

The Catholic Record.

"Christianus mihi nomen est, Catholicus vero Cognomen."—"Christian is my Name, but Catholic my Surname."—St. Pacian, 4th Century.

VOLUME 12.

LONDON, ONTARIO, SATURDAY, JANUARY 18, 1890

NO 587

Catholic Record

London, Sat., Jan. 18th, 1890.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

A New York paper has decided to publish Rev. Justin D. Fulton's lectures under the heading "Our Funny Column." Mr. Fulton is undoubtedly funny, but he is somewhat of a nuisance, too, and has done a good deal of harm in his time, for many innocent Protestant people are not aware that Mr. Fulton is a great inventor.

The Protestant school trustees of Norquay District, Manitoba, have pronounced distinctly against the abolition of separate schools in that Province. The resolution which was passed at a meeting held December 20th, 1889 says:

"Be it resolved, that we hereby express our strongest conviction that the abolition of separate schools would prove injurious alike to the interests of Catholics and Protestants, and that we will oppose such abolition to the utmost of our power."

Sir—I have read the latest letter of Bishop Cleary in reply to Hon. Mr. Meredith, the noble leader of all those who are in favor of just and equal rights of all citizens. I call it an impudent one. Will Bishop Cleary, as an honest, straightforward man, state in an honest and plain manner whether he is in favor of the sentiments expressed in the Kingston paper, or whether he is opposed to them. It does not require a long rignarole.

The above letter appeared in the Toronto Mail of the 10th. It was signed by John Rawlings, and his place of habitation was given as London. We have lived in this city for more than thirty years, and, with a certain degree of mortification, we make the admission that we do not know John Rawlings. We are sorry the street number and occupation were not added, so that John Rawlings could be traced up. We merely desire to add that, in the words of Archbishop Cleary, "gentlemen are not expected to answer impertinent questions," even when propounded by John Rawlings, of London.

AS ALREADY stated, it has been charged that the Toronto Mail managers have been carrying on negotiations with certain American parties with a view to selling about the annexation of Canada to the United States. The editor of the Mail, Mr. Farrar, has, it seems, been lately in Washington, but that paper states that his object in going there was simply in search of health and recreation. We hope Mr. Farrar's health has been much benefited by the trip, and we are pleased to know that Washington is a healthy place for annexationists. When certain parties placed one hundred dollar bills in the hands of members of Parliament in the assembly room, at Toronto, a few years ago, no doubt have we that they, too, were in search of health and recreation.

A MEETING of the Dominion Alliance was held in Montreal on Tuesday last. These dear good men are far out on the ocean and have neither oars nor steering apparatus for their little craft. The alliance itself is an aggregation of contradictions. Some will fight to the death for the Scott Act, others for total prohibition, others for high license, others again for a small number of licenses, and so on; but the body as a whole does not really know what it wants. It is composed in great part of Protestant clergymen and laymen who are more enthusiastic than sensible so far as the promotion of temperance is concerned. A number of subjects were to be discussed at the meeting, but we have not yet seen a report of the proceedings. The 4th section of the business was put down thus: "The alliance platform for political action." The Catholics have been accused, and very unjustly too, of doing something of this character. The principle has been denounced as something odious by the Equal Rights fanatics. Will the alliance be condemned for straying into this path? We think not, for quite a large number of people have one set of scales by which to weigh Catholic movements and another for those of Protestants. There are altogether twelve questions to be discussed. The last one is: "Are Prohibitionists fools?" We have our own opinion of men who would ask such a question about themselves; but we might add that a number of gentlemen in Canada seeking to bring about such a momentous change in our condition are losing much valuable time.

FROM a letter which appears in another column, it will be seen that the statements made by the Toronto School Inspector, Jas. L. Hughes, in a lecture recently delivered in this city, in regard to illegitimacy in Catholic as com-

pared with Protestant countries, were shameful misrepresentations. We would be pleased were we to have cause for suspicion that Mr. Hughes was mistaken in his assertions; but judging from his well-known character, we are forced to the conclusion that he knew he was bearing false witness against his neighbors. That this man should hold the position of superintendent over the education of children is one of those things that is very puzzling to people outside of Toronto. The school board of that city must be composed of gentlemen of the anti-brass money and wooden foot-wear variety. Mr. Hughes and the board get along very well apparently, being birds of a feather. Let us fancy for a moment what would be the result were Catholics to give up their separate schools and place the education of their children in the hands of these senseless and ferocious bigots.

Mr. MOODY, the evangelist, held a series of revival meetings in this city last week. Our separated brethren took a very great amount of interest in the services and large crowds attended them. It is claimed that much good will result. We hope this will prove to be the case, for it is a matter of gratification to know that resolutions leading to a better mode of living is abroad among the people. One especially pleasing incident connected with the movement is the fact that Mr. Moody spoke some very plain words to the preachers. He drew attention to the fact that many of them had strayed away from their calling and had been engaged in work not at all becoming in men who professed to be ministers of the gospel. Great emphasis was placed by the evangelist on the necessity of preachers attending to their own business, and leaving worldly affairs to the laity. We doubt not this admonition was called forth on account of the scandalous behavior of many of the clergy of the city during the past few years in turning their pulpits into rostrums of amusement and oftentimes the discussion of purely political matters and the sowing of dissension and ill-will formed a goodly share of their work. While preachers who are guilty of this unbecoming conduct should be and are condemned and reprobated, it is to be hoped that the laity, like the evangelist's lash, deserve a severe application of the demand for a departure from the usual routine of scriptural discourses, and they allowed themselves to drift with the tide of novelty. We have always thought that one of the weakest parts of the Protestant system was the entire dependence of the clergy on the managers or owners of the churches. The preaching must be cut according to the measure supplied by the church committee, or the preacher must hand in his resignation. We hope our city preachers will carry out the good resolutions made to Mr. Moody. His visit will not have been in vain if Revs. Messrs. Hunter, Murray, Porter, McDonough, etc., will now become preachers of the gospel. Were it not for Mr. Moody's visit we verily believe poor Mr. Hunter would ere this have been disposed to connect the Jesuits in some manner with the prevailing epidemic of influenza.

IT WILL be remembered that a few weeks ago a Mail correspondent in Belle River, some uncultured as unscrupulous Equal Rights fanatic, sent that paper a harrowing account of hardship, wherein those dreadful nuns were about to become teachers of the school in that village, while the former teacher was summarily dismissed to make room for them. The Free Press, the London annex of the Mail, also printed the "news," as given in that paper, but a few days later the Free Press editor was forced to pull the following very wet blanket over his shoulders:

To the Editor of the Free Press:—Sir—The recent communication written by the Belle River correspondent of the Toronto Mail calls for a few comments. Had the communication in question never appeared in any other journal except the Mail, I might, perhaps, have passed it by unnoticed, for the simple reason that the columns of the Toronto Mail always contain more sensation than truth. When, however, I find the Belle River communication copied into the London Free Press and other respectable journals, then it seems to me that I have a right to print out some of the false statements.

First—I never was dismissed by the Belle River Public School Board, hence the Mail's correspondent is in error. In December, 1887, I was engaged by the Belle River School Board to take charge of the school for 1888. Before going to the school at all I gave them notice that I did not desire to teach more than one year. At the end of that year, December, 1888, I resigned, but the School Board called a special meeting for the purpose of inducing me to continue in the charge of the school, then and there adding \$50 to my salary. I agreed to these terms, but at the same time gave them notice that I would not teach in any

school after December, 1889. During the year '89 they asked me several times to reconsider my determination to give up teaching, and it was only after I answered them that my decision was final that they began to make arrangements for the Sisters of St. Joseph to take charge of the school. Such being the facts of the case, what right, I ask, has the Mail's correspondent to tell the public that I was "dismissed?"

Second—We are also told that the nuns who are to teach in Belle River school have no certificates. Now, many of the nuns of St. Joseph are in possession of certificates, and at the time the Mail correspondent wrote the letter the Belle River nuns were not yet appointed. How, then, could the Mail correspondent find fault with the certificates of the Belle River nuns, seeing that the Belle River nuns were not yet appointed?

Thanking you for inserting this reply in your popular journal, I remain, Sincerely yours,

Strathroy, Jan. 6, 1890. E. HEALY.

THE Globe prints the annexed piece of fun at the expense of the Ontario folk who are so prone to mind every one else's business but their own. All this while the good people of Quebec are pursuing their avocations in the sequestered manner, paying no attention whatever to the howling of the half crazed politicians and preachers of Ontario:

"Mr. Mercer, in his Quebec Speech from the Throne, . . . sketches a forthcoming bill for rewarding French Canadian fecundity. This law measure, coming so soon after Mayor Clarke's election, may be expected to complete the insanity of our contemporary on the northwest corner of King and Bay streets. A free homestead of one hundred acres to be granted to every Quebec mother of twelve children born in lawful wedlock! Horrors! Isn't this mad or mad legislation! Isn't it a dark and deadly continuance of the Ultramontane law! It utterly out of keeping with Montaigne's precepts, and the doctrines of all those French philosophers from whom our contemporary derives its notions of true Liberalism! Isn't it a direct encouragement to the enormous crime of increasing the French Canadian population?"

The following extract from the Globe will, we trust, have the effect of enlightening those who, when speaking or writing on questions affecting Catholics, allow their common sense to be blunted by the "ferocious bigotry" which is, like the gripe, now so prevalent in the air of Ontario:

"In reply to our statement that the French Canadians in Ontario pay for their own schools just as we pay for ours, it is pointed out that in some places Prescott and Russell, the English ratepayers own more property than the French ratepayers, and, therefore, pay more taxes; but that the French ratepayers are more numerous, and therefore control the schools. In other words, the ratepayers get control of the schools in proportion to their numbers and not in proportion to their wealth and the taxes they pay. This is the case not only in Prescott and Russell, but all over the Province. A rich man in Toronto may pay \$10,000 a year in taxes, and yet have only one vote for a School Trustee; while a thousand votes may be cast by men whose aggregate taxes are only \$5,000 a year. Moreover, the thousand poor men may send altogether four or five thousand children to the schools, while the rich man gets no direct advantage from them at all. Nobody disputes the fact that our school system favors the poor at the expense of the wealthy. It must do so unless we give the wealthy man, a hundred, or a thousand votes in proportion to the taxes he pays. We don't think this will ever be done, not only because it would probably destroy our school system, but because people are not easily excited to compassion for the woes of the rich. If the English Protestants of Prescott and Russell are less numerous than their French Canadian neighbors, where else, if the majority rules is everywhere else, if they are more wealthy than those French Canadian neighbors that is merely a trick for which they should be grateful."

AN ELECTION will be held next week in the county of Bertier, in the Province of Quebec. Mr. Destatier, who formerly supported the Conservative party in that Province, has declared himself a supporter of Mr. Mercier's Government. Hon. Mr. Laurier advises his friends to sustain the decision of Mr. Destatier because he knows him to be an honest man and a good Catholic. For doing this Mr. Laurier is denounced by a Toronto Empire, in a leading article headed "The Ultramontane Yoke." The Toronto Mail, who is at loggerheads with the Empire on every other subject, agrees with it on the subject of Ultramontanism, and denounces both Laurier and Mercier as Clericalists. "Ultramontanism" and "Clericalism" are the surnames given to good Catholics in France and Italy by the infidel journals of those countries. These bad names are adopted by the infidel Mail and the Orange Empire, and are hurled at the men in Lower Canada, who love their Church and practice the lessons of Christianity. It is fortunate for the Church in particular, and for society in general, that the two leading politicians in the Lower Province, who command the

respect and the confidence of a great and influential body of politicians, are both good Catholics and exemplary Christians. No higher praise could be lavished on them than the abuse of the Orange Empire and the un-Christian Mail.

"Mr. Meredith proposes to give Roman Catholics the privilege of voting for separate school trustees by ballot, that they may vote as they please. Mr. Meredith proposes to allow every Roman Catholic to decide for himself whether he will support the separate or public school. For proposing to give these liberties to Roman Catholics some Roman Catholics say that Mr. Meredith is attacking them."—Hamilton Spectator.

It will be time for Mr. Meredith to grant favors to the Catholics when he is asked. Forcing doubtful gifts upon your neighbor is not the best way to show friendship. Compelling him to accept as meat what he considers poison is likely to stir him up to a resentment of your gifts and to a temptation on his part to take you by the nape of the neck and kick you out of doors. If the Catholics want the ballot they will petition for it in the ordinary way. If a Catholic wants to put his name on the list of supporters of the common school the way is open to him. He, or his wife in his absence, can tell the assessor to put his name on the proper list, and the thing is settled.

The amendment to facilitate the working of the separate schools is what is killing the fanatics. They would like to have all the corporation taxes, as they now have, and about one-half the Catholic school tax, as they had under the old system. This is how it happened: When strangers from the other side came to London, Toronto or St. Thomas, and were Catholics, they sent their children to the separate school; but, not knowing the law, they did not send into the city clerk their written declaration of being Catholics and supporters of the Catholic school. Their school taxes were then paid into the common school. After some time the school trustees found out that the school population had increased, and the school tax remained the same. Then it was their duty to hunt up the new-comers and obtain their signature to a notice of declaration that they were supporters of the separate school. Several difficulties here occurred:

1st. The trustees are all men of business, who would lose time and miss customers by going around from street to street hunting up the new-comers.

2nd. When they reached the house the occupant was out on the road. He was off to Buffalo or Detroit. He was a railroad employe.

3rd. When, after a third or fourth visit, he was found at last, he was afraid to sign the paper, thinking it would involve him in the payment of some debt on school building or purchase of a new site for school purposes. Very often he refused to sign any paper until he would consult a lawyer or his parish priest. Meanwhile, if his written declaration were not filed with the clerk on or before the first day of March, his taxes went to the support of the common school. In this manner about one third of the Catholic school tax went every year into the pockets of the common school trustees. In the Province of Quebec no such pilfering is allowed of the Protestant tax for the support of Provincial Catholic schools. There the Protestants get all their own tax and one third of the school tax levied on railways, banking institutions, etc.

E. B. A.

To the Officers and Members of the Emergent Beneficial Association of Ontario:—GENTLEMEN AND BROTHERS—I beg to request you that your names be sent to the Grand Secretary, Mr. J. H. G. S., on or before January 15. And so trust you will at once comply with the rule as laid down in the constitution. I would also remind you that all notices of motion to be considered at the convention must be sent on or before March 8th. Yours fraternally,

W. LANE, G. S., St. Paul's Branch, No. 8, of Toronto, decided to have an open meeting of their Branch on Thursday, Jan. 9th, and invited their lady and gentlemen friends to be present at the installation of their officers for 1890. A numerous party of members with their wives or cousins attended at the appointed time, but unfortunately the gipped had claimed some of the offices, and the installation had to be postponed. The party then adjourned to the supper room, where a beautiful supply of oysters and other delicacies of the season awaited them. After having done full justice to the good things provided, a few short addresses were delivered by A. McDonough, chairman; W. Lane, G. S.; U. Burn, G. J.; and P. Hurley, President of the Branch.

The committee had engaged some professionals to give a choice selection of songs and recitations, but again the gipped put in his claim, and so prevented their attendance. Nevertheless a very pleasant evening was spent, each doing their best for the general amusement,

HON. H. G. JOLY.

OPINIONS ON THE RACIAL AGITATIONS.

The following letter appeared in the Montreal Witness:

Sir—The Jesuit Estates Bill has become the signal for a strong agitation throughout the Dominion. Men who for so many years have lived together in confidence and good fellowship, notwithstanding differences of origin and religious creed, are now growing suspicious of one another and gradually getting estranged.

A great deal has been said and written by leading men on one side or the other, but there are two sides to every question. Is it possible to lay aside all personal feelings as completely as to deal fairly with both sides of the question?

Every effort must be made to preserve the old feeling of mutual trust and forbearance, which has made us, Canadians, English and French, Roman Catholics and Protestants, live happily side by side in peace, in days when there is so little peace in the world; such efforts deserve to be supported by all men of good will.

It is not an easy task; it can only be attempted at the risk of giving offence to both sides in turn, and, what is worse, alienating old friends, but if it can only lead men to look for one moment from their side of the question to the other side it will not be labor lost.

No one will be so unjust as to make the Honorable Mr. Mercer and the "Parli Nationale" answerable for the Northwest Rebellion, but they have availed themselves of its closing incident, the execution, to attain power by encouraging a dangerous agitation, which has naturally led to the present counter agitation.

When the opportunity to attain power by such means is offered to a political party, is it right to accept it, or must it be rejected? Let the great constitutional writers who have taught the absolute necessity of parties under our form of Government answer the question if they can, as all prevailing notions of right or wrong are lost under the iron rule of party discipline.

One thing, however, appears evident. If the Racial agitation has been so far successful in the Province of Quebec it must be admitted that a much deeper meaning has been attached to it than its originators ever contemplated, when they had recourse to it as one of their party tactics. If they will put themselves for one moment in the place of the English Protestants of Canada they will easily understand why it was taken by them as a serious provocation.

Neither the execution of Rivet, on the one side, nor the Jesuit Estates Bill, on the other, appear to justify the appeals made from both sides to the religious and national feeling of the two component parts of our Canadian nationality. But, to return to the Jesuit Estates Bill, it is not fair to inquire how many of those who condemn it, and look upon it as an act of hostility, have taken the trouble to read and study it? An overwhelming majority of them have received their opinion from men whom they are accustomed to look up to with well placed confidence. Far be it from me to charge such men with wilful misrepresentations in their interpretation of the statute; but they are speaking under a strong sense of provocation, which must, to a certain degree, bias their judgment and lead their audience further than they really intend. They solemnly and truly, I am certain, protest that their intention is not to excite any unfriendly feeling against either Roman Catholics or French Canadians, but, if they admit that they have, however unwillingly, done so.

I firmly believe that the real nature of the Jesuit Estates Bill is not well understood by those who condemn it so absolutely. For instance, the payment of the four hundred thousand dollars is condemned as the endorsement of one favored Church at the expense of the public exchequer. Why represent that payment as an endorsement? Does an endorsement generally consist in returning to the person endowed what once he had loaned to that person or its equivalent? Why not call it at once what it really is, the settlement of a long pending claim? It is perfectly fair to attack the validity of the claim, but the existence of a claim ought not to be ignored.

If it be argued against the validity of the claim that the property has been confiscated, I maintain that it has not been confiscated, but exchequered. The distinction is a most important one when it comes to a question of equity.

As Blackstone says on confiscation, "It is the forfeiture of lands and goods for offences." What offence had the Jesuits of Canada committed against the Crown of England since the conquest? Justly the confiscation of their property? But when their Order had been suppressed by the Pope, its property became vested in the Crown, in virtue of the law of escheat, which applies in cases of failure of persons legally entitled to hold property. The claim certainly deserves to be looked upon with much more favor than if the property had been confiscated in punishment of an offence against the Crown. If the Order had not been suppressed by the Pope, the Jesuits of Canada would have kept their property. As it is, the Crown only took possession of it in the year 1804 after the death of Father Lussan, the last surviving member of their Order in Canada.

Before Confederation, it is not likely that such a bill as the Jesuit Estates Bill could have passed (though after the vote of next session in the House of Commons it is difficult to foresee what might have happened under certain political exigencies), but, now, with any one word that in the Province of Quebec, where the Roman Catholics are by a great majority, a claim to property of such a nature as the Jesuit Estates pro-

perty was, should have been ultimately settled?

It is generally feared by those who condemn the bill that the payment of the \$400,000 is only an instalment to be followed by much larger sums. That amount is so much less than the real value of the estates that there might be some just grounds for apprehension were it not that the terms of the settlement are an absolute bar to any further claim. I will refer your readers on that point to the sixth clause of the settlement sanctioned by the bill, page 22 of the statute book, which reads as follows:

"The Government of the Province of Quebec will receive a full, complete and perpetual concession of all the property which may have belonged in Canada, by whatever title, to the Fathers of the Old Society, and the Jesuit Fathers will renounce all rights generally whatsoever upon such property and the revenues therefrom, in favor of the Province, the whole in the name of the Pope, of the Sacred College of the Propaganda and of the Roman Catholic Church in General."

The introduction of the Pope's name in the preamble, the acknowledgment of the necessity of his consent to a settlement and the leaving to him the distribution of the fund are construed into contempt for the Queen's authority and dignity on the part of the Legislature of Quebec, and as an abdication of its Legislative functions.

Had I been a member of the Legislature at the time, if the name of the Pope and his consent to the settlement had been omitted, I would have insisted upon their being entered into the bill before allowing it to pass.

If a bargain with any commercial or other corporation, in order to be legally binding, must have the sanction of the proper authorities, the Board of Directors or a majority of the shareholders, as the case may be, what an inexcusable oversight it would have been to neglect obtaining the sanction of the supreme head of the Roman Catholic Church, the Pope, without which no settlement could be considered as final?

A great proportion of the contents of the preamble to the bill appears, at first sight, either out of place and objectionable or superfluous; but upon further examination it will strike the patient reader, especially if he possesses some legal knowledge, as evidence of the minute precautions taken to secure a valid and final discharge and settlement for the Province of Quebec.

I shall feel grateful if I have succeeded in removing, even to a small degree, the prejudices entertained against the Jesuit Estates Bill and those who passed it.

At the same time I hope that the majority in the Province of Quebec will understand that, unintentionally, they have given their friends of other origin and creed fair grounds for suspicion. Once they see that clearly, I trust in their good will to avoid all further cause of misunderstanding. H. G. JOLY.

Quebec, Jan. 7, 1890.

CHATHAM CHANGES.

FATHER WILLIAM'S DEPARTURE—A MAN HE WAS TO ALL THE COUNTRY DEAR—PRESS COMMENTS.

FOR the last twelve years the Rev. Father William, O. S. F., has been parish priest at Chatham, laboring for the elevation of men and the salvation of their souls. During that time who but God, in whose hands he was an ever-ready instrument, can measure the good he has done? No ordinary priest even could have so enshrined himself in the hearts of his people. Kind, sympathetic and charitable, the fallen might well turn to him when others comforted them not. The wavering received new courage and those in affliction found him a sharer in their sorrows.

Last Thursday he received instructions to report forthwith at Cincinnati, there to be assigned his new field of duty. Sad, indeed, was the parting, but faintly indicating the feeling of love and attachment between Father William and the congregation of St. Joseph's, to whose united efforts are due the magnificent new church and presbytery erected during his stay here, to stand as evidences of Catholic faith, Catholic zeal and Canadian energy, in the cause of holy religion. Never before has been seen here such an affecting farewell; strong men of all denominations wept, and women were disconsolate with grief, all realizing that they were losing a friend and father. The C. M. B. A. in Canada loses an enthusiastic and able advocate. Father William was among the ablest pulpit orators of Ontario, and precept from his eloquent lips soon became practice in the daily lives of his audience. The news of his departure spread rapidly through the town and all who could lost no time in tendering him their respect and good wishes.

This really sorrowful parting must be rendered less bitter to both Father William and the congregation when it becomes known that Father Paul has been selected as his successor with Father Benedict as assistant.

From the Chatham Market Guide. Father William's transference to another sphere of duty and usefulness is deeply regretted, not only among his own flock, but Protestants of all creeds, with whom his amiable disposition and public spirit, gained him so many admirers during the twelve years' sojourn in Chatham. Personally we add our tribute, as having lost one whose kind offices will not soon be forgotten. It seems hard to lose such a man but the summons of the Church is imperative, and admits not of delay. The best wishes of this town and county, in no perfunctory spirit, follow the good Father, wherever he goes.

From the Chatham Banner. Father William carries with him the respect and esteem of the people of all denominations; and he will long be missed.