

The Catholic Record.

Published Weekly at 484 and 485 Richmond street, London, Ontario.

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

REV. GEORGE R. NORTHGRAVES, Author of "Mistakes of Modern Infidels."

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

Approved and recommended by the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa, and St. Boniface, and the Bishops of Hamilton and Peterboro, and the clergy throughout the Dominion.

Correspondence intended for publication, as well as that having reference to business, should be directed to the proprietor, and must reach London not later than Tuesday morning.

Arrears must be paid in full before the paper can be stopped.

London, Saturday, April 18, 1896.

CHRISTIAN UNION.

The Rev. Hugh Price Hughes, who has been the most prominent character in bringing together the ministers of various English denominations at Grindelwald, Switzerland, to confer each year on the means of effecting a union of the various Protestant sects, was chosen recently to preside at a conference or congress of the "Free Churches" of England, at Nottingham.

He is reported as having said in his address: "The Roman Catholics are one in the Pope, the Anglicans one in the Crown, and the Free Churches one in Christ."

Of course the meaning of all this is that the unity of the Catholic Church through obedience to the Pope is inconsistent with, or exclusive of, unity with Christ, a matter which Mr. Hughes makes no attempt to show; but any one who follows the abortive attempts he made at Grindelwald to patch up some sort of unity between the sects, will understand the absurdity of the claim that there is any kind of unity "in Christ" between them. It is simply throwing dust into the eyes of the public to pretend that there is such a unity existing.

Both at Grindelwald and Nottingham there was a miscellaneous gathering of Presbyterians, Methodists, Baptists, Plymouth Brethren or Disciples, Congregationalists, etc. All these denominations maintain strenuously that the doctrines taught in their respective formularies of faith, and which differ from each other most irreconcilably, are truths revealed by God which every Christian is bound to believe, and between them there can be no "union in Christ," unless it can be shown that it was Christ's intention that each person should believe as little or as much of His teachings as they think proper.

This supposition is opposed to the whole scope of Christ's teaching. He commanded His Apostles "to teach all things . . . to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you;" and elsewhere he pronounced that "He that heareth you heareth Me, and he that despiseth Me despiseth Him that sent Me." He also commands obedience to His Church, and declares that whosoever "will not hear the Church shall be as the heathen and the publican.

It is evident from these and numerous other passages that it is not enough to claim unity in Christ, without that external bond of union which makes the members one body with their pastors, and especially with their chief pastor, to whom they should pay deference both as their teacher and guide. This bond of union existed under the Old Law, and included submission to the High Priest. Under the New Law, it exists through submission to St. Peter's successor. It is, therefore, a very lame attempt on the part of Mr. Hughes to endeavor to make it appear that union "in the Pope" is incompatible with union "in Christ." The union with or in Christ does not exist without the external union "in the Pope" which is a necessary consequence of the union with the Apostles which Christ Himself ordains as being essential to union with Him; and the Free Churches, therefore, do not possess either one union or the other.

Concerning Mr. Hughes' description of Anglicanism we have nothing to say. Union "in the Crown" is not essential to Christianity; however, Mr. Hughes' jingling phrase fairly describes the character of Anglicanism, which is positively subject to the Crown in all things. We may remark also that it does not tell well for the prospects of a reunion of the Protestant sects, when the leader of the Continental Union movement thus uncharitably pokes fun at the most important of the denominations which he professes to be anxious to bring within the scope of his scheme for Christian unity.

By the way, we believe that neither the Unitarians nor the Universalists were included in the invitation ex-

tended to the Free Churches to meet in the Congress. Are we to infer from this that these denominations are not looked upon as being Christian sects? It is true, they reject important Christian doctrines from their creeds, yet where are we to find authority for asserting that they are any the less Christian than are the sects which were represented at the Congress? Their systems are just as much the consequences of the boasted principle of private interpretation of Scripture as are those of the sects which were admitted to brotherhood, and which are described as being "one in Christ." On the other hand, it is well known that the very theories for which the Unitarians and Universalists have been so strongly condemned by the other Churches, often called Evangelical, have, during late years especially, been largely adopted in practice by these same Evangelical bodies. The late Rev. Mr. Spurgeon made it clear that this is the case with the Baptists, whom he described as going rapidly on the down grade to infidelity. The Congregationalists are certainly almost at the bottom of the same grade, and the numerous heresy trials among the other denominations have put it beyond dispute that even if they have not gone quite so far, their ecclesiastical ships too are very near the brink of the cataract.

It is fashionable now-a-days to talk about the possibility of union between the sects, and any one who casts doubt upon its feasibility is regarded by the promoters of the movement as an ill-minded "prophet of ill." But notwithstanding all this we feel bound to put on record our opinion that the union, whether regarded as a future contingency, or as an existing fact, such as Rev. Mr. Hughes represents it to be in the quotation given above, is but a phantasy.

UNITED IRISHMEN.

About twenty years ago there was formed in this city the Irish Benevolent Society. Two noble objects were contemplated in this movement—the giving a helping hand to their natives of Ireland especially emigrants, who were in need of such aid, and, second, the creation of a spirit of unity and friendship amongst natives of the Emerald Isle and their descendants.

It has been customary each year to hold a picnic at Port Stanley, and these reunions have always been of a most successful and pleasant character, cementing old and creating new friendships. In addition, during the past two years a grand banquet has been given in the Tecumseh House. That given on Tuesday evening of last week was one of the most notable gatherings of this kind held in the city. The banquet hall was well filled by representative Irishmen of all creeds, together with many invited guests of other nationalities. Brilliant speeches and songs and music of the old land were the order of the evening, and exhibitions of the utmost good fellowship were not wanting.

We wish the Irish Benevolent Society a long and prosperous career.

KINGSTON PENITENTIARY.

HAS THE P. P. A. A FOOTING THERE?

A few weeks ago we published an article calling attention to the one-sided policy of the Government, or rather of the Department of Justice, regarding Penitentiary administration. We pointed out the fact that no Catholic has any voice or control, at Ottawa, in connection with the government or running of the penal prisons of the Dominion. In the past, we showed that the Catholic element was represented on the Board of Directors, and that, since its abolition, a Catholic Inspector with the Minister of Justice and his Deputy—both Protestants since long before Confederation—presided over the penitentiary regime. It is true that, for a few years, Sir John Thompson filled the office of Minister of Justice, and, consequently, the penitentiary system was, virtually, under the direction of two Catholics. Notwithstanding this fact, we believe we can safely affirm that, in no instance, was there ground for complaint on the part of Protestant members of the staff of any penitentiary or prisons, of unjust or prejudiced treatment on the score of religion.

We have reliable information that at least two Catholic officers, of unblemished character and long service, have been dismissed under the new penitentiary dispensation. The one, a guard, a respectable, highly intelligent and well-conducted man, for the sole offence of having complained to the

Minister of Justice of the food supplied, at dinner, to the Catholic officers, on fast days. The other, a keeper of twenty-four years' standing, with a large family, was summarily dismissed for the escape of a convict for which he had no responsibility, the guards in charge of gangs being solely accountable for their safe keeping. It is hardly too much to say that were the Minister of Justice or the Deputy Minister of Justice, or the Inspector of Penitentiaries, a Catholic, Guard John Darragh or Keeper McConville would not have been so pitilessly sacrificed and sent adrift without any compensation for their unjust dismissal or the gratuity for their faithful service, which, we understand, is usually given to well conducted and efficient officers. This, we presume, has been withheld on the plea that these officers were dismissed—a valid plea, we fully admit, had they deserved dismissal. But, as we are reliably informed, these men were wrongfully punished, because they had not a fair hearing—in fact they had no trial at all, no opportunity for defence or explanation. The charge about unsuitable rations, on fast days, was referred back to the Warden for explanation. He called upon the officers who were responsible for the grievance complained of to make a report on the matter. As was only natural, these men exculpated themselves, and Darragh was dismissed on this ex parte statement, although, as a matter of fact, there were ample grounds for the complaint he made, in that proper rations were not supplied. This could have been proved by a large number of witnesses had a full inquiry been made. McConville was dismissed without the question of his responsibility for the escape having been considered at all.

We are further credibly informed that a P. P. A. combination, among a number of Protestant officers of Kingston Penitentiary, is in full operation.

The following paragraph, which we copy from the Kingston Freeman, clearly indicates that if Chief Keeper W. T. Hughes be not a member of the P. P. A. brotherhood, he is enacting the role, in the penitentiary, which his brothers "Sam" and J. L. play, respectively, in Parliament and in the school inspectorship, that of a rabid Orangeman and bigot. Our confrere says:

"The investigation into the twenty-three charges preferred against James Devlin, Chief Engineer of the Penitentiary, by the recently appointed Chief Keeper, W. S. Hughes, brother of Sam Hughes, M. P., and J. L. Hughes, ex-Grand Master, was continued at the prison from Tuesday until late on Friday evening. The utmost secrecy prevailed—a genuine 'Star Chamber' court of enquiry. Inspector Douglas Stewart presided; over fifty witnesses were examined, and John Mulien, of the Department of Justice, took down the evidence in shorthand, which was very voluminous. Notwithstanding the secrecy observed, we have learned that the 'charges' not only missed fire, but the witnesses generally (for the plaintiff and defendant) showed most conclusively that Mr. Devlin was a most capable and efficient officer. It is said that not only did a large majority of the officers establish that fact under oath, but almost every head of a department in the institution, from the Surgeon down, denied that the Chief Engineer was other than a painstaking, courteous obliging and most competent officer."

If it be true, as stated in the foregoing quotation, that the "charges" not only missed fire, but the witnesses generally (for plaintiff and defendant) showed most conclusively that Mr. Devlin was a most capable and efficient officer, the man who made those charges—namely, W. S. Hughes—and who failed to prove them, should meet with the treatment undeservedly awarded to Messrs. Darragh and McConville. We cannot suppose for a moment that Hughes' conduct in bringing false charges against a deserving, "capable and efficient officer," will be overlooked by the Minister of Justice. And here we take occasion to say it was a crying shame and an injustice to appoint this narrow-minded member of an oath-bound society to the position of Chief Keeper, over the heads of competent officers who had spent twenty-five and thirty years in the penitentiary service, because of being "Sam" Hughes' brother. Having been Warden's clerk, Hughes, for a few years, had no knowledge or experience of discipline or of the character and habits of convicts which would qualify him to fill, efficiently, the important post of Chief Keeper.

In the case of Chief Engineer Devlin, we repeat what we have said in reference to the dismissal of Guard Darragh and Keeper McConville, viz., that if a Catholic were connected with the administration of the penitentiaries, at headquarters, "Sam"

Hughes' brother would hardly, in the first place, be Chief Keeper, or, in such event, he would not likely have indulged his intolerant penchant by trumping up "TWENTY-THREE charges" against the Catholic "Chief Engineer of the Penitentiary."

We thoroughly indorse what our contemporary recommends, as well in the Devlin matter as in other instances, of wrong and tyrannical treatment which Catholic officers in Kingston penitentiary have suffered. He says:

"We are certain we echo the sentiments of all classes of citizens, irrespective of politics, in expressing the hope that the Ottawa Government will, before it goes out of office, put a stop to the abuse and injustice that is now pervading the Kingston penitentiary, and see that our co-religionists in that institution receive the fair play they are justly entitled to."

The question is, who is accountable for this "abuse and injustice"? This should be fully investigated. Nothing can be more subversive of discipline, good order and the friendly feeling which ought to exist among the staff of a public institution than a system of spying and undermining of character. On this score the Kingston journal truthfully and wisely adds:

"There can be no progress made where such work is carried on, therefore the Department of Justice should act promptly in the premises. If this course is pursued there will be no need of frequent investigations, and officials would feel more secure in their positions."

We desire it to be clearly understood that we do not attach blame to any particular party, at Ottawa, for the abuses complained of and to some of which we have called attention. It is to the policy of exclusiveness and the ostracizing and persecution of Catholics that we take exception. We cannot help expressing the conviction that if the Warden of Kingston Penitentiary discharged his duties competently and impartially the terms "abuse and injustice" could not be applied to his administration. He seems to lack the moral courage or the necessary sense of justice to stand by and defend the innocent victims of bigotry and intolerance.

THE MONTREAL MINISTERIAL ASSOCIATION AND THE SCHOOLS OF MANITOBA.

The rev. members of the Ministerial Association of Montreal assume to take great interest in the Manitoba School Acts, and on the 9th ult. a special meeting of the Association was held to discuss the question, together with the Remedial Bill now before Parliament.

A committee had been appointed at a previous meeting to consider certain questions formulated by the Association, and at the special meeting the answers given by the Committee were reported. As might have been expected from the well-known hostility of these gentlemen toward Catholics, all the answers taken together were of the general purport that Catholic education is necessarily inferior, and that the education given in the Public schools, without any definite religious teaching, is more productive of morality and intelligence than any system of religious, and especially Catholic, education can possibly be.

All the conclusions of the committee were adopted unanimously, and in regard to the Remedial Bill the Association decided to inform the Dominion and Manitoba Governments that in their opinion it should not be passed by Parliament, because it is "calculated to provoke irritation, and is a menace to the peace and harmony of the Dominion," besides being, perhaps, unconstitutional, and sure to result in expensive litigation.

The committee reports that there is "no evidence that there is a demand on the part of the Roman Catholics of Manitoba to return to the system of Separate schools which existed prior to 1890, but there is evidence that many of them appreciate the national schools; on the other hand, there is abundant evidence that the demand for the re-establishment of Separate schools emanates from and is pressed by the Roman Catholic hierarchy of the Dominion, and especially of the Province of Quebec.

To this we reply that there is abundant evidence that the Catholics of Manitoba desire to preserve their Catholic schools. Public meetings of Catholics have been held throughout the Province wherever the localities are densely enough settled to ensure a sufficiently large assemblage to carry weight, and the opinions expressed were in each case almost unanimous in favor of the preservation of the system of Catholic education, of which Mr. Greenway's Government has deprived the Catholics,

so far as hostile legislation could effect this.

This cry, which has been raised by the enemies of Catholic education, to the effect that the people do not want Catholic schools, but that they are being forced upon them by the hierarchy and clergy, has been raised before now in the hope of inducing a division between the clergy and the people on the question of education, but the effort is futile. The Catholic clergy and laity are one on this point, notwithstanding the fact, which we are ready to admit, that there are a few so-called Catholics who, either through a desire to be considered liberal-minded, or through a want of appreciation of the importance of a religious education, express their preference for secularized Public schools. The Catholic body, however, must not be judged from these very rare and exceptional cases.

In support of their contention, the committee report states that "A large number of Roman Catholics prefer to send their children to the Public schools." This assertion is untrue, as we know it to be the fact that such cases occur very seldom. On the other hand, we know of many instances where Protestants prefer to send their children to the Catholic schools, and it will be found that the reason for their so doing is very frequently because though it is the practice with Catholic teachers not to interfere with the religion of their Protestant pupils, the religious atmosphere of the schools, and the Christian morals inculcated in them, have the effect of impressing a habit of virtue and morality upon those who are educated under such influences. If the Ministerial Association may appeal to the isolated and unusual case of a few Catholics who send their children to schools in which religion is not taught at all, we may certainly appeal to the case of numerous Protestants of the highest respectability and character who prefer the teaching of Catholic schools precisely because these is a moral training given in them which cannot be obtained elsewhere. At the present moment there are schools taught by Catholic religious communities in all the large cities of Ontario, in which nearly half, and in some cases more than half, the children in attendance are Protestants of the most respectable families. We may also mention here a well-known fact that the late Rev. Dr. Egerton Ryerson, Chief Superintendent of Education for Ontario, was one Protestant who had his daughters educated by a Catholic religious community, in spite of the protests of the Methodist Conference to which, being a minister of that denomination, he was supposed to be subject.

But the Committee also maintains that the education given in Catholic schools is inferior to that given in Protestant schools, and the curious reason is given that this is necessarily the case because "so much of the pupils' time is consumed in the study of the catechism, and the forms and tenets of the Roman Catholic Church." It may fairly be presumed that the introduction of a new subject into the school curriculum takes a certain proportion of the pupils' attention from other branches, but it remains a fact that there is no branch of more importance than the catechism; but to what extent the study of the catechism may interfere with the study of certain secular subjects, such as grammar, arithmetic, geography, history, etc., it is difficult to determine. An examination of the annual school reports of the Education Department for Ontario does not show that the Catholic schools are behind the Public schools because of the time given to religious instruction. It is very possible that the teaching of religious duties makes the children more zealous in fulfilling their other obligations, and that, on the whole, the general progress is better because some time is devoted to the study of religion and religious obligations. At all events it is the fact that when the children of the Separate schools present themselves at the High school entrance examinations, as a rule they prove themselves to be quite equal to their Protestant fellow competitors, and in many cases the Separate school children take the lead. We have frequently recorded in our columns instances of this, and such instances occur whenever these examinations take place.

In addition to this the school reports show a better average attendance of Catholic children, and quite as good a proportion in the higher branches as in the Public schools. We shall in a future issue deal with this subject more in detail, but at present we content ourselves with merely stating the fact. But it is not true, as the Ministerial

Committee reports, that an excessive time is devoted to the catechism in the Catholic schools. It is studied as a branch on the curriculum; and surely if there are too many branches of study for the children generally, it is not the catechism which should be eliminated. It will be more useful to them in after life than either botany, physics, physiology, or even than the most useful of secular studies.

It is scarcely necessary for us to add that many Protestant ministers of all Provinces in the Dominion have publicly given their opinion that there should be religious teaching in the schools, and that there is too little of such teaching in them now. Catholics, therefore, are not alone in holding this view, but if the Ministerial Association are of the opinion that religious teaching should not be given, they are almost alone among Christians in this conviction. We have good reason to believe, however, that their opposition to Separate schools does not arise from any adverse opinion to the propriety of religious instruction, but from their inherent hostility to Catholic teaching; and it will be remarked that in the resolutions they adopted, from which we have made the above citation, they do not pronounce against the teaching of religion, but merely the teaching of the Catholic catechism and "the forms and tenets of the Roman Catholic Church." They are actuated solely by a spirit of hostility to Catholics; but as Catholics form 42 per cent. of the population of the Dominion, we have a right to insist upon it that Catholic convictions shall be respected in the matter of the education of Catholic children, and that the ideas of Protestants shall not be forced upon us as to the amount or nature of the religious instruction which shall be given in schools attended by Catholic children. What we here say has reference not only to the Catholic schools of Manitoba, but also to those of Quebec and Ontario; and it must be remembered that in the Provinces wherein Catholics are a minority their rights were guaranteed on their entry into the Canadian Confederation. If the majority in Manitoba had continued to be Catholic, as it was when the compact was made for that Province, the Catholics would never have desired to overthrow those rights, but but as the majority is now Protestant it had the idea that Catholics would submit tamely to their schools being taken away unceremoniously.

There is a principle at stake which we hold sacred. If we were to yield on this point it would be an invitation to the Ministerial Association to attempt further to encroach upon Catholic rights. The Montreal Association has even intimated that this is the result we might anticipate, for one of the speakers on the resolutions they adopted said that Catholics and Protestants in Canada are in the relation of "the conquered and the conquerors." The inference plainly intended was that Catholics should be treated with ignominy and as a conquered class. We deny that any such relation exists, and it would be impossible for the Rev. T. Everett to establish so false a proposition, though we may say that even if it were the case, it would be a very poor justification for the unjust and ungenerous treatment to which the Catholics of Manitoba have been subjected by the Protestant majority there.

There are some other points in the Ministerial resolutions on which we would be glad to make some remarks, but we must leave their consideration over to some future time.

AN A. P. A. WATERLOO.

The A. P. A. of Saginaw, Michigan, have met with an unexpected reverse at the municipal elections, which appears to indicate that the people of that section are thoroughly sick of Apaisism in politics. Saginaw is the county town of the district for which Mr. Linton was elected to Congress, and Mr. Linton has made himself conspicuous in his Apaisism, he being the member who introduced into Congress the resolution to remove the statue of Father Marquette from the Capitol at Washington for no other reason than that he was a Catholic priest. This gentleman made himself sure that his constituency is certain to stay under A. P. A. control, as the society has been in league with the Republicans, and it was supposed that the alliance could not be vanquished, but though Saginaw has always hitherto been Republican, the normal Democratic vote being only five hundred, at last week's election the Democratic candidate was elected to the mayoralty by a majority of 1695 over the candidate of the A. P. A. and the Republicans.