

The Catholic Record.

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

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

REV. GEORGE R. NORTHGRAVES, Editor.

Author of "Mistakes of Modern Invidious," "THOMAS COFFEY."

Publisher and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY, Messrs. LUCE, KING, JOHN NICH, and P. J. NEVEN, are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transact all other business for the CATHOLIC RECORD.

Rates of Advertising—Ten cents per line each insertion, agents measurement.

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, June 23, 1894

Official.

The annual retreat of the secular clergy of the diocese of London will begin on the evening of July 9, in Assumption College, Sandwich.

By order of His Lordship,
M. J. TIERNAN.

St. Peter's Palace,
London, June 18, 1894.

TO THE POLLS!

Before the next issue of the CATHOLIC RECORD shall have reached our readers the electorate of Ontario will have decided the issue whether or not Sir Oliver Mowat and his Cabinet shall continue to administer the affairs of the Province. The question is a most important one, and as it behooves the electors to consider carefully the course they are to pursue in recording their votes, it is proper that we also should lay before them, to the best of our ability, the reasons which should guide them in coming to a decision.

Mr. Meredith and Sir Oliver Mowat have both proclaimed in several constituencies, from their respective points of view, the issues at stake, and we must say, on comparing the speeches of the two gentlemen, that while Mr. Mowat's declarations have within and about them the characteristics of candor, those of Mr. Meredith are the utterances of a man who has something to conceal, and something which he wishes to be accepted by different parties concerned in different senses, according to their divers views and desires.

An example of this is to be found in the most elaborate of his recent speeches, which is described by the Toronto Mail as his "most telling" one on the Separate school question, that delivered a few days ago in Napanee. The speech was lustily cheered. This was to be expected; for he had an audience fully in sympathy with him; and the character of his audience may be judged from the portions of his address which elicited the most hearty applause.

We are told by the Mail that he "scorched" the learned and venerated Archbishop of Kingston, and it was while this "scorching" process was going on that the speaker received the loudest plaudits, which seemed to give him new animation. All this was no doubt very acceptable to an audience which resembled very closely a P. P. A. lodge or convention; but the scene was scarcely such a one as would satisfy those who expected to hear of the wise measures Mr. Meredith intends to adopt for the furtherance of peace and general prosperity in the country. On all this Mr. Meredith was as solemnly silent as would be a forest owl placed in the position he occupied before a presumably intelligent audience.

In the report of his speech given in the Mail, Mr. Meredith's special organ, just twenty-one lines are devoted to Mr. Meredith's policy on which he appeals to the electorate for support, while nearly a column is devoted to the "scorching" process, that is to say, to abuse of the Most Reverend Archbishop of Kingston.

His Grace certainly did say of Mr. Meredith that he had demoralized the Conservative party, by his appeals to the prejudices of the Protestants of the Province; and though Mr. Meredith assures us that he is on the side of toleration, the country knows better. We all know that from the firing of the first gun by him in the Opera House in this city, to the present moment, the leader of the Opposition has been pandering to the worst of fanaticisms, and the whole Conservative party is thereby in fact demoralized; so that Archbishop Cleary undoubtedly told the truth, and this is why Mr. Meredith feels so sorely on the matter.

But His Grace is not asking for the suffrages of the people, as Mr. Meredith is doing, and therefore it is Mr. Meredith, and not the Archbishop, who is on trial before the tribunal of the country. It is Mr. Meredith's declaration of policy, therefore, that

we have now to consider; and in what does it consist?

He says in this same speech, "I am not going to ask the Protestants of the country to vote with us because Bishop Cleary has summoned his cohorts against us. But I do call on all who believe in the principles I have advocated to resent the treatment accorded a public man for upholding them."

As we understand this appeal, Mr. Meredith does exactly what he declares he did not intend to do. He asks all who believe with him that Catholic education is an evil which must be borne with, to unite with him in harassing Catholic schools, because Archbishop Cleary has exposed his double dealing in regard to them.

Mr. Meredith's reference to the Archbishop's "cohorts" who are summoned to the fight is intended to be an insult to the whole Catholic body. It is a condensed method of repeating all the calumnies which have been for years published in the Toronto Mail concerning the "solid" or "crystallized" Catholic vote, which is said to be sold from time to time by the Bishops of Canada to one party or the other, according to the price which is paid for it.

We do not wonder that under such circumstances Mr. Meredith had a presentiment that his words would give offence, as was evidently the case, for he adds immediately:

"If the result of this controversy be to shatter my party, I shall regret it, but I shall maintain the principle of complete separation between Church and State."

All this is mere buncombe. It is an appeal to fanaticism on false grounds. Our Separate school system, to which Mr. Meredith here alludes, does not imply any connection whatsoever between Church and State, but only the liberty of conscience of the individual. It implies that if we Catholics are willing to pay for the education of our own children, we shall not be taxed for the education of those of other people. It follows from this that the real tyrants who would impose a State Church upon their fellow-citizens, are they who, like Mr. Meredith, insist upon imposing on us a system of education without religion, and declare that if we are not content therewith we must pay a double tax, one for the education of our own, and another for that of our neighbors' children. The kind of State Church, too, which they would impose upon us is of the very worst character, a State Church that does not recognize the existence of a God. The real friends of civil and religious liberty are the Catholics, who demand that they shall be allowed the fullest liberty of educating their children in accordance with their conscientious convictions.

But is it not State Churchism to ask that the State shall pay for the teaching of religion? It matters not whether the answer to this be yes or no, for we do not ask anything of the kind. In reality it is not the State, but the taxpayer, who pays the money which sustains the school system. But this has nothing to do with the matter. All we ask is that if the State is to furnish a system of education at all, it shall not exclude us from participating in the benefit, because we unite religious with secular instruction. We do not ask the State to furnish the religious instruction, but we are just as much entitled to have the State pay for the secular instruction imparted in a religious school, as are those who educate their children without letting them know there is a God. Mr. Meredith's talk about State Churchism in connection with Separate schools is, therefore, a mere cloak for persecuting us. It is a pretext for imposing upon us a system of education against which we have conscientious objections.

But again we are told that Mr. Meredith does not purpose to take away from us the Separate school system, which is guaranteed to us under the Confederation Act. Well, we admit that he says he will not interfere with us, as far as he is restrained from doing so by a power superior to himself, but he does not conceal his intention to make it as hard as possible for us to conduct our Separate schools. He proclaims it to be his purpose to legislate with a view to make it as difficult as possible to conduct Separate schools, so that there may be as few of them established as possible, and he openly charges it against Mr. Mowat's Government as a crime, that under its legislation Catholic Separate schools increased in number. His reasoning today is just the same as it was on Dec. 16, 1889, when he said in the speech which announced the policy of his party:

"Now we cannot alter the conditions on which Separate schools came into

existence. My opinion is that while we should be and I am willing to give every facility for the improvement of these Separate schools consistent with the conditions under which they were established, yet I would be guilty of treason to my country if I opened any wider the doors that are already wide enough for the establishment of Separate schools."

He proclaimed then, as he does still, his wish to repeal those amendments which were introduced under Mr. Mowat's administration, to facilitate the working of the Separate school law, his purpose being to kill off the Separate school by throwing obstacles in the way of their operation.

These amendments do not put the Separate schools on an equal footing with the Public schools, though we admit that Mr. Mowat's purpose was to treat them as fairly as possible; but Mr. Meredith's avowed object is to rob the Separate schools of a few dollars whenever he can find an excuse to throw some petty annoyance in their way. He proposes not to abolish the schools—because he cannot—but he will kill them by the kind methods of "improvement" he is willing to apply to them.

It is no wonder that Mr. Meredith's policy is acceptable to the P. P. A. and all enemies of Catholic education. It is just the thing these associations want, and there is so perfect an understanding between the P. P. A. and Mr. Meredith's party, that his candidates all over the Province are supported by the P. P. A., who take care not to bring forward a candidate of their own where there is a Conservative in the field; and on the other hand, where there is a P. P. A. candidate in the field, the Conservatives are quite content to give him their support.

The triumph of Mr. Meredith at the pending elections will undoubtedly be the triumph of P. P. Aism. We therefore advise those Catholics, if there are any, who wish to see a P. P. A. Government in power to support Mr. Meredith's party. Should Mr. Meredith become the Premier of Ontario, the principal member of his Cabinet, and probably his Minister of Education, will be a P. P. A. man, and the P. P. A. will at once begin to thrive all over the Province; but if Mr. Meredith and his party be defeated, it will be a death-blow to P. P. Aism, just as the last general election was the death-blow to bogus Equal Rightism, which was P. P. Aism under another name.

All friends of civil and religious liberty, Catholic and Protestants alike, should, therefore, go to the polls next Tuesday and vote without hesitation for Sir Oliver Mowat's candidates. Be not deluded by side issues. Let there be no shilly-shallying with independent, or Patron candidates, where there is a supporter of Mr. Mowat's Government in the field. A straight support of Mr. Mowat's Government on the present occasion is the only sure way to crush the existing rampant spirit of religious bigotry and fanaticism. Mr. Mowat's Government is attacked by the P. P. A. because it showed some desire to give fair treatment to Catholics. Four years ago, and eight years ago, it was attacked for the same reason. It had then brought upon itself the hatred of bigots, but it was for this very reason that it was sustained by the people, and we trust it will be sustained again now by all who love civil and religious liberty. We hope that liberal Protestants and Catholics alike will rally to its support.

To the polls!

UNITED STATES PARSONS are once more engaged at Washington in trying to break up the Catholic Indian schools of the West. It was because the Government found that the religious denominations succeeded better than the State in civilizing the Indians, and did the work more economically also, that the system was adopted of paying the denominations to keep up the Indian schools. But the Presbyterians and Methodists found themselves outstripped by the Catholics in the work, and they succeeded during the term of the late administration in persecuting the Catholic Indians by endeavoring to break up the Catholic schools. Their efforts were baffled, however, under the administration of President Cleveland, and now they are moving heaven and earth to get the policy of ex-President Harrison adopted once more. It is not likely, however, that they will succeed. The opposition to the existing policy arises, not from conscientious objections to religious teaching, but from hatred of Catholic education. In order to destroy the many Catholic schools, they are willing to close their own,

which are but few. They are, besides, aware that if they get secular schools established they will be really Protestant schools.

HOT MUSTARD FOR THE P. P. A. AND A. P. A.

The New York Times throws some new light upon the methods of the Apatists of the United States, showing what, indeed, we knew already, that the no-Popery dark lantern organization propagates itself by no other means than infamous falsehoods. The Times has unearthed many documents which have been circulated by the association in that city, and is publishing extracts from them. These papers are being secretly circulated by the A. P. A., and, to use the language of the Times,

"They say plainly that they want to do all the injury they can to the communicants of the Catholic Church, but they want to do it without injuring themselves or taking any chances in that direction. It is for this reason, they freely confess, they work secretly, instead of coming out in the open to fight in the usual American manner."

Among the falsehoods propagated by these bigots are the following, taken from a pamphlet entitled "The American Protective Association Explained." This handbook says:

"Our army and navy are almost wholly Romanized."

Well; if such were really the case, it would only prove that Catholics are more ready than Protestants to sustain the Government of the country at the risk of their lives. Such a fact would be no excuse for persecuting them, and it would further follow that the pretence on which the dark-lantern association has been founded is a miserable and false one, namely, that Catholicism is anti-American.

The handbook in question further states that "the Jesuits control the heads of the Government at Washington," and "there are frequent desecrations of the American flag by priests."

Such absurdities do not need serious refutation; yet there must be a class of people who will believe such things as gospel, or the A. P. A. would not dare to publish them; and the members of the society must be the most stupid class in the country, else they would sicken when fed on such rubbish.

The lies circulated by the P. P. A. of Canada are of precisely similar character to those of the United States organization. They pretend that Catholics have much more than their share of public patronage, and that in some inexplicable way the hierarchy controls the Governments of the Dominion and the Province of Ontario.

Concerning the United States story, the Times says:

"That it is untrue that the army and navy of the United States are Romanized, and that the Jesuits control the heads of Government at Washington, makes not the slightest difference to the A. P. A. people. They rely on these statements to arouse the prejudices of the masses, who are not in a position to investigate them, and they have been successful."

The Times states that it is the intention of the A. P. A. to attack Lutherans as well as Catholics in the near future; and that its prognostications are correct seems to be borne out by the fact that already some of the A. P. A. papers have commenced their attack on these lines.

While on this subject, we ought not to neglect to compliment the Congressional Union of Canada for the manly stand it took at its meeting in Toronto on Monday, the 11th inst., in condemning the P. P. A., though that organization was not actually named.

The following resolution was passed by a vote of 44 to 8, Mr. Edmund Yeigh being the mover, and Mr. R. W. McLachlan of Montreal the seconder:

"That the union takes this opportunity of re-affirming the principles of civil and religious liberty for which our forefathers contended and suffered, the absolute equal rights of all religions in the eyes of the law, with freedom for all, and neither proscription nor favor for any; and while careful to abstain from all interference with individual liberty, we regret the formation of organizations which appear to us to conflict with these principles."

The minority endeavored without effect to soften the resolution, on the principle that the Union had no right to restrict the liberty of Protestants, but the more sensible view prevailed that the Union had a right to pronounce upon a matter of Christian morality, especially as it was compromised to some extent by the fact that the President of the P. P. A. is a Congregational minister.

We had occasion before now to blame the Congregational Union for having somewhat compromised itself by its apparent approval of Dr.

Wild's un-Christian vagaries, but by its present action in placing on record its condemnation of the uncharitable and abominable principles of P. P. Aism it has done much towards redeeming itself, for Holy Writ tells us that "charity covereth a multitude of sins."

It is worthy of remark that both the Rev. Dr. Wilde, and Rev. Mr. Madill, the P. P. A. President, absented themselves from the session of the Union when the vote against P. P. Aism was passed. It may be presumed that they absented themselves to avoid the humiliation of seeing their anti-Christian violence condemned. To them, of course, Mr. Yeigh's motion was gall and wormwood.

The action of the Union was all the more creditable as the resolution above given was adopted in the face of a nondescript resolution whereby it was intended to throw dust into the eyes of the public by condemning equally those "passionate Roman Catholics and passionate Protestants" who "in these times" go "to extremes." Such a resolution as this would have been "a mockery, a delusion and a snare;" and as such it was regarded by the majority, for every one knows that there is no anti-Protestant agitation among Catholics to call for such condemnation, and it was in the full consciousness of this that Mr. Yeigh's motion was passed. This is evident from the speech of Mr. R. W. McLachlan, who seconded the motion. He said:

"Such associations as the P. P. A. are unnecessary. In Montreal, notwithstanding the preponderance of the Roman Catholic population, there is no need for such an organization. How then could there be in Ontario, where the circumstances are reversed? I think the Protestants of Toronto might learn tolerance from the Roman Catholics of Montreal."

THE PARNELLITES.

The policy of opposition to Lord Rosebery's Government announced by Mr. John Redmond as that decided on by the Parnellites in Parliament turned out to be a tremendous fizzle. The cable despatches announced the complete victory achieved by the Government in passing the budget, which was carried by a majority of forty, whereas not more than one of fourteen was expected, owing especially to the defection of the Parnellites, and certain malcontents among the Welsh members who were dissatisfied with the delays over the Welsh disestablishment bill. The Welsh malcontents returned to their allegiance, but the Parnellites adhered to their announced resolution to oppose the bill, with the result that Mr. John Redmond, his brother William, and two other members of the Parnellite party marched into the lobby with the Tories to vote against the Government. In full force, the Parnellites would have mustered only nine votes, but it is most ridiculous to suppose that the fag end of a party, the majority of whom prefer to absent themselves from a most important division, can expect to dictate the policy of the people of Ireland. The Parnellites have certainly over-reached themselves by their absurd attempt at terrorizing the Nationalists. Their fiasco was the more complete, as the Messrs. Redmond left London after their display of weakness, and there remained only three Parnellites in the House to watch over the interests of Ireland, and these three could not agree upon a course to be followed, two of them, Colonel Nolan and Mr. Field, voting for the Government, and the third, Mr. Maguire, going with the Opposition. Surely the Irish constituencies which sent these members to guard their interests in Parliament will have the good sense at the next election to unite in supporting the truly Nationalist party, and will leave the Parnellites to do their quarrelling at home, where they cannot do any injury to the National cause.

In contrast with Mr. Meredith's dealings with the P. P. A. and their platform, we have great pleasure in recording the fact that Mr. E. C. Carpenter, the Reform candidate in North Norfolk, stated publicly in a speech at La Salette on the 12th inst., that the P. P. A. had presented their platform to him for his subscription, but he had informed them in writing that he could not approve of it, and that he therefore returned it to them. He added in the most manly fashion, that he does not expect P. P. A. votes; that he does not want them; and that he repudiates all assistance from that quarter. The announcement was received with great applause. The Conservative candidate in the same constituency approved of the platform, of course.

The Catholic school exhibit of the Archdiocese of New York was closed with appropriate ceremonies on the evening of the 27th of May, and from the account of the closing exercises given in the New York Sun, they evinced the excellence of the New York system of Parochial schools.

The exhibit was, in every respect, a great success, and the facts elicited during the closing exercises are as instructive to Ontarians as they were to the people of New York, the circumstances of the two countries being similar in very many respects.

It was pointed out by one of the speakers that there are 60,000 children attending the Parochial schools of the Archdiocese, and that these have as much right that their education should be paid for by the State as have the children of their Protestant neighbors. Yet the city has not provided any school accommodation for them, nor has either city or State furnished one cent towards their education, though their parents pay their full share of the Public school tax.

It is the object of Mr. Meredith and his supporters to bring about a similar state of affairs in Ontario. They seem to think that it is a clever trick to double the school taxes of Catholics because our consciences tell us we should give our children a Christian education; and they even expect that some Catholics will aid them by their votes at the coming election, to put their plans into successful operation.

CATHOLIC EDUCATION AND THE A. P. A.

The Catholic school exhibit of the Archdiocese of New York was closed with appropriate ceremonies on the evening of the 27th of May, and from the account of the closing exercises given in the New York Sun, they evinced the excellence of the New York system of Parochial schools.

The exhibit was, in every respect, a great success, and the facts elicited during the closing exercises are as instructive to Ontarians as they were to the people of New York, the circumstances of the two countries being similar in very many respects.

It was pointed out by one of the speakers that there are 60,000 children attending the Parochial schools of the Archdiocese, and that these have as much right that their education should be paid for by the State as have the children of their Protestant neighbors. Yet the city has not provided any school accommodation for them, nor has either city or State furnished one cent towards their education, though their parents pay their full share of the Public school tax.

It is the object of Mr. Meredith and his supporters to bring about a similar state of affairs in Ontario. They seem to think that it is a clever trick to double the school taxes of Catholics because our consciences tell us we should give our children a Christian education; and they even expect that some Catholics will aid them by their votes at the coming election, to put their plans into successful operation.

Mgr. Farley, the Chairman of the Catholic School Board, presided, and, speaking of the work of the schools, he said:

"In the parochial schools the children have not only been taught the love of God, but they have also been taught the love of their country. Though they have been taught the duty to die for their faith they have also been taught the duty to die for their country when necessity calls. They have been taught to reverence next to their Church that symbol of the country's greatness, the American flag—the Stars and Stripes."

This was a complete answer to the slanders of the Apatists of the United States, who have absurdly endeavored to make it appear that Catholics are now engaged in devising a plan for the overthrow of the Government of the country.

Father Farley's remarks were received with prolonged applause, and then speaking of the Sisters who are teaching in the parochial schools, he told of their work as nurses during the war, concluding thus:

"And when the war was over, where did they go? Not to the pension office. No, they returned to teach the children of the soldiers who had died on the field; to teach them faithfulness and loyalty to the glorious flag, to tell them how their fathers had died in its defence."

Col. John R. Fellows, District Attorney of New York city, followed, remarking that the storm did not seem to have kept away any one at home that night; but he knew a Baptist minister in town who, if he were there to see the enthusiastic crowd, would bear an additional load upon him during life on seeing how little is the force of water.

Col. Fellows stated that he is a Protestant, and that in being so he follows the faith he received from his mother; nevertheless he has no wish to propagate Protestantism by persecution, as a certain association is attempting to do.

He did not name the association referred to, but every one understood that he was scoring the A. P. A. when he continued:

"What do these men want? What are they objecting to? For what was this country founded if it wasn't to guarantee to all men free religion! Is there not in the Constitution a guaranteed right to worship as one pleases? Founded by something more than a hundred men on the principle of freedom in worship and freedom in all things, there are tens of thousands, ay! hundreds of thousands, and millions of Protestants to-day who are prepared to fight for those principles even as the hundred fought, who are prepared to shed their blood that you may keep what our fathers gave to you."

The colonel is evidently a great friend of civil and religious liberty, and not a sham like many in the United States and Canada who with impudence and hypocrisy combined have this phrase constantly at the end of their tongues; and what the eloquent speaker said of the United States is quite applicable to Ontario, for there are many Protestants in Ontario like him. The P. P. A. and the A. P. A. can never carry their principles through to practical operation while such is the case, for there are plenty of fair-minded Protestants like Colonel Fellows who will assist in fighting the demon of persecution.