

The Catholic Record.

"CHRISTIANUS MIHI NOMEN EST, CATHOLICUS VERO COGNOMEN."—"CHRISTIAN IS MY NAME, BUT CATHOLIC MY SURNAME."—St. Pacian, 4th Century.

VOLUME 9.

LONDON, ONTARIO, SATURDAY, NOV. 5, 1887.

NO. 472.

Catholic Record.

London, Sat., Nov. 5th, 1887.

MR. TASSE AND THE MAIL.

The Mail has been sorely pressed to reply to Mr. Tasse's letters on the rights of French Canadians, and their relations to the Protestant minority in the Province of Quebec. Lord Durham, who has been constantly quoted by that journal, as if he fully recognized the determination of the French Canadians to tyrannise over the Protestant minority, is shown by Mr. Tasse to have spoken in entirely opposite sentiments to those which have been attributed to him. The Mail was rather unfortunate, Lord Durham having spoken thus in the very report to which the Mail referred:

"It is a subject of very just congratulation that religious differences have hardly operated as an additional cause of dissension in Lower Canada; and that a degree of practical toleration known in very few communities has existed in this colony from the period of the conquest down to the present time. . . . The Catholic priesthood of this Province have to a remarkable degree conciliated the good will of persons of all creeds, and I know of no parochial clergy in the world whose practice of all the Christian virtues and zealous discharge of their clerical duties is more universally admitted, and has been productive of more beneficial consequences."

In this strain of praise Lord Durham continues. We shall only quote another extract with which he closes this panegyric on the virtuous, zealous, loyal and tolerant clergy of the Province of Quebec:

"The Catholic clergy of Lower Canada are entitled to this expression of my esteem, not only because it is founded on truth, but because a grateful recognition of their eminent services in resisting the arts of the disaffected, is especially due to them from one who has administered the government of the Province in those troubled times."

The testimony of the noble-hearted and honest Lord Durham is worth that of a thousand of the class who are now endeavoring to raise a disturbance between the two sister Provinces, but who are known by their past history to be ready to shape their opinions to meet the views of those who will pay them the highest price.

Concerning this quotation, the Mail of the 2nd inst. complains that Mr. Tasse "at the outset accuses us by implication of withholding a portion of Lord Durham's report. Our quotation . . . simply had reference to the potential injustice of the tithing system, Lord Durham pointing out that the system afforded the priests a motive for discouraging the settlement of Protestants." He then goes on to explain, in effect, what every one is perfectly aware of, that when we cite an authority to sustain us in an opinion, it is not necessary to cite everything that our authority says on every conceivable subject.

So it is only a "potential grievance" that the Mail has now against the French-Canadians! And he merely quotes Lord Durham to prove that the French Canadian population and priests may possibly tyrannise over the "British population." Is it for this that the Mail has worn out so many pens and poured out so much ink in endeavoring to rouse into action the dormant energies of the people of Ontario, for a merely "potential" grievance? Let us look up a few of the Mail's articles on the Province of Quebec, and see whether this be the case. On September 5th the Mail asserted:

"Our quarrel is with priestcraft." "The Mail leaves creeds alone, and deals exclusively with those mundane powers and prerogatives which the clergy in Lower Canada have usurped to the injury of the people." There is a "conflict between the State and a Church which asserts her divine right to be above the State in all matters defined by herself to be within her own sphere." "Clericalism is completely dominant in Quebec." It proclaims "its hatred of liberty of thought and freedom in civil institutions, and its intention of repressing the one and destroying the other whenever it can find the opportunity."

Hence the Mail infers that the population of Ontario should rise as one man to repress French Canadian Clericalism, and to govern Quebec on Ontario principles, to deprive the Quebecers of a voice in the management of their own affairs, to make the laws in a language that the people do not understand, to deprive her of religious education, unless she will mix into it a satisfactory quantity of Protestantism, and not to allow them to tax themselves for the support of the Church, because a small minority of the people are afraid they will be absorbed by the majority if their religion be allowed to prosper.

It is on this pretense that the Mail made

himself sponsor for the opinions of the Protestant Minister of Montreal, whose letter gave occasion to the controversy now going on. Here is some of that Protestant Minister's tomabawk talk:

"A crisis is looming up, and there is no trying to blink it. . . . Quebec is in no sense a British Province. . . . The spirit shown toward the minority is arrogant in the extreme, and the common talk is that we will either be absorbed or driven out of the place, and that in ten years from now this city will be entirely French and Roman Catholic. . . . I cannot blame the Church and French Canadians, but I blame the British and Protestant people of Canada for not enforcing throughout the land the great principle of religious equality."

This of course means, as is usual with such roaring patriots, and friends of civil and religious equality, to deprive the French Canadians of their language, religion, and self government, and to impose upon them contrary to the treaty by which Quebec was ceded, and to the British North America Act, the notions of the demagoguing class represented by this Minister and the Mail. We thank Providence that there is little fear that these firebrands will succeed in their designs. Even the Mail acknowledges from time to time that he has little or no hope of a successful issue to his crusade. Why then does he persist in preaching it? Is it in the hope of stirring up animosity between two Provinces now dwelling in harmony together? If such be his object, he may to some extent succeed; but both English and French races are too numerous in this Dominion to be absorbed one by the other. Yet it is in this spirit of domination that the pretended minister of the gospel of peace writes:

"We are left either to protect ourselves or to call in Dominion aid, or as a last resort to appeal to the Mother Country."

He adds: "We have a right to be here, it cost the blood of our fathers."

We may inform him that the blood of his fathers did not acquire for him the right to domineer over French-Canadians. It gained no more than the treaty made on the occasion of the surrender granted, and by that treaty the rights of the people of Quebec, as British subjects, were guaranteed.

These are the rights of which the present agitators would deprive the French-Canadians. And they have on their lips constant denunciations of "Roman Catholic aggressiveness." In view of the facts we have stated, it will be seen that the "aggressiveness" is altogether the other way. It is no small change of front, then, that the Mail now states that he quoted Lord Durham, merely for the purpose of showing that there is a "potential" injustice in the Lower Canadian tithing system. As long as the injustice is restricted to potentiality, the Protestant minority in Quebec may well afford to dispense with the proffered aid from Ontario to redress their grievances. But it was not a merely potential grievance that the Mail called on Lord Durham to bear witness to. On 19th August the Mail set forth a long catalogue of pretended actual grievances, which is thus concluded:

"Lord Durham appears to have been the only prominent man in our early history who realised the true magnitude of the race question now confronting us."

Lord Durham only! and now that Lord Durham is acknowledged to have differed widely from the Mail's view of tyranny exercised over the British population of Quebec, who is left to side with the Mail? No one, it would seem by the same issue of that journal, till we come down to Mr. July. This gentleman, we are told, "endeavored to impress the Fathers of Confederation with it, but to no purpose. The fathers of Confederation had, it appears, too much good sense. Even then, it seems, the grievance was but 'potential,' and from the Mail of September 15th it appears that the injustice of the tithing system remains still hidden from sight in the realms of 'potentiality.'"

In the name of common sense, let there be an end to this arrant nonsense. It might depress us in looking forward for the future of the Dominion, only we know that it is all froth and foam.

The Mail says, however, that Mr. Tasse "still refrains from coming to close quarters with the English grievances as categorically set forth in these columns." Mr. Tasse meets in detail the charge of French-Canadian intolerance, which includes most of the Mail's imaginary grievances; he speaks specifically of the Oka question, the liberality of the Quebec School Law toward Protestants, and the question of property exemption from taxation. He proves by statistics that in proportion to population the Protestant exemptions are in excess of the Catholic, at least in Montreal, so that even the Mail is obliged to acknowledge "that until the minority is prepared to abolish its own exemptions this part of its case against the majority is not likely to commend itself to unprejudiced outsiders." It appears then that

Mr. Tasse did come to pretty close quarters, whereas he has driven the Mail out of this tower of strength, the exemption question. On this question we may say a word which it did not enter into Mr. Tasse's province to dwell upon. Since the Mail's grievances are made a pretext for the interference of Ontario in Quebec matters, Ontario should in the first place have very clean hands itself before assuming to undertake the management of the affairs of Quebec. Now it happens to be the case that Ontario too has exemptions. In Quebec churches and schools are exempt from taxes: the same institutions are exempt in Ontario, and so are clerical residences to a fixed amount. The Mail's course reminds us strongly of the old fable of the wolf who formulated so many complaints against the lamb, his sire, and grand sire. But there is this difference, that Quebec has not the slightest intention of becoming a daisy dish for the gratification of the Mail's appetite.

On the subject of schools, we have already said enough in these columns. Catholics are fixed in the determination of having religion taught in their schools. In Quebec religion is so taught, but religious instruction is not imposed upon Protestants who are obliged to go to the schools in Catholic sections. The Protestants have full liberty to establish Protestant schools where they see fit, and from the beginning they have always had a more complete system of "Dis-sentient" or "Separate" schools than the Catholic minority in Ontario have yet succeeded in obtaining. The Catholics of Quebec, Liberal as they have always been, granted these rights to the Protestant minority without raising any obstacle. In Ontario the case was different. An intolerant faction opposed the Catholic claims to the fullest extent in their power, and it was only after many years of violent agitation, and many a bitter contest at the polls, that the school law of 1863 was gained; and there is still an intolerant faction desiring to deprive us of the right we have secured after such a struggle. Those who are aiming at this result, under the Mail's leadership, ignore even the fact that they cannot gain their wishes without endangering the rights enjoyed now by the Quebec Protestant minority. This they are willing to do if thereby they can impose an intolerable burden on the Ontario Catholics. Despite their hollow professions of having at heart the interests of the Protestant minority of Quebec, they are their most malignant enemies, actuated by the most degrading sentiment of mere selfishness. The intelligent among the Quebec Protestants must see this; and for this reason, if for no other, the Mail's crusade will be looked on coldly by the great body of Quebec Protestants.

In regard to the efficiency of the Quebec schools, Mr. Tasse says:

"We are proud, Mr. Editor, of our university, of our colleges, of our convents, of our academies, of our school houses of all kinds. They have moulded more than one generation. They are the noble work of a noble succession of bishops, priests, laymen and nuns, who, like the rest of old, have kept burning the sacred fire of nationality. . . . I am not exaggerating in asserting that our religious orders, the Sulpicians, the Jesuits, &c., have become, to a certain extent, the educators of this continent."

He then gives numerous facts to show that the schools of Quebec are of a high order.

The Mail says on this point:

"Mr. Tasse's eulogium on the Roman Catholic Schools and Colleges is no doubt well deserved, but it has no bearing upon the present controversy."

"O! what a fall was there, my countrymen!"

It is but a short time since the Mail asserted, as one of the reasons for Ontario interference in Quebec, that the schools there, "directed by the hierarchy, are of a very inferior character." Mail, Aug. 20. But now, when brought to task for his assertion "Mr. Tasse's eulogium on the schools is no doubt well deserved!"

The Mail is evidently disconcerted on coming into intellectual contact with a French Canadian! He finds the race not quite so ignorant as he made believe, and his "roars" for mercy are as loud as were those of Falstaff's famous recruit, Peter Bullcalf.

A MOB of London's unemployed workmen marched in procession on Sunday, 24th October, from Trafalgar Square to Westminster Abbey during service. Inside of the Abbey many remained covered and indulged in whistling, tobacco-chewing, spitting, climbing upon the columns and statues, &c., so that the worshippers were obliged to leave the building. The clergyman who read the lessons was loudly jeered, and his voice was completely drowned. Canon Prothers attempted to

preach on the necessity of punishment for law-breakers. He was interrupted by cries of "Oh, Oh!" and "Booh." When he said "Legislation alone could provide a remedy for hunger and suffering, but everybody could express sympathy," he was interrupted by loud laughter and a cry of "That's all we shall get." At the close the mob hissed and marched out of the Abbey cheering, shouting and hooting; proceeding then to Trafalgar Square, where the leaders made speeches denouncing the Church and police. Several arrests were made. The next day, Monday, one of the men arrested, named George Budgett, was arraigned for the disturbance, and was fined £5. When the police removed him, he kicked and struggled, and otherwise made a great uproar.

ARREST OF SIR WILFRED BLUNT.

The British Home Rule Union summoned a meeting to be held at Woodford, in the County of Galway, on 22nd October. Sir Wilfred Blunt, formerly a Conservative, but now a Home Ruler, was announced to preside, supported by Mr. Rowland and other English members of Parliament. The meeting was proclaimed by the Government, and soldiers and police were mustered to prevent it. Divisional Magistrate Byrne forbade Mr. Blunt to hold the meeting. He defied the magistrate, however, and the police were ordered to clear the platform. Several policemen seized Mr. Blunt and threw him violently from the platform. He then challenged them to arrest him, whereupon the District Inspector said: "Arrest you." The police then attacked the crowd and many persons were severely injured. Mr. Rowland called for three cheers for Blunt, which were given heartily. Mr. Blunt was then brought before two magistrates who insisted that he should promise to refrain from participating in any meetings. He refused to comply, and was taken to Loughrea jail, and afterwards to Woodford, under a strong escort.

This meeting was not even a branch meeting of the League. The Government promised when getting the Coercion Bill passed through Parliament, that merely political meetings would not be interfered with, but if any were galled by such promises, their eyes must be opened by such facts as this. It is now in their power to prohibit any meetings in Ireland at which they suppose the wisdom of their policy will be discussed. Yet they have the effrontery to assert that the laws are the same in Ireland as in England! If their course is justifiable in Ireland why may they not suppress meetings in England, Scotland, or Wales, called to discuss such questions as disestablishment, Free Trade, or Protection, or any other matter relating either to the domestic or foreign policy of the Government?

There seems to be little doubt that the Courts will give ample satisfaction to Sir Wilfred Blunt; but if they do not, the Government may soon expect a burst of honest indignation from the people of the three kingdoms, who are thus wantonly deprived of the right of free speech. Every day makes it more and more evident that the folly of the Government will bring on soon the day of retribution.

When Sir Wilfred was brought to Woodford prison, he was met at the station by a procession with bands of music, led by Messrs. Rowlands and Sheehy, Members of Parliament, and was in this style escorted to the jail.

Lord Randolph Churchill, in a speech at Stockton said "The Nationalist Leaders had made a tool of his friend Blunt, who was an impulsive man, and knew nothing whatever about Irish affairs. If the treatment Mr. Blunt received at Woodford is to be justified on such grounds, what becomes of the boasted rights of free speech? Every one, it would seem, who does not know as much as Lord Randolph thinks he knows must be ill-treated and thrown into prison, if he appears at a political gathering, and the treatment is thus justified! This is a very convenient doctrine for gagging the public. The Government will find ample reason, on such grounds, to stop any political discussions they see fit.

Sir Randolph continued: "Some sentimental people were shocked by these collisions with the police; but in America the people had become so squeamish, knowing that it was impossible to trifle with lawlessness in a country with large democratic institutions, that for instance, had Mr. Blaine spoken about the American police, and Mr. Gladstone had spoken about the Irish police at Kidderminster, he would probably have been expelled from public life."

Have the police, then, become so pro-

ious, that they may without provocation, as at Mitchellstown, bludgeon the people to provoke resistance, so as to have a chance to shoot them down, or as at Woodford, prevent public discussion, and yet the public not have a right even to criticise their conduct?

Where, in America, did Sir Randolph Churchill find the police acting as they have done in Ireland? He must rely very much on the gullibility of an English audience when he can dare to make such comparisons in their presence. He adds: "The Legislatures of New York and other American States are fond of passing resolutions expressing sympathy with disturbers of order in Ireland, but when similar events occurred at home, the police speedily used clubs and the military rifles."

No one knows better than Sir Randolph that this is a palpable perversion of facts. The parallel to the Mitchellstown massacre, and the Woodford suppression of liberty of speech, has never occurred in the history of the United States since they became a nation.

THE CARDINALATE AND PRESBYTERIANISM.

The Presbyterian papers are always foremost in proclaiming an outrage against Protestantism, whenever any evidence is brought before them of the progress which Catholicity is making on this continent or elsewhere. It is not long since Catholics were suffering persecution under the penal code of Great Britain. The generation has not passed away that endured it; but now all this is changed. It is acknowledged even by liberal minded, thinking Protestants, that the Church, which numbers, even under the flag of Great Britain, more than any other Christian denomination, should be treated with respect, but when this is done their inherent bigotry will not allow the Presbyterian press to witness the occurrence in silence, which would be a wiser procedure than the exhibition of rage presented to our vision by the Presbyterian Review of the 13th inst. Throughout this article breathes the true spirit of John Knox and the Presbyterian ministers who, on 27th May, 1561, being assembled at Edinburgh, complained to the Estates that "The Roman anti-Christ is again endeavoring to erect idolatry, and we crave that such attempts should be repressed, otherwise the brethren will be obliged to take up the sword themselves for that purpose." At the same period Lethington wrote to Cecil, "Those that give themselves out for Protestants are not all earnestly bent to maintain it."

In very similar words, the Review complains: "How ready some so-called Protestants are to acquiesce in Papal assumptions."

No doubt the editor of the Review would be glad to see the days of the penal code restored. But he should learn a lesson of toleration from the example of such gentlemen as delighted in paying due honor to a prince of the Church which numbers among its adherents 250 millions of Christians. "So-called Protestants" foremost! Protestantism must be at a low ebb if there are none Protestant but those who are of the tribe of the Review! He might learn from our Lieutenant-Governor that the conferring of the Cardinalate on a native of Canada was "an honor to Canada for which Protestants and Catholics are grateful," for "to no one in his humble judgment could the honor have more appropriately fallen than to Cardinal Taschereau. He was grateful for being allowed to join in that testimony of respect and honor towards his Eminence."

Whence arise, then, the lamentations of the Review? "People who have seen the heir-apparent of the throne, and other representatives of her Majesty . . . were gravely asked to believe that never was the city so honored as by this visit of the native representative of an Italian priest."

We have not a word to say against the proper respect being paid to gracious Royalty. It is a Scriptural precept: "Fear God: Honor the King." But the "Italian priest" to whom the Review refers so sneeringly is also a King. His domain is small temporally, but his rank as a King is recognized even by the Italian guarantee, and his nuncios are received by all the Sovereigns of Europe as Royal Ambassadors. The penny whistler of the Review cannot deprive him of this rank. But he is more than a temporal king. He is the spiritual ruler of 250,000,000 subjects; and as such, in acknowledgment that the spiritual order is above the natural order, all sovereigns grant his representatives precedence over the representatives of earthly authority. Here is the key to the honors paid to a "Prince of the Catholic Church." It is not derogatory to the respectable and discerning Protestants to recognize facts; and the Pope's position

is a fact, despite the ravings of the Presbyterian Review.

But the Review has more weighty reasons still why Protestants should not honor the Cardinal. He says that Roman Catholics assume that Protestants are "actually glad to have in their midst, and a guest at Government House, a man who has sworn to the Pope an oath in which occur the following words: 'Heretics, schismatics and all rebels to our said lord (the pope) or his aforesaid successors, I will to my utmost persecute and oppose.'"

Is there any evidence, then, that Cardinal Taschereau has "persecuted" or attempted to persecute Protestants? Certainly not; nor does the Review pretend there is. Would not this lead to the suspicion, then, that the Review is a calumniator? And so he is.

But the Review will undoubtedly say: "If the Cardinal has not done this, he has neglected or shirked his duty." We might answer that the Cardinal, probably, knows and fulfils his duties quite as well as the editor of the Review; but instead of this we will inform the gentleman that the Cardinal has taken no such oath as he pretends.

A certain Protestant dignitary, whom we might name, travelling in Rome, saw announced on a church "Indulgentia plenaria et quotidiana pro vitiis et defectibus." Returning to Canada he gravely informed his audience, in a lecture, that he had seen advertised "Indulgences for sale daily." This was his translation—through ignorance or malice. Perhaps the Review is sailing in the same boat.

A similar freak was perpetrated by another minister who declared he saw a church dedicated to "Mary the equal of God." It was inscribed "Maria Despara": "To Mary the Mother of God." Does the editor of the Review see the point? We would recommend him to spend some time in one of our "Collegiate Institutes" before giving any more versions of "Cardinal's oaths."

The Review concludes his ebullition of bigotry by a gentle reference to the "Woman of the Apocalypse" who represents, as he tells us, the Catholic Church, "red with the blood of the martyrs of Christ." He has quite mistaken the application. The "Woman of the Apocalypse" called in the King James' version "the Mother of Harlots, drunken with the blood of the saints," is a more apt symbol of the Church which issued the bloody proclamation quoted by us at the beginning of this article: the Church which in its Catechism makes it "sin" to "tolerate a false religion," meaning not only Catholicity, but Protestantism also in any form except that set forth in the Westminster confession—a Church which has in solemn assembly declared: "We 'with our hands lifted up to the most High God do swear . . . that we shall in like manner, without respect of persons, endeavor the extirpation of Popery, Prelacy etc. . . . that the Lord may be one, and his name one, in the three kingdoms."—The covenant of 1643 1651.

The abuse of the Holy name of God in such a connection makes the oath blasphemous as well as murderous. It comes with ill grace from a Presbyterian to accuse any other church of the stain of blood, which has not such doctrinal decrees as these. Individual members of other churches have persecuted; but Presbyterians alone have made persecution a duty arising from the law of God. It is little wonder that Jefferson said: "The Presbyterian clergy are the loudest, the most intolerant of all sects: the most tyrannical and ambitious."

The intolerant spirit of the Presbyterian clergy was exhibited in the United States just as it was in Canada. The Presbyterian Journal of Philadelphia declared itself provoked because at the Centennial celebration of the American Constitution marked honors were paid to his Eminence Cardinal Gibbons; and that in the "great Protestant city of Philadelphia." In reply, President Kesson said:

"The Journal falls entirely to comprehend the significance of this great national celebration. The very plan of the Commission involved the participation of every order, rank, and quality of the American people, subject only to the condition that they acknowledge allegiance to the Constitution and loyalty to the flag of the United States. To have made it partisan, either in a political or religious sense, would have been a gross outrage upon the patriotic sentiment of our people, and upon the principles of the Constitution itself."

"Representatives of every religious denomination, except Mormons, so far as the Commission could ascertain their names and addresses, were invited to participate, and seats on the principle platforms were provided for at least one of all such representatives."

"Remembering that the most numerous body of professing Christians belonging to any one Church or sect in this country is the Catholic, the Commission invited for the performance of the next office of prayer, the leading representative of that Church."

Much of what President Kesson says is applicable to Canada.