

The Catholic Record.

Published Weekly at 44 and 46 Richmond street, London, Ontario.

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

REV. GEORGE R. NORTGRAVE, Editor.

REV. WILLIAM FLANNERY, Editor.

THOMAS COFFEY, Proprietor.

Publ. and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY.

Publ. and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY.

Publ. and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY.

Publ. and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY.

Publ. and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY.

Publ. and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY.

Publ. and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY.

Publ. and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY.

Publ. and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY.

Publ. and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY.

Publ. and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY.

Publ. and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY.

Publ. and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY.

Publ. and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY.

Publ. and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY.

Publ. and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY.

Publ. and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY.

Publ. and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY.

Publ. and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY.

Publ. and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY.

Publ. and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY.

Publ. and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY.

Publ. and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY.

Publ. and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY.

Publ. and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY.

Publ. and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY.

Publ. and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY.

Publ. and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY.

Publ. and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY.

Publ. and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY.

Publ. and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY.

Publ. and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY.

Publ. and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY.

Publ. and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY.

Publ. and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY.

Publ. and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY.

Publ. and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY.

Publ. and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY.

Publ. and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY.

Publ. and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY.

Publ. and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY.

Publ. and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY.

Publ. and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY.

Publ. and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY.

Publ. and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY.

Publ. and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY.

Publ. and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY.

Publ. and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY.

Publ. and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY.

Publ. and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY.

Publ. and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY.

Publ. and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY.

Publ. and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY.

Publ. and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY.

Publ. and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY.

Publ. and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY.

Publ. and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY.

Publ. and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY.

Publ. and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY.

Publ. and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY.

Publ. and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY.

Publ. and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY.

Publ. and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY.

Publ. and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY.

Publ. and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY.

Publ. and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY.

Publ. and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY.

Publ. and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY.

Publ. and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY.

Publ. and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY.

Publ. and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY.

Publ. and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY.

Publ. and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY.

Publ. and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY.

Publ. and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY.

Publ. and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY.

ment indicates that his audience under-

stood him well.

And why should Mr. Meredith and his

party endeavor to suppress Catholic

schools? They are certainly desired by

Catholics, since wherever they are

established, it is a very rare occurrence

that Catholic parents send their children

to any other than the Catholic school.

On the other hand, there is certainly no

injury done to Protestants by their ex-

istence. They are supported solely by

the taxes of Catholics, and it is only by

means of them that the liberty of Catho-

lics to give their children a religious

education is secured.

The plea which Mr. Meredith puts

forward, that the law is overridden by the

fact that the clergy of the Church, and

especially the hierarchy, have too much

influence in the management of the

Separate schools, is a false issue. The

school trustees are elected for Separate

schools in the same manner as Public

school trustees. Their management is

equally in the hands of the people, and

if the Catholic people willingly recognise

the influence of the clergy in the con-

duct of the schools, it is their business.

It is no reason why they should be de-

prived of their liberty of having Catho-

lic schools.

The elections of last week have shown

unmistakably the sentiment of Ontario

to be, not as has been represented, hostile

to Catholics, but favorable to the preservation

of Catholic liberty. By repudiating Mr.

Meredith and his platform the people of

Ontario have declared that the Province is

not to be governed on a no-Popery basis.

At two general elections the anti-Catholic

crusade has been pertinaciously preached,

and, though it has been worked to the

utmost, the verdict was given on both

occasions against the advocates of fanati-

cism and intolerance. The verdict of the

people in 1886 was decisive. In the con-

test which has just taken place, though the

efforts of the fanatics were almost super-

human, the verdict has been more decisive

than ever. In spite of the Lodges, and

the Ministerial Associations which entered

so resolutely into the contest, intolerance

has received a check from the stunning

effects of which it will probably not re-

cover for years. The no-Popery cry was

worked with great energy, but the Pro-

testants, equally with the Catholics, of the

Province have declared that they are not

prepared to become the dupes of the dis-

honest and fanatical brawlers who have

raised the false cry that the Catholic hi-

erarchy and priesthood are engaged in an

aggressive warfare against the liberties of

Protestants, and especially against the

Public school system.

It is certain that Mr. Mowat will be

supported in the new Assembly by a

majority of 21, being less than that which

supported the Government in the last

Assembly.

It is a gratifying feature of the contest

that of twenty declared Equal Rights and

Third Party candidates only two have

been elected, Mr. Campbell of East Dur-

ham, and Mr. Barr of Dufferin. The

former of these will support Mr. Mowat's

general policy; the latter has been a

Conservative, and will probably continue to

follow Mr. Meredith's leadership. Mr.

Campbell succeeds Mr. Craig, who led

the attack upon the French schools in

displeased with them. But the Catholic

vote would have been insufficient to

sustain Mr. Mowat if he had not at the

same time the hearty support of the

Protestant lovers of good government.

The result is, therefore, due not to the

Catholic vote specially, but to the cordial

union of Catholics and Protestants alike

in support of a good cause.

THE SCHOOL QUESTION IN WISCONSIN AND MASSACHUSETTS.

A case which fully justifies the oppo-

sition of Catholics in the United States to

State inspection of private schools

occurred recently in North Brookfield,

Massachusetts. A certificate was refused

by the School Committee to a boy of

fourteen, named Danis O'Brien, a gradu-

ate of the Sacred Heart parochial school

of that town, though the law decrees that

such certificates should be granted at

that age provided the qualifications of the

candidate be up to what the law requires.

The boy was found to be a bright lad,

and well grounded in all the branches re-

quired, as he had been thoroughly

trained: the course followed in the

Sacred Heart school being the same as

that of the Grammar schools. Notwith-

standing this, the chairman of the School

Committee maintained that in the opinion

of the Committee the Catholic school was

not up to the standard of the Public

schools, and that, therefore, the certificate

should be refused. He said he had no

prejudice against Catholics at all. This is,

of course, just what we would expect a

fanatic of his stamp to say, and the enemies

of Catholic schools in Ontario say the same

thing.

Straightforward evidence was given as

to the excellence of the school, and the

evidently good training which the boy

had received proved also the efficiency

with which the school has been conducted.

The boy's father brought the case be-

fore the courts, and Judge Knowlton

pointed out to the defendants the require-

ments of the law, thus leaving us to sup-

pose that he will give his decision against

the School Committee, but for the present

the decision is reserved.

We can easily see from this that the

object of the fanatics who are demanding

that private schools, that is parochial

schools, shall be inspected, is to inflict

persecution upon Catholics. It is for

this reason that the Bishops of

Wisconsin are so resolutely opposed to

State inspection of schools, which are not

aided by the State to the extent of one

cent.

The Bennett Law, against which the

Bishops have protested so strongly, estab-

lishes this State inspection, and it is

against this feature chiefly that the protest

has been issued by the Bishops. Ontario

anti-Catholic journals persist in repre-

senting that the Bishops oppose the law

because English is required to be taught

in the schools. This is not the ground

of their objection, for they state that the

law is unnecessary, inasmuch as English is

taught in a satisfactory manner in all the

parochial schools. They object to the

dictation of the State in schools to which

no State aid is given, and the objection is

solidly grounded on the natural rights of

parents.

The objection to teaching English

comes, not from the Catholic hierarchy,

but from the German Lutherans; hence

the Lutherans are so strongly opposed to

the law as the Catholics are, and there is

little doubt that it will be repealed, after

the next election.

Another misrepresentation has been

repeatedly put forward by the anti-

Catholic press of this Province. They

deserve only to be persecuted with petty

annoyances.

From this statement of the case it will

be seen how grossly the Mail and other

no-Popery sheets have misrepresented the

Wisconsin school laws.

Since the above was written, we have

found that Charles O'Brien, the father of

the boy whose certificate was refused by

the Brookfield School Committee, has

gained a complete victory. The chair-

man of the Committee was ordered by the

court to do his duty according to the

law, and in consequence of this order he

sent the following note to Mr. O'Brien:

To Charles O'Brien:

I will sign a certificate in behalf of

your son, Danis, and all other similar

applications in case of pupils more than

fourteen years whenever the proper person

makes application. Yours truly,

L. EMERSON BARNES.

It is thus acknowledged that the School

Committee have been persecuting the

Catholics of Brookfield for more than

two years, contrary to law. This is a

sample of the justice which would be

meted out to Catholics in Ontario if the

Catholics were placed at the tender mercy

of the James L. Hughes and