

The Catholic Record.

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

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

REV. GEORGE E. NORTGRAVES,

Author of "Mistakes of Modern Infidelity."

REV. WILLIAM FLANNERY,

Author of "The Catholic Record."

REV. L. J. KING, JOHN NICH and

LUKE NICH are fully authorized to receive

subscriptions and transmit all other business

for the CATHOLIC RECORD.

Agent for Alexandria, Glenora and

London.—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.

Boniface 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.

Articles must be paid in full before the

paper can be stopped.

Persons writing for a change of address

should invariably send us the name of their

former post office.

Catholic Record.

London, Sat., Dec. 14th, 1889

A POLITICAL ELIXIR OF

LIFE.

The Mail of the 5th inst. has an elaborate

editorial instructing the Equal Rights

Party how they are to secure a moral victory

when the next elections come on, and,

by its plan, it declares that "the independent

voter," that is to say, the party of

fanaticism, "may be, if he so wishes, all-

powerful." We are fully aware that the

fanaticism is wish. However, cunning as the

Mail may think itself, we are not very much

alarmed at its proposals, which are simply

the dying throes of the wholehearted

concern. Speaking of the West

Lambton election it tells how each of the

great parties of the Province is claiming a

moral victory over the other, from the

fact that neither obtained an actual majority

of the vote cast. This is a thing that

frequently happens in Canadian elections,

when there are three candidates: still it

has never yet operated in such a way as to

throw the Government of the country into the

hands of an insignificant minority, and,

by no combination with other parties or

factions, has such a minority ever been

able to grasp the reins of Government.

Neither is it likely that such a thing is

going to happen in the future: yet this is

precisely the feat which the Mail recom-

mends the fanatics to accomplish.

That journal says: "It is not, of course,

the duty of the partisan to see the actual

lesson which the result (in West Lambton)

teaches." Of course not: so the Mail is not

disposed to see the lesson, which is that

fanaticism is a discredited in Ontario.

But let us see how that journal pro-

poses to accomplish its object. It gives a

list of forty-six Ontario constituencies

which the Equal Rights Party are to win

by their astuteness. The majorities in

these constituencies ranged, at last local

general election, from two hundred down

to one. The Mail acknowledges that

where the difference between the two

parties is very much greater than these

figures, Equal Rights candidates have

not the ghost of a chance; but

cannot the fanatics manage to get in

one of their own candidates under

the colors of one or other of the

two great parties, at least in these forty-

six constituencies? This is evidently what

is meant when it says: "Let the non-

political element, that is, the element that

is not tied to party, purify the representa-

tion in these constituencies, or where pure,

keep it pure, and the higher forces will

have a pretty strong and decidedly useful in-

fluence in the next Parliament. Not only so,

but the freedom of the electorate from

hester control which independent men can

bring about will be an advantage of incal-

culable value to the country."

It is, surely, a humiliating position in

which the fanatics find themselves when

they are reduced to the open advocacy

of this disgraceful artifice. Politicians

are pretty well skilled in election tricks,

and it is well known that this very trick

has been used before; so that the Mail

cannot even claim the merit of its dis-

covery now. The only merit it has in

the matter is that it has openly dignified

this corrupt mode of manipulating elec-

tions with the name "purifying the

representation," and has styled the party

which could stoop to such courses "the

higher forces." In this, we believe, the

Mail is original.

We confess we notice with gratification

the evidence afforded, by this leading

article, of the total collapse of the party

of fanaticism which was established amid

so much boasting and with such a flourish

of trumpets. The persons and the press

that hatched it into existence proclaimed

that through them Ontario spoke, and

vigorously were their appeals to make no

peace with either political party. A war

of extermination was preached, which, in

the language of ex Bishop Carman, was to

"sweep the boards" of both parties, for

they were equally corrupt, equally

sold to Rome. The Mail's recommenda-

tion for the fanatics to attain "influence,"

as they need not expect dominancy, is

simply the last gasp. It is the story of the

maiden going to market, told over again.

She began to count up the money she

would receive for the eggs which she

carried in a basket on her head, and that

putting her receipts into her business,

they would gradually increase until she would be rich, happy, and respectably married. The thought made her dance with joy, and the eggs, falling to the earth, her prospects, equally with her property, were totally destroyed. So with the influence of the "Equal Rights" Association," in spite of the new dodge recommended by the Mail. An alliance with the Equal Rights party, or the adoption of its principles by any considerable portion of either political party in the Province, would be as fatal to it as the suspicion of being tainted with similar principles has proved before now. We believe that both parties will as carefully shun the contamination in Ontario as they did the other in Brome.

Between this new policy which the defunct party proposes to adopt and their pretence that they are seeking for Equal Rights, whereas their real object is to inflict grievous wrongs upon Catholics, the name "Party of hypocrisy" would suit them much better than the names by which they desire to be known, viz., "The Party of Parity and Righteousness," and "Party of Equal Rights."

AN IMPUDENT FABRICATION.

The Toronto Mail of the 21st ult. published an item which was pretended to be part of a despatch received from its regular correspondent at Winnipeg, and it gave such news as was indeed alarming enough to friends of constitutional government. It was an account of a plot entered into between the terrible "Church," which is always so aggressive, and the Ottawa Government, by means of which the Greenway Government was to be overthrown by a trick, in which Lieutenant Governor Schultz was to take part. The correspondent was represented as saying:

"Mr. Prendergast and his friends have become quite confident of late of their ability to save both the French language and the separate schools. They talk indeed of being able to defeat the Greenway Cabinet by some kind of a combination. One of them is authority for the statement that they have received great encouragement in Quebec. The Church there will, it is said, put the screws on Sir John and Mr. Laurier, and compel them to throw out Greenway's legislation. If necessary the Ottawa Government will instruct Lieutenant Governor Schultz privately to dismiss Mr. Greenway on some pretext, and on the appeal to the people, the Canadian Pacific will do its utmost to beat the Liberals. This party is certainly believed by the French party, though, of course, it looks somewhat improbable."

There was a species of wisdom in putting in the last clause, about the improbable features of the story, but the whole thing is so much of a piece with the usual news furnished by Mail correspondents, that it was not unlikely that such balderdash had been sent over the wires. To the Free Press of Winnipeg is due the honor of the discovery that no such despatch was sent from Winnipeg. Of course the inevitable conclusion is that it was a piece of news especially manufactured in Toronto for the Mail, and as Mr. Greenway was in Toronto at the time this characteristic despatch was concocted, and as there is good ground for believing that Mr. Greenway was in communication with the Mail, the Free Press has no hesitation in saying:

"This rubbishy report was not telegraphed from Winnipeg, but it nevertheless appears in the Mail as a part of the regular despatch. The correspondence, therefore, must have been doctored in the Mail office. No one connected with that paper would be likely to forge the item without some suggestion from the outside. Mr. Greenway was in Toronto at the time, and, as we have reason to know, in communication with the Mail. There is then every reason to believe that the despatch was forged by the Mail, at the instigation of Mr. Greenway."

The transaction is just such a one as dovetails well with the antecedents of both parties concerned. The proprietor of the Mail is well known as the chief operator of the celebrated plot whereby the Mowat Administration was to be overthrown, by bribing those members of the Legislature who were thought to be not above temptation in 1884. The plot, however, was foiled by its premature discovery. On the other hand, Mr. Greenway's treasons towards both parties, while he was a politician in Ontario, are well known at the scene of his transactions, and especially in the County of Victoria. We must say that we are much inclined to believe the solution of the problem afforded by the Free Press. We are aware, besides, that it is no new thing for the Mail to concoct correspondence to which are attached the names or noms de plumes of persons at a distance. Concerning the whole transaction the Mail is now observing a very discreet silence, leaving us to infer that there is something in the egg which smells not sweetly. Why does not the Mail furnish an explanation?

The whole affair gives good reason to believe that Mr. Greenway is not so sure as was proclaimed of carrying out his school programme which was introduced with such a flourish of trumpets. If success were certain, it would be unnecessary to concoct such fishy stories to help his cause through.

EVANGELICAL ALLIANCE.

The Protestant Evangelical Alliance met in Toronto last week and held two sessions. The principal aim of the Alliance seemed to be, as announced,

"the best means of preserving the sanctity of the Sabbath," "the promotion of temperance," and "Christian union among the various Protestant denominations."

What practical efforts were made to secure these much coveted blessings remains to be seen. A good deal of bluster was indulged in, and several speeches delivered that, no doubt, left upon the listeners a vague idea of earnestness on the part of the speakers. But for the life of us we could not see in any of the speeches one practical suggestion. It is no wonder, then, the whole object of the Alliance—if it had a clearly defined object, which we fail to see—should remain unsettled, and that, as on all such occasions, even such as Pan Anglican or Pan Presbyterian synods, things would remain in the end exactly as they were before.

No dogma of faith was promulgated or subscribed to; no rule was laid down to bind men's actions or guide or direct men's consciences. Every man was allowed to depart as he came, perfectly free to pursue the even tenor of his way, and believe what he liked best, and practice what was most comforting and conformable to his own views and habits.

The executive report was read by Rev. A. Campbell, who, on behalf of the Alliance, had travelled seven thousand miles, written six hundred letters and preached seventy times. "The people," he said, "were at first interested, but as they became absorbed in the Equal Rights movement the holding of meetings became more difficult." The fact is the people became disgusted with the bigotry of Rev. Campbell's lectures, and refused to attend them. He misrepresented the teachings of the Catholic Church and told such abominable lies about priests making money out of dead men's bones, and had recourse to other such low and unpriestly modes of polemical warfare, that in some places he was opposed, and riots were with some difficulty avoided. Rev. Campbell's report went on to say that petitions for disallowance of the Jesuits' Estates Act had been sent to the House of Commons, to the Governor-General and to Her Majesty the Queen. And large numbers of lying pamphlets on Romanism, by Rev. Drs. King and McVicar, had been circulated. It must have been very consoling to the Evangelical Alliance to learn that so much labor had been labor in vain, and to be forced to the admission that all their nefarious plottings against justice to the Jesuit Fathers had resulted in their own discomfiture and shame.

In the afternoon session Principal Caven presided. He was accompanied on the platform by the arch-hypocrite, ex-Mayor Howland, and Col. E. F. Shepherd of New York. After prayers and praise and the reading of Scriptures Principal Caven spoke on the institution of the Sabbath. He was glad to see so many present accustomed to handle the Sabbath question in various ways. He said: "There were various points of view from which it might be considered: for example, the identity of the Christian with the Jewish Sabbath and the various theories respecting Christian arguments: whether they had their basis distinctly on the fourth commandment (3rd Com.) or exclusively on New Testament authority, or whether the Sabbath was an ecclesiastical institution." Principal Caven made no attempt to throw light upon so varied a subject, but allowed every man to think for himself. He did not even hazard a distinction between the Jewish Sabbath and the Christian Sunday, and wound up by acknowledging the folly of the whole movement and the utter absurdity of the Evangelical Alliance in trying to enforce better observance of the Lord's day, whereas it would be absolutely necessary to have the co-operation of the United States, and that they could not get.

Col. Shepherd, a representative American, acknowledged as much when he stated that very little heed was paid to the Sabbath in his country, and that the first to lift the bar of Sabbath preservation in New York was a Christian minister who obtained permission from the Elevated Railway Company to carry his Sunday school children two miles to an anniversary service. This was made the excuse for running the Sunday cars. "The remaining contentions were," said Mr. Shepherd, "to lead men to the Lord, to make the earth fruitful in increased capital, and to bless mankind."

When Mr. Shepherd prayed for an increase of capital, or an accumulation of "filthy lucre," he forgot, no doubt, all about the sermon on the Mount, "Blessed are the poor in spirit." He certainly cannot be of the same mind as our Blessed Lord, who said "that it is harder for a man of capital to go to Heaven than for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle."

Rev. Principal Grant drew a distinction between the invisible and the visible Church, without defining either. "The invisible church he declared to be a unit. But visible divisions, such as Congregational, Presbyterian, Episcopal and others, dividing to suit the times, each being

substantially wise, necessary, and of domestic choice, etc."

It is surprising how men distinguished for learning, eloquence and worldly tact and wisdom are so inconsistent, and we would venture to say, childish, if not foolish, when deprived of the light of Catholic teaching. They flounder about from one spiritual quagmire to another.

What does Principal Grant mean by an invisible Church? The office of a Church is to teach men heavenly truth and lead them to God. How can men go to Church for instruction and guidance if it cannot be seen, if it be, as Principal Grant says, invisible? It would be rather a curious sort of Church that people would have to be groping in the dark after. It certainly would not be the Church of God, to which was promised that "thy light shall come, and the glory of the Lord is risen upon thee and thy gates shall be open continually; the nation and the kingdom that will not serve thee shall perish." (Is. 60.) The Prophet Micah (iv. ch.) speaks of the Church as "being prepared on the top of the mountains and high above the hills, and the people shall flow to it. And many nations shall come in haste and say, come, let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, and to the house of God and He will teach us of His ways, and we will walk in His paths, etc." This is the Church of God—a visible Church, seen by all, sought for by all, except by those who are determined, like Principal Grant, to keep on groping in the darkness and floundering in the quagmire of an invisible Church.

The Rev. Principal, however, gives credit to the Papacy, "which has preserved its unity, and performs a most useful purpose in upholding a common and stable centre of intelligence to Europe." It is certainly a striking contrast to a Church that is visible only in its divisions. Especially is it comforting to us Catholics to feel, even on the admission of our opponents, that our Church is visible at all times, and perfectly united; one body, one faith, one baptism, fully realizing the will of Him who prayed: "that they all may be one, as Thou Father in Me and I in Thee, that they also may be one in Us." (St. John xvii. 21.) "What," continued Principal Grant, "is to hinder the two largest Protestant Churches in the Dominion, the Methodist and Presbyterian, from uniting at once?" (Hear, hear and applause.) The sequel will plainly show what the opposing forces to this unity.

On the last day of the session Rev. Mr. McLaren "spoke of the obligations of Christian unity, maintaining that no one was obliged to work for such unity. The Church of Rome," he said, "was quite right in claiming that there is only one Church, but wrong in claiming that one Church is the Church of Rome, or any other Church visible whatever."

Rev. Principal Sheraton said the Church of England had been borne away from reformation ground by political alliances and doctrinal perversions.

Rev. Dr. Auliff "could not accept Dr. McLaren's understanding of Christ's idea of unity." Dr. McLaren explained that he believed the unity of Churches "would be a good thing." No doubt, when he secures it, which will be at St. Tibb's eve, which occurs neither before nor after Christmas.

Rev. G. M. Milligan thought we should pray for greater unity, but protested strongly against a "close communion church, where a man may preach and then have to walk when the sacrament is served."

Rev. Principal MacVicar rose in vigorous protest against the last statement. He asked if unity meant the crushing out truth.

Rev. Le Roy Hooker believed that God purposely split up the Protestant Church as a protest against the idea of Rome, that the Church must be outwardly one.

Rev. D. J. McDonnell feared that the lessening of men in a village "would not necessarily mean more men for the Heavens, but simply more money for cigars."

He supported Mr. Milligan's charge against the close communion Baptists, and wanted to be a member of a Church that permits both infant and adult baptism, and both extempore and liturgical prayers."

With such diverging opinions and contradictory beliefs as these how is it possible to form a united Protestant Church? After conning over the speeches of those leading and shining lights of Evangelicalism, one would be tempted to contradict Rev. Principal Grant, who said, in the morning session, that the "spirit of unity was in the air." It looks all the other way, and it appears as though wherever Protestantism exists "division is in the air." But division means separation of parts, dissolution or annihilation. "A house divided cannot stand." Rev. Le Roy Hooker spoke like one inspired when he said, as above, that "the believed God had purposely split up the Protestant Church."

At the closing session Ven. Archbishop Evans presided and spoke of the Protestant problem. He said that the French-Canadian people are not a bigoted people, and he urged that their efforts be not against the Catholic Church as such. This is the character given of the French-Canadian people by all who have resided amongst them. They know the gospel of

mutual forbearance too well to be bigoted.

It would be well if the preachers who go amongst them encouraging rebellion to priestly authority would learn a lesson of Christian charity from those innocent habitants and return to Toronto to look after the bigoted hoodlums who attack Catholic processions and stone Archbishops.

In contradiction to Archbishop Evans' policy "of letting the Catholic Church alone," Rev. Dr. Stafford, in summing up, said that the Protestant Churches needed unity, "for doctrinal liberty, for business, and for its effect on Heathenism, Intemperance and Romanism." Whatever may have been the stand taken by the Protestant churches against the two former, they certainly have always been a unit against the latter. All the Protestant Churches, with fidelity, Agnosticism, Mormonism, Socialism and Romanism, have at all times united their efforts to believe, calumniate and destroy if possible, the Catholic Church. They were so many impotent waves dashing against a rock. The Church is there to-day as young, as vigorous, as defiant, as at any age of her history, and all the Churches in the world would be better employed standing idly on the roadside whistling jigs to a milestone than attempting to pull down or even to weaken the Catholic Church, which is built on a rock.

MR. MOWAT AT WOODSTOCK.

On Tuesday evening, the 3rd inst., the Hon. Oliver Mowat, Premier of Ontario, addressed his constituents of North Oxford in the Court House of Woodstock. The occasion was a favorable one for the explanation of his policy and for the vindication of himself and his colleagues from the attacks which have been made upon him recently, and we are pleased to be able to say that his explanations were clear and satisfactory, and that they manifested a spirit of broad statesmanship which should commend itself to citizens of Ontario of every creed and race. It is not our purpose to take sides in the political issues which are at stake between the two parties of the Province, but it must be borne in mind that on merely political issues we can scarcely say that Mr. Mowat has been attacked at all. The race and religious cry has been raised against his administration, unjustly indeed, but it is a subject in which we cannot but feel profound interest.

Mr. Mowat reminded his audience that already the religious cry had been raised twice against his Government. In 1883 the cry was that Catholics were not treated fairly, that patronage was not extended to them in proportion to their population. Mr. Mowat acknowledges that in this respect Catholics have perhaps some reason to complain, but he declares it to be his wish to act fairly towards all classes. How unfairly, then, is the cry that has been more recently raised against his Government, that his administration are "obedient servants of the Catholic hierarchy" and "traitors to their faith in giving everything to the Roman Catholics."

It will be remembered that in the election campaign of 1883 Mr. Mowat's administration was fiercely attacked because of means of which the separate school laws were more easily worked. By these amendments nothing more was done for the separate schools than to render the task of the separate school trustees less onerous, and to place them somewhat in the same position in relation to municipal authorities, as the public school trustees occupied. This of itself was but just, yet it was made the basis of an outcry against the administration, and a demand was made that the amendments should be repealed. The object of such a demand could only be to injure Catholic education or make it impossible.

The natural consequences of the raising of such an issue was that in that year even Catholic Conservatives were obliged in self-defence to sustain the Government. Mr. Mowat says: "The cry of 1883 but us some Roman Catholic votes, and the cry of 1886 lost to us some Protestant votes. A religious cry, however little reason it may have, has always some effect: but in neither year was the effect great enough to accomplish the purposes aimed at. Our public record was so satisfactory to the country that we were able to stand our ground against even a misleading religious cry."

Mr. Mowat continued by showing the want of foundation for the religious cry, which is now being raised against him. The excitement created among Protestants by the passage of the Jesuit Estates Act of Quebec has revived old hopes for a no-Popery cry. One would think that the most zealous Habbakuk Mucklewrath could scarcely blame Mr. Mowat for an Act with which he had nothing whatever to do, and over which he had no control whatsoever. Suffice it to say that Mr. Mowat stated that he did not know anything of this Quebec Legislation except what was known by everyone through the newspapers. We readily believe that this was the case, and there has been no evidence which could be called even plausible to show that he was ever consulted in reference to the Jesuit Estate Act.

The question of the separate school amendments has been brought up recently as it was in 1886. Mr. Mowat tells us that

they were passed because they were thought reasonable. They were considered reasonable both by the late Dr. Ryerson and the Hon. George Brown, the "great champion of Protestantism," and they were passed by the Legislature without any opposition. It is fair to infer that the attacks now made upon them are not intended for the purpose of making either the public or the separate school system more efficient, but solely for the purpose of raking up some objection against the Ontario Government which may have the effect of withdrawing from them as many voters as can be influenced by an appeal to bigotry.

The French school question has also been raised as an issue. It has been represented that Mr. Mowat had agreed with Mr. Mercier "to put no serious obstacles in the way of propagating Nationalism in the schools of Eastern Ontario." It is almost needless to tell our readers that such a statement is absurd. There is not a particle of evidence that such an agreement was ever made; but Mr. Mowat shows that since 1885 it has been the policy of his Government to make the teaching of English more efficient in the French schools of Ontario, and that they have succeeded, so that at the very moment when the charges were brought up that the administration was plotting to make French the predominant language of part of Ontario, English was taught more efficiently than ever before in French localities; and this was done with the full consent of the French Canadian people themselves. Mr. Mowat says: "The Government had moved in this matter before the Opposition moved in it, before the newspaper, now so zealous, moved in it, before the Protestant clergy moved in it, and I may add before Orangemen moved in it, as Orangemen generally claim a prominent place in such matters."

In this English-speaking Province, we have certainly no reason to object that the study of English should be encouraged and enforced, and the French-Canadians of Ontario are themselves anxious to have English efficiently taught in their schools; but they very properly object to the total exclusion of French with which they have been threatened, both because French is their mother tongue to which they are attached, and because children whose language is French would be left in ignorance if French were suddenly disallowed in the schools.

Mr. Mowat states that the raising of the no-Popery cry in 1886 had the effect of giving his government a majority of the Catholic votes in that year; but he reminded his audience that he had also a majority of Protestant votes. A majority of Baptists, a majority of Presbyterians, a majority of Methodists and of Congregationalists supported him. He added very reasonably that it was no wonder that under the circumstances he was supported by a majority of Catholics; for "I venture to say that if any political or municipal party should adopt as a battle cry 'No Presbyterianism' Presbyterians like myself would not be found all voting for that party, whatever our previous relations with them had been," and the result would be similar if the cry of "No Methodism," or "no Episcopalianism" had been raised.

Mr. Mowat's concluding words are well worthy of being recorded:

"I claim that in this matter of French schools we have been true to our duty as trusted Ministers of the Reform Party. We have had to deal with a mixed community of different races and creeds. We have been fair and considerate towards the minorities who belong to other races and hold other creeds than those of the majority of our people; and at the same time we have not forgotten our obligations to the majority who are of the same nationality and speak the same language as ourselves, and have the same religious creed as most of us. The policy we have pursued I claim to be the policy of true Liberalism, and the policy best suited not only for producing mutual confidence and good will among our people, but also the best policy for advancing the common interest of the people without injustice to any."

THE OTTAWA UNIVERSITY.

A very interesting and what will at the same time prove a most valuable work is the most volume just issued by the Owl Publishing Co., Ottawa, being an account of the ceremonies connected with the inauguration of the University and the unveiling of the Tabernacle statue. The work opens with the beautiful addresses of Rev. Fathers Ogier and McGuckin, followed by the sermons in the chapel of Bishop Rogers and Archbishop Tache. Then comes the eloquent and touching address of the distinguished member for Montreal Centre, J. J. Curran, Esq., Q. C., and that of Mayor T'Allon, of Sorel; telegrams of congratulation; lines on the statue, by J. K. Foran; the Banquet; the ceremonies at the Basilica, with the address of Archbishop Duhamel; the Autumn Bonfire, by M. L.; the three Doctors of Laws—Sir John Thompson, Principal John A. MacCabe and Hon. R. W. Scott, with portraits; Hon. L. A. Olivier