rev. Dr. O'Brien, Archbishop of Halifax. His Grace points out that the theory of his man's future lot pronounced by the divines of Andover college under the guise of "Progressive Orthodoxy," is a modern invention, having no foundation in Holy Scripture or tradition. According to this novel teaching, man must have after this life a period of continuous probation, inasmuch as many men did not know sufficiently God's will while they were on earth. His Grace properly condemns this invention of new doctrines and passing them off as if they were divine revelations, a practice which is very common nowadays among the various sects.

His Grace says: "The only probation ground for man is this world, for it is appointed unto man once to die, and after this the judgment." (Heb. ix, 27.) . . . and "those who lived under the law as the Apostle taught were judged by the law; those who lived without knowledge of that law are judged by the law of nature—that is, by the use they make of their reason and free will and the initial grace of prayer."

The Presbyterian Witness congratulates His Grace on his having some acquaintance with "the great debate" on this subject of "the Progressive Orthodoxy of Andover." It is great only in the sense that it shows that the whole theology of that institution consists in substituting human fancies for divine revelation, and the debates on the revision of the Westminster Confession are great in exactly the same sense. His Grace, speaking of the Confession, says, after referring to the "cruel Calvinistic doctrine of foredoom":

"Let those look to the rock from which they were hewn (Is. li), and ask themselves why or how their confession arose at all. Clearly it cannot be God's work, else to revise were to incur the anathema pronounced by St. Paul: 'But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach a gospel to you besides that which we have preached to you, let him be anathema.' It cannot have been the creed of the early Christians, for that we find identical with the teachings of the Catholic Church, always living, always progressing, always developing new beauties, and more perfect symmetry of form, but always on the same lines and in the same essence. Why, then, does this reversible Confession exist in our age of enlightenment and culture?"

He then explains that were it not for the prejudices of education and for want of reflection on Catholic unchangeable truth, "thousands would cry: 'cut it down! why cumbereth it the ground.'"

The Witness is not pleased with His Grace's forcible logic, and, like many dishonest controversialists, answers with a volley of abuse, which we pass over in order to reach its attempt at reasoning. It says: "As might be expected, His Grace misapprehends the relation of the Presbyterian Church to the Confession of Faith. We never received it as a revelation from God, as infallible, or irrefragable or unreviseable. We know it to be a human production, and do not pretend that it is anything else. We do not deceive ourselves or our people by claiming that it is inspired or infallible." . . . and more of the same sort.

Surely this is a very convenient way to excuse one's Church for having taught false doctrine for nearly three hundred years: "We always held it to be reviseable. We always knew it contained merely human doctrines." Why then has Presbyterianism always claimed to reform the one true Church which Christ instituted, and to substitute its now acknowledged errors for the doctrines which have come down in the Catholic Church unchanged from the Apostolic age? What have men gained if they are merely to be taught such absurdities as foredoom, future probation, and, above all, that the Pope is anti Christ, instead of the venerable doctrines of the Catholic Church, whereas it is now admitted that the Presbyterian novelties are errors which must be revised out of the Confession? And by what claim can Presbyterian teachers, with these falsehoods on their lips, profess that they have received from Christ the mission to "teach all nations all things whatsoever I have commanded you?" (St. Matt. xxviii, 20) With what face but a brazen one can they pretend that Christ promised to send the Paraclete, the spirit of truth, to teach them ALL TRUTH, and to abide with them forever?

The Confession of Faith which is thus acknowledged to be but a tissue of falsehoods, a mere human compilation put forth under pretence of being the divine and revealed truth of God, ought indeed to be revised—out of existence. The Church of Christ, styled by St. Paul "the pillar and ground of truth," should teach nothing but the truth of Christ; but of this compilation of error the Archbishop very properly asks: "Why cumbereth it the ground?"

Not His Grace, but the Witness, misapprehends the relations of the Presbyterian Church to the Confession. The Church formally claims that the Confession contains "God's undoubted truth and verity, founded only upon his written word. And therefore we abhor and detest all contrary religion and doctrine." Further, the Church declares: "To which Confession and form of religion we will ingly agree in our conscience in all points." Among the doctrines thus solemnly pronounced upon, it condemns "the usurped authority of the Roman anti-Christ." (See National Covenant of 1590 and 1651.)

If this were not the case, how could a Presbyterian Apostle presume to act upon the directions of Christ to go forth from the unbelieving house or city which refused to receive him, shaking the dust from his feet, in the consciousness that because of His divine mission, it would be "more tolerable for Sodom and Gomorrah on the judgment day than for that house or city?"

The same covenant declares "before God and the whole world" this Confession to be "the only true Christian faith and religion pleasing God and bringing salvation to man." And all this is not only affirmed, but is sworn to by the Church most solemnly.

The Witness, however, has a queer theory in regard to revelation. It states, in reference to the doctrine that the Pope is anti-Christ: "Now, no doubt the Pope is (anti Christ) but many of us think it would be well not to have the statement in the Confession."

If this be left out of the Confession, of course it will be no longer an obligatory doctrine to be believed, and it will no longer be sworn to by the clergy. We all know how difficult it is to have the Presbyterians believe what is actually in the Confession; but if it be left out of "the only true Christian faith and religion," how is it to be expected that it will be received as a part of revealed truth? It is a queer method of obeying the command to teach all which Christ revealed, to leave some of His revelation out of the body of doctrine because "some think it would be well to leave such a statement out." When the Presbyterian Church organs speak in such a style, it is surely time to ask "Why does the Confession any longer cumber the ground?"

The Church organs may try to conceal the fact under a delusive form of words, but the reason why the revision movement has grown so strong is that Presbyterians no longer believe in the Westminster Confession of Faith. They know it to be false in many parts, notwithstanding its pretensions to be the truth of God. Why then cumbereth it the ground?

We will not here refute the nonsensical statements of the Witness that Catholics are guilty of Mariolatry, or that the Catholic Church has many "un-Christian features." It is easier to make such false statements than to prove them, and the Witness does not attempt proof, because it well knows that it would fail lamentably.

ENGLISH TEACHING IN FRENCH SCHOOLS.

The Education Department for Ontario has published a valuable pamphlet containing the evidence of well-known educationalists in England, Scotland, Wales, Ireland and the United States in regard to bi-lingual education. The universal testimony of these educators is what was to be expected, that where children are accustomed to one language at home, which differs from that which is prevalent in the country, and to which special attention is paid in the school-room, the only means of teaching successfully is through the medium of the language which is heard at home. This is the case equally in districts of Wales, in the Highlands of Scotland, in those parts of Ireland where Irish is the prevailing tongue and among the Indians in the Western portions of the United States. In every case the writers state that where the mother tongue is ignored, the children make little or no progress, and even where some progress is made at school, the natural result of the ignoring method of treatment is that the children grow up detesting one language or the other. In most cases they detest the language which they are forced to learn at school, as being imposed upon them by an alien race desirous of suppressing everything which savors of their own nationality. In some cases they grow up detesting their own nationality, which they are forced to look upon as inferior.

We may safely say that in either case a grievous wrong is inflicted. It is not desirable that children should learn from

childhood to detest their own race and nationality; neither is it good they should foster a hatred towards that of their companions who constitute the predominant element in the country.

In Canada we are peculiarly situated owing to the existence of two languages, each of which is predominant in its own locality. Yet it is to the interest of the whole population that both races shall feel themselves to be truly citizens enjoying equal rights before the law. It would be disastrous to force on one-third of the population of the Dominion the conviction that they are regarded as aliens or intruders in the country. The French Canadians are neither aliens nor intruders. They are the original possessors of the soil, and the pioneer settlers of the country. When Canada was ceded to Great Britain, they were guaranteed the full privileges of British citizenship, so that any attempt to place them in a position of inferiority would be as unjust as it were ungracious.

It has been said by one of the foremost of Canadian statesmen that the majority of the population of a country should treat the minority not only with justice, but with overflowing generosity, precisely because they constitute the majority; with such generosity should the English speaking population of Canada, and especially of Ontario, regard the French Canadians, the more so because the latter have in good faith accepted the position of British subjects, relying upon the promises which were made to them. Or rather, it is more accurate to say, the forefathers of the present race of French-Canadians accepted this position, and maintained it at a time when great inducements were offered them to abrogate it. By their loyalty to the British throne they preserved this Dominion to be a British colony. Surely by such devotedness they earned for themselves and their posterity all the equal rights to which British subjects are entitled.

But the present race of French-Canadians have, if possible, still stronger claims upon the English speaking population. They were born British subjects, equally with the English speaking portion of the country, and they have contributed their share towards building up and defending the Dominion. Nothing less than the most narrow-minded bigotry could bring the English speaking section of the population to deprive their French-Canadian fellow-citizens of their rights in the smallest degree. It would, therefore, be a most inexcusable piece of tyranny to attempt by force to deprive them of their language.

It is not long since we had occasion to rebuke a contemporary which made an impassioned appeal to the people of Ontario to suppress the French "patois." To characterize the language of a Chateaubriand, a Bismarck, a Fenelon, a Lamartine, as a patois, which ought to be suppressed, is indicative of an ignorance which ought to be not merely suppressed, but wiped out of existence.

We say then that the crusade which is being carried on against the use of French in Ontario schools is ungenerous, narrow and unjust. It is not desirable, if it were possible to suppress it. The testimony of the pamphlet issued by the Government proves to demonstration that the best way to bring the French Canadian population in Eastern and Western Ontario to a knowledge of English, is to teach both languages effectively in their schools. Let it be the aim to teach English especially, but not through the total exclusion of French, which is the means which Mr. Meredith, the Mail and the London Free Press would adopt for this purpose.

There is little if any doubt that in time the English language will prevail even in the French settlements of Ontario. The French settlers are gradually learning English, and they are anxious to have their children also instructed in English. As a matter of fact, the report of the Commissioners on French schools state that in many of the localities which a few years ago were almost exclusively French, English is the prevailing language now, and in some cases almost exclusively taught. It is not necessary, then, to use violent means to suppress French, though we are decidedly of opinion that it would be well, on the contrary, to take measures, not for its suppression, but for its preservation.

It is remarkable that Mr. Meredith, in the Ontario Legislature, accused the Administration of issuing campaign literature at the public expense, because of the publication of the pamphlet to which we have alluded above. Surely after the fiery speeches which were delivered during the past year on the necessity of having English taught in all schools, it was desirable that the public should have some information on the best means of teaching English. This information the pamphlet in question affords. But it is easy to see that the information goes to prove that Mr. Meredith's plan is not the best, but that the Hon. Mr. Ross's moderate policy is the one best calculated even to attain the object which Mr. Meredith professes to have in view. We can only conclude that Mr. Meredith's object is simply to gain the votes of those who desire not so much that the

French Canadians in Ontario should become skillful English scholars as that they should be humiliated and persecuted for the delectation of Orangemen and their glorification on 12th-of-July platforms. It remains to be seen whether Mr. Meredith will gain his object by his unpatriotic course.

ANOTHER MANIFESTO.

"On foundations of equity alone can a great country be built up, and with whatever solid decayed material may be incorporated into the edifice, the day of trial will discover its weakness and will demonstrate the folly of preferring party or temporary quiet, or the false representation of charity, or anything else, to those clear principles which are the safest guide of public action, and of which perfect freedom and true charity are the blessed fruit."

This declaration is found in a pretentious document issued last week by the Provincial Council of the so-called Equal Rights Association for Ontario, and if the document in question confined itself to the enunciation of such views we could cordially agree with it. But, unfortunately for the peace of the country, the measures proposed therein are quite at variance with these correct principles.

Last summer the convention which, under pretence of representing Ontario, met in Toronto to consider the Jesuit Estates Act of the Province of Quebec, and to impose the will of an inconsiderable faction in Ontario upon that Province, advisedly refused to touch the subject of Separate schools. There is no doubt as to what were the general sentiments of the assemblage. They would willingly have put into their programme a clause calling for the abolition of Separate schools in Ontario, but it was decided that their doing so would have endangered the privileges enjoyed by the Protestant minority in Quebec. What else than this could have been expected from a convention led by the persons who at their synods and conferences pronounced that Popery is a menace to the country, and that a body of unostentatious priests who, unlike these meddling persons, mind their own business and the calls of duty, are endeavoring to subvert the Constitution of the Dominion, and ought to be driven from the country. In their mouth "Equal Rights for all" means rights and privileges for Protestants, wrongs and persecution for Catholics.

This newly-issued manifesto, however, throws off the mask. It is now to be a plank in their platform to take out of the Confederation Act the clause which saves the educational rights of minorities in the Dominion. At first glance this might seem fair enough, since they acknowledge that the Protestant minority of Quebec must in such case be subjected to the mercy of the Catholic majority, if the Catholic minority in Ontario be subjected to the will of the Protestant majority. They say, in fact:

"No one wishes to claim for Ontario anything which would not be conceded to Quebec. All the Provinces should have liberty to establish or retain or abolish Separate schools as they should see cause. All should be placed on exactly the same footing."

It would seem, therefore, that the party of Equal Rights are quite willing to abandon their present protectorate over the Protestants of Quebec, provided they can get into their hands the power of dealing harshly with the Catholic minority in Ontario. It is difficult for us to believe that a majority of the people of Ontario would consent to adopt this platform so ungenerous to their own co-religionists, even if they were as anxious as are these Equal Rightists to annoy Catholics.

But the concocters of this plan have a method in their madness. They have persuaded themselves that the people of Quebec will tamely look on, and will continue to the Protestants of that Province the privileges of Separate schools, while the Protestants of Ontario are restricting, nay abolishing, all the privileges which are now enjoyed by Catholics. They say:

"Should such modification of the Federation Act be obtained as would allow the Provinces to deal with the whole question of education, and should Ontario, in the exercise of her liberty, abolish Separate schools, there is no fear of Quebec making reprisals upon the minority of that Province."

After this acknowledgment that they have every confidence in the straightforward honesty and liberality of the Catholic people of Quebec, whom they admit that they think they cannot even goad to illiberal measures, what are we to think of the pretence of Ontario Equal Rights orators who have all along made it one of their chief arguments against the Catholic body that we are only anxious for the opportunity to persecute Protestants? The Equal Rights Committee have made it plain where the anxiety to persecute for conscience' sake exists. They firmly believe that they can bring a majority of the people of Ontario to force their obnoxious views upon Catholics; while they acknowledge that it is their belief that Catholics, where they are in a majority, cannot even be goaded into making reprisals!

The Equal Rightists may find them-