

The Catholic Record.

Published Weekly at 481 and 186 Richmond street, London, Ontario.
Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

REV. GEORGE R. NORTHGRAVES,
MISSES. LUTY, KING, JOHN NICH, P. J. NEVEN and M. C. O'DONNELL are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transact all other business for the CATHOLIC RECORD.

THOMAS COFFEY,
Publisher and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY, MISSES. LUTY, KING, JOHN NICH, P. J. NEVEN and M. C. O'DONNELL are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transact all other business for the CATHOLIC RECORD.

Rates of Advertising—Ten cents per line each insertion, adrate measurement.
Approved and recommended by the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa, and St. Boniface, and the Bishops of London, Hamilton and Peterboro, and the clergy throughout the Dominion.

Correspondence intended for publication, as well as that having reference to business, should be directed to the proprietor, and must reach London not later than Tuesday morning.
Arrears must be paid in full before the paper can be stopped.

London, Saturday, April 23, 1892.

DOES THE END JUSTIFY THE MEANS?

A curious prosecution has been instituted by Rev. Dr. Parkhurst, of New York, as President of the Society for the Prevention of Crime.

Dr. Parkhurst, in company with a Mr. Gardner, agent of the society, and Mr. John Irving, a member of Mr. Parkhurst's congregation, visited a disreputable house kept by a Mrs. Hattie Adams, for the purpose of obtaining evidence on which to base a prosecution against the proprietress.

The evidence of the three visitors was to the effect that Dr. Parkhurst had discarded his clerical dress and assumed that of a man of business, so that access to the house would not be denied the party. They reached the house at half past eleven, before midnight, and after some parley with the proprietress, it was arranged that five of the girls who were inmates of the establishment should dance the can-can in their presence.

We suppose that the reverend gentleman, who was the manager of the whole proceedings, imagined that by employing an agent to make the subordinate arrangements for the "circus," he would escape the guilt of participating in the immoral entertainment of which he was the chief promoter and designer. Surely the reverend doctor deserves as much fame for his ingenuity as was attained by Beatrice de Cenci, who did not herself imbue her hands in her father's blood, but merely employed and paid the assassins who carried out her plans. We may here remark that the term "circus" was used by Dr. Parkhurst himself in describing the proceedings. Being asked in the cross-examination what he meant by this word, he answered that "he meant a sort of gymnastic exercise performed by the young women."

We are aware that detectives sometimes succeed in breaking up bands of thieves, burglars, and other criminals, by becoming members of their gangs, and even by taking part in the crimes committed, or by inducing them to commit crime, so that they may be captured in the act. But we were not aware that Christian ethics permitted this to be done, in face of the pronouncement of St. Paul that evil is not to be done that good may come from it. Yet we find a singular disinclination on the part of the Protestant religious press to pronounce it wrong for Dr. Parkhurst to have bargained for an immoral exhibition, even though his object was to get sufficient proof of the evil character of the establishment, so that it might be broken up.

Are we to conclude from all this that what Protestant ministers have been long proclaiming to be one of the wicked teachings of Jesuits is in reality a distinctively Protestant doctrine? There is in fact considerable evidence in history that this doctrine is really generally believed by Protestants, notwithstanding the indignation they so readily exhibit when the Jesuits are falsely accused of teaching the same thing. The Anglican Bishops formally told Charles I. of England that he could lawfully sign Lord Stafford's death-warrant, in order to save his throne; and a Presbyterian clergyman who condemned dancing as a sin, at the same time publicly declared that President Harrison was justified in permitting it at his inauguration ball; and now we find Dr. Parkhurst and the Society for the Prevention of Crime endorsing by their practice the same doctrine.

It is perhaps unnecessary for us to repeat here that neither Jesuits nor any other Catholic theologians have ever taught this doctrine, that "the end justifies the means," though it is not long since the parsons of Ontario and Quebec endeavored to stir up the Protestants of the Dominion into a ferment mainly on the plea that this is a Jesuit doctrine. Over and over again was this calumny repeated, especially during the anti-Jesuit agitation, and

Principal MacVicar of Montreal went so far, in June, 1887, as to read before the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Canada a report of the Committee on French Evangelization, in which occurs the statement that the "standard Jesuit theological and ethical writings which are assiduously inculcated in colleges and seminaries, but also are made to permeate the whole system of elementary education in the Province of Quebec" are "impure and corrupting," and that in consequence of such teaching there is a "great and increasing difficulty in getting witnesses to speak the truth and to regard the sacred obligations of a judicial oath." (Proceedings of Assembly at Winnipeg, 11th June, 1887.)

Bishop A. Cleveland Cox, of Western New York, was also one of those who made a similar charge against the Jesuits. Would it not be in order now for these gentlemen to pour out some of their indignation against Dr. Parkhurst and the theologians who belong to the Society for the Prevention of Crime, who have practically advocated the very doctrine which they falsely attributed to the Jesuits?

We do not expect them to do this, however. Both these gentleman and others whom we might name devote so much of their leisure to the concoction of calumnies against Catholics that they cannot find time to purge false teachings out of Protestantism.

WAR BLUSTER.

It is a favorite device of the Irish Orangemen to threaten dire warfare unless their political notions are carried out by the powers that rule. This habit seems to be hereditary, and we are accustomed to read in the twelfth of July orations every year the harmless threat that rivers of red gore will flow if their views are not carried out. But the country generally goes along smoothly enough in spite of these terrible menaces, and we are never treated to the scenes of bloodshed with which we are regularly threatened, except that if on such occasions a lonely Catholic is met by a dozen or more of these fire eaters, he may fare badly at their hands—or if there is an orphanage or hospital kept by unarmaged Catholic ladies, such as the Sisters of Charity, an Orange mob is very likely to assemble from time to time to break the windows at midnight, when there are no men around to protect the defenceless females.

The Orange members of the British Parliament have recently proclaimed once more their determination to resist by force the establishment of Home Rule in Ireland if the Liberals pass a Home Rule measure during the next session of Parliament. A meeting was held recently at the residence of Lord Arthur Hill, comptroller of the Queen's household, at which the Ulster Tories members formed themselves into an "Ulster Defence Association," and passed blustering resolutions by which all present bound themselves to take up arms to prevent Irish self-government in case a Home Rule Bill should become law. One of the principal speakers was the notorious Colonel Sanderson, who promised that Ulster would furnish 300,000 men to fight the Home Rulers, and to protect Protestant Ulster against being dominated by the Papist majority of the other three provinces of Ireland.

The character of the Irish Orangemen is so well known that these threats are taken at their proper value. The Orangemen of Ulster have just courage enough, when they are in overwhelming force, to waylay funeral processions, as they did recently the procession which was escorting the remains of a venerated priest to its last resting-place. They break windows under cover of the darkness, and attack peaceful Catholics in their homes, but they take care to do the like of these acts of violence only when they know there will be no men to resist, or when they are backed by a strong police force, or by the military. Hence Colonel Sanderson's braggadocio is very generally estimated at its proper value, and those who took part in the bluster at the Defence Association meeting are ridiculed as empty blusters even by the Tory press. Lord Randolph Churchill affects to believe that the threats will be carried out and that a serious conflict will take place between Protestants and Catholics in Ireland if Home Rule be granted; but the Belfast *National Observer*, which is an ultra-Orange organ, advises the nationalists not to make themselves ridiculous by their empty threats. Lord Churchill's views on their significance are put at their true value. He advised Ulster to take up arms in self-

defence in his famous Belfast speech a few years ago, and he gets so much value on his own influence that he imagines the people of Ulster will do just what he recommended.

The truth is the Protestant tenant farmers of Ulster are becoming every day more and more convinced that the triumph of the Nationalist cause is the only remedy for the evils from which the country is suffering, and which press upon them just as severely as upon their Catholic neighbors. Home Rule is not a religious question at all. The question at issue is the protection of the people at large from landlord oppression, altogether independently of their religious creed; and the Protestant tenant farmers are becoming fully aware of this.

The Orangemen, however, fearful that their dominancy will be at an end, as a last resort have resolved to raise a religious howl as a means of preserving their ascendancy. It is certain, however, that no agitation they may attempt will prevent the success of the Liberals at the coming election, which it is now expected will take place in June or July.

It is said that the Unionists or Tories will contest every seat in Ireland, and this statement is probably near the truth.

Outside of Ulster, that is to say, in nearly three-fourths of the constituencies of Ireland, the Tory vote amounts to less than 9 per cent. of the total vote usually polled; but the only hope of the party to retain the sixteen seats they now hold in Ulster is to make it as expensive as possible for the Nationalists to keep their eighty-six seats. They hope that in this way the Nationalists may run short of funds to contest the elections successfully. There is little danger, however, that the Nationalists will suffer for want of money, as means are already being taken to supply this need at the present critical juncture. The principal danger lies in the fact that the division in the Nationalist party, arising out of the obstinacy of Mr. Parnell and those who adhered to him, may cause the loss of a few seats—not more than half a dozen at most. But there is even ground for hope that this unfortunate breach will be closed before the elections come on, and that the Nationalists will take the field as an unbroken phalanx, in spite of the cowardly threats of Colonel Sanderson, T. W. Russell and their tribe.

It is scarcely necessary to say that the Irishmen and English Liberals laugh at the threats of Colonel Sanderson and his echoes. The same doubtful warriors made precisely similar threats when the Irish Anglican Church was disestablished. Colonel Sanderson and Orange Grand Master Johnston declared then that "the ditches from Belfast to the Boyne would be lined with rifles" in defence of the tyrannical Irish Church of England establishment; but the lining was never supplied. It is worthy of note, however, that the Government have taken no notice of these treasonable sentiments uttered in the house of one of the Queen's officials. If Irish Catholics had given expression to such threats they would have been mercilessly shot down, as even innocent men were dealt with at Mitchelstown for attending a peaceable meeting, the object of which was to obtain redress of grievances by constitutional means.

The utter folly of all this talk about Ulster demanding protection from the rest of Ireland in case Home Rule be established, is sufficiently clear from the single fact that at this moment a majority of the Ulster members in Parliament are Home Rulers. Ulster has 33 members, 17 of whom are Nationalists and 16 Tories. But the popular majorities make the absurdity still more conspicuous. The Nationalist vote polled in 1886 were 118,008, while the Tory votes numbered only 105,591, giving a Nationalist majority of 11,417. The fact is the ultra-Protestant Ulster of which so much is spoken is a mere myth. It is true the Protestants of Ulster are a majority of the population, but the majority is but small, as the Catholics are within a small fraction of 48 per cent. of the population of the Province, according to the last census. The numbers are: Catholics, 833,566; Protestants, 909,513. But from the votes polled it will be seen that many Protestants are as much in favor of Home Rule as are the Catholics.

It follows from this that Colonel Sanderson's army of 300,000 Ulster Orangemen attacking Home Rule would be sadly lacking in the expected number of rank and file; and as the Catholics and Protestant Home Rulers would not be likely to lie down quietly to be killed while the 300,000 were

marching to victory, the latter would find quite enough to do to hold Ulster instead of marching on to Dublin to overawe the new Irish Parliament.

The Ulster Nationalists elected in 1886 did not gain their seats by merely accidental majorities. The three Donegal members were elected by majorities of 1,421; 3,349; 3,506, respectively. South Down was carried by 970; the two Fermanaghs by 266, and 1,233; Mid-Tyrone by 1,987; the two Monaghans by 1,471, and 3,706. In the other Nationalist constituencies the majorities were smaller, but they were sufficient to show that the Ulster Orangemen are not Ulster. Some of the Tory members had majorities which were small enough too. In South Tyrone the majority was only 99, and in South Derry it was only 138, or about one half of the smallest Nationalist majority given above.

With these facts in view, it will be seen that the talk of the Ulster Defence Associates is empty vaporing. In Ireland, with Home Rule, the Protestant minority would be treated justly; but justice is not what the fanatics want. They want ascendancy. Catholics are now excluded from office, and practically from any share in the government of the country. The people are also punished for crimes which are no crimes at all, and the rulers of the country are at no pains to conceal their hatred of the people they govern. These are some of the things which Colonel Sanderson and his little clique wish to perpetuate, but they are the things which must be changed.

THE JESUITS IN FRANCE.

The enemies of the Catholic Church everywhere have a special spleen against the Jesuits, because this illustrious religious order is always in the van in the advocacy of Catholic truth and the defence of the liberty of the Church.

It will be remembered by our readers that the leaders of the anti-Catholic movement in this country, during the last three or four years, occupied themselves chiefly in maligning the Jesuits, pretending that they had nothing to say against the Catholic body generally, but that they wished merely to repel aggressions which the Jesuits were making against civil and religious liberty.

There was not a particle of truth in these allegations, but as the Jesuits are well known to be among the most zealous and exemplary of Catholic priests, the attack was made upon them as a preliminary to a more determined onslaught against the Catholic religion on every point. The infidel Government of France are now following tactics similar to those which were pursued by the self-styled Equal Righters of Canada, the pretence being that the Jesuits are improperly interfering with French political matters.

A recent telegram informed us that on the 25th of March Premier Loubet said in the French Chamber of Deputies that the Jesuit Father Lemoigne delivered in the Church of St. Merri an unpriestly address, and that the Government is determined not to allow the pulpit to be turned into a tribune for political agitation, and that if existing laws do not suffice to correct the evil the Government will close the churches of offending ecclesiastics. In addition he said that "the Scotch Jesuit Forbes, who had insulted the French army in his sermons, would be expelled the country." The statement of the Minister was loudly applauded, and at Mons. Loubet's request a vote of confidence was taken which resulted in 254 votes for the Government, and 116 against.

We are so accustomed to the misrepresentations of the infidel rulers of France, and even their positive falsehoods, whenever they speak of religion, that it might well be suspected that Premier Loubet did not confine himself to truth in making these statements. The Jesuits are such efficient preachers, and so resolutely opposed to arbitrary irreligious measures, that we may always expect that the enemies of religion will make them a target for their shafts of calumny; and this is just what has happened in the case of Mons. Loubet's accusations.

The Jesuit Father Lemoigne did no more than condemn the interference of the French Government with the liberty of the Church, and he very properly exhorted his hearers, who are voters, to be faithful to their religion, and by their votes to elect men to Parliament in future who will fulfil their obligations to God and to religion, so that the Church may not be oppressed in the future as it has been in the past. This language will be acknowledged by all fair-minded people to be quite justifiable and even very

moderate, and especially so in a Republic wherein it is the duty as well as the right of every citizen to use his influence and powers of persuasion to induce the electorate to vote according to the dictates of conscience. France is a Catholic nation at heart, notwithstanding the temporary apathy which is exhibited by the bulk of the people in regard to the religious convictions of their representatives, and it is the knowledge of this fact which makes the infidel rulers of the French Republic fear that the people will rouse themselves to take more interest in the elections; for they well know that if this be the case, the days of infidel rule will soon come to an end. Premier Loubet's despotism is simply a very un-Republican attempt to put off the day of retribution, which we believe to be near at hand, and which cannot be delayed much longer; for the signs are numerous and unmistakable that the French people are fast awaking to the importance of resolute action in politics.

The Scotch Jesuit, Father Forbes, of whom Mons. Loubet also spoke disparagingly, was no more guilty than Father Lemoigne; yet he has been expelled the country, to the great delight of the infidel party. The subject of his discourse, which was so distasteful to Premier Loubet, was the religious education of the French people. He told his congregation that if religious education be abolished, a generation of bad citizens will grow up, and, referring to the laws by which every possible obstacle is thrown in the way of the practices of religion in the army, he said that if these laws succeed in their purpose of driving religion out of the army, the army will be demoralized, and will suffer even more humiliating defeats than those which were endured during the Franco-Prussian war, which resulted in depriving France of two of her most highly prized provinces, which, with their wealth, were transferred to victorious Germany.

In all this there was no insult to the French army. It was, on the contrary, an appeal to the patriotism of the people to preserve the efficiency of the army, but it suited the Premier's purpose to misrepresent Father Forbes' words.

Father Forbes is a Scotch Jesuit who has resided many years in Paris, and he is much beloved by the people. Premier Loubet cannot prevent the truth of what Father Forbes said from becoming known, and he will only render himself and his Government ridiculous by his harsh treatment of the aged and venerable priest. By such measures as he has thought proper to adopt to prevent liberty of speech, he will rather hasten than delay the day when the French people will assert themselves at the polls, and place in power a new Government which will rule the country in accordance with the wishes of the people.

Father Lemoigne's sermon, the despatch tell us, gave great offence to many persons in the congregation, and especially to a number of Socialists who were present, and who raised a cry in the church, that "the Republic is insulted." It is evident that these Socialists went to the church on purpose to interrupt the preaching of the Gospel. The fact that there are in Paris so many of this noisy class is the best possible proof that the predictions of Fathers Lemoigne and Forbes are true, that the people will become immoral if religion be suppressed. These Socialists are the very people who are at this moment causing so much consternation, and giving so much trouble to the Government by their frequent murders committed by exploding dynamite bombs among the people wherever they will cause most damage. It is the best possible proof that Father Lemoigne was in the right when we find that he gave offence to the worst criminals in Paris.

A DESPATCH from Montreal informs us that the Paulist Fathers, from New York, concluded a monster mission at St. Patrick's Church last Sunday. The mission has been one of the most successful ever held in the city. During its progress over five thousand people signed the total abstinence pledge and fifty-six converts were received into the Church. The Fathers strongly denounced the Montreal civic authorities for their apathy in not enforcing the liquor laws. The denunciation was made in the presence of Mayor McShane and a number of prominent city officials, and produced a great sensation. The effect was so great that Mayor McShane and other officials were led to sign the pledge. A large sum of money was collected during the mission to assist in educating young Catholic missionaries at

the Catholic University, Washington, D. C.

A FALSE EDUCATIONAL THEORY.

The Detroit *Evening News* of 11th April publishes an interview between one of its reporters and Colonel John Atkinson, a Catholic lawyer of that city, on Parochial schools, this being the name by which the Catholic schools of the United States are known.

The *News* interviewer tells the public that the Colonel has long been opposed to the "Catholic policy of maintaining separate schools," but "the reasons for his opposition are now given for the first time."

All that he is able to say in favor of secular public school education may be comprised in the following propositions:

1. That they engender prejudice against Catholics, and prevent them from being employed in official or other positions, especially those which depend upon the votes of the people.
2. They are an impediment to that intimate acquaintance with Protestants which would result from friendships contracted in the school room.
3. They make the Public schools anti-Catholic, and anti-Catholicism becomes a sort of State religion, inasmuch as Protestants come to regard Catholics as half aliens, because of their apparent antagonism to public institutions in which non-Catholics take a deep interest.

4. They result in imposing a double tax on Catholics for educational purposes, and embarrass the priests financially, as well as by imposing on them excessive labor.
5. There is a waste of energy in the commonwealth, because two schools have to be sustained where one would be sufficient.

The present is not the first occasion on which the Colonel has given utterance to views in which no true Catholic can acquiesce. So recently as last Thanksgiving day many appreciative listeners were disgusted on hearing him declare in a public lecture or address delivered at a meeting whereat the Right Reverend Bishop Foley, of Detroit, presided, that the New England Puritans are the source from which is derived everything that is worthy of admiration on this continent. There was not a word of reprobation for the Blue laws and witch-burnings, which were characteristic of Puritan rule; not a word of praise for the noble efforts of the zealous Jesuit and other missionaries who were the first to endeavor and who are endeavoring still with wonderful success to Christianize and civilize the aborigines; not a word of admiration for the Catholic colonists of Maryland, who were the first to make laws on this continent proclaiming liberty of conscience to all colonists.

We could respect a Protestant who would appeal to us, as some have done, on the ground that separate education destroys the good feeling which ought to exist between Catholics and Protestants, because they are kept asunder. We deny, however, that such is the case. In Catholic schools the children are grounded in the principles of their religion, one of which is to love our neighbor as ourselves, without distinction of nationality or creed. By such teaching hatred for our fellow-man cannot be engendered; still we can respect the philanthropic sentiments of Protestants who differ from us in opinion, and would desire to see children of all creeds educated together, but in this case we would demand that they leave us free to follow our own convictions in the matter and not endeavor to force us to adopt their views. But we confess we are surprised to find professing Catholics, who should know better, maintaining that Catholics must necessarily mix with Protestants at the elementary schools in order that life friendships may be there established between them. In actual life a very small proportion of the friendships which endure are contracted in school days; but at all events the number of schoolmates a child will have is necessarily limited, and there is no reason why these school-day intimacies should not be formed between children of the same religion as between those of different creeds.

We venture to say that the life-long intimacies will be more numerous among those of the same creed than they would be if children of all religions were educated together. However, it is not on this plea that we insist on the necessity of religious instruction in the schools. It is because the whole child should be educated, the moral faculties should be developed as well as the intellectual and physical, and this can be done only through religious teaching. The most important lesson to a child is to know God and to serve Him in thought, word and deed. This lesson is not imparted at all in purely secular schools

and it is imparted very differently in any school which is not purely a religious school.

But Colonel Atkinson tells the supporters of Public schools that we adhere to our conscientious opinions. Surely we would desert persecuted if through fear of persecution we were to give up our right to neglect our duty to educate children according to the precepts of his Church and our conscience.

There are duties from which no one can be exempted through fear, may lose certain State patronage that our neighbors will seek to cut us, or that they will refuse employment, or that they will vote as elections. One of these is the proper education of our children, and if it were needful to sacrifice itself to maintain this right, we should be ready to make the sacrifice.

We often hear quoted with approval the motto of the heathen: "It is a glorious thing to die for one's country."

It is still more glorious necessary in the cause of God. Will the Colonel say that we are less for God than the Federalists were willing to do thirty years ago to maintain the integrity of the States?

But Catholics of the United States are not required at present much as this, and will they make the necessary sacrifice though they be taxed doubly to maintain their Catholicity? Yet there is hope that the people of the United States will be brought to justice of inflicting this. We sincerely trust the Catholics will continue their demand of this grievance till the abolished in every State. It is not abolished unless Catholics can firm in their demand.

"Who would be free, themselves free the blow."

Of all that Colonel Atkinson advanced in favor of his views only remains the argument is a waste of energy in the wealth when two schools are instead of one. To this we add the commonwealth or state with schools which will furnish education, we may serve with the State school. State schools are insufficiently important matter of religion; parents cannot evade the ability to God to see that their children be supplied. The consideration will be an additional unjust expense is but a second. Parents should endure it, but they may seek for a lawful means by making injustice, by using their obtain restitution through the civil authorities, at their electoral franchise state of affairs changed.

There is also a suggestion of the reasoning that schools are made anti-Catholic because Catholics have Parochial schools. This is contrary to fact. It is the tendency of Protestant school commissioners or introduce Protestantism teaching. The instances prove this are numerous, here only refer to the case of teacher Travis, who was the popular vote of the Catholic school commissioners or introduce Protestantism teaching. The instances prove this are numerous, here only refer to the case of teacher Travis, who was the popular vote of the Catholic school commissioners or introduce Protestantism teaching. The instances prove this are numerous, here only refer to the case of teacher Travis, who was the popular vote of the Catholic school commissioners or introduce Protestantism teaching.

The Colonel follows up of his own views by would not surprise him were within a few years abolition of Parochial instruct Catholic parents children to Public schools scarcely necessary for such a prognostication fancy. Pope Leo's doctrine is identical with illustrious predecessors Pius IX., in his celebrated December 8th, 1864, following modern error.

"Catholics can approve of instructing youth Catholic faith and the Church, and while solely, or at least primarily, the natural science life on earth."

The direct consequences cannot approve of