

The Catholic Record.

Published Weekly at 484 and 486 Richmond Street, London, Ontario.
Price of Subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

REV. GEORGE H. NORTHGRAVE,
Author of "Sketches of Modern Ireland."
THOMAS COFFEY,
Publisher and Proprietor, Thomas Coffey.

Messrs. Luke King John, P. J. Naven and Miss Sarah H. Naven are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and to transact all other business for THE CATHOLIC RECORD.
Agents for New-England, Mr. James Power of St. John.
Rates of Advertising—Twenty-five per line each insertion, space measurement.
Approved and recommended by the Archbishop of Toronto, King's College, Ottawa and St. Boniface, the Bishops of London, Hamilton, Peterborough, and Oshawa, N. Y., 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 Monday morning.
When subscribers change their residence it is important that the old as well as the new address be sent us.
Subscribers when changing their address should notify this office as soon as possible in order to insure the regular delivery of their paper.
Agents or collectors have no authority to stop your paper unless the amount due is paid.
Matter intended for publication should be mailed in time to reach London not later than Monday morning. Please do not send us poetry, obituary or marriage notices sent by subscribers must be in condensed form, to insure insertion.

LETTER OF RECOMMENDATION.
UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA,
Ottawa, Canada, March 7th, 1905.
The Editor of THE CATHOLIC RECORD,
London, Ont.
Dear Sir: For some time past I have read your estimable paper, THE CATHOLIC RECORD, and congratulate you upon the manner in which it is published.
In matter and form are both good; and a truly Catholic spirit pervades the whole. Therefore, with pleasure, I can recommend it to the faithful.
Blessing you and wishing you success.
Believe me to remain, as ever,
Yours faithfully in Jesus Christ,
D. FALCONER, Arch. of Larles.

LONDON, SATURDAY, APR. 8, 1905.

THE QUESTION OF COERCION.

"Coercion for all time" is the way in which the Toronto Mail and Empire presents the educational clauses of the North-West autonomy bill. Elsewhere the same journal says:

"Fortunately for the West, and in spite of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Manitoba is left as a Pale for settlers who cherish freedom in educational matters."

This reasoning is most delusive. Suppose that two settlers go into the Manitoba Liberty Pale, one a Catholic, the other a Protestant. The Catholic desires to give his children a sound religious as well as a secular training. He is convinced in conscience that he is bound thus to provide for the education of his family.

Is there any authority on earth which has the right to say he shall not educate his children in the way he desires? Has the Government of the country the right to throw obstacles in his way to prevent him from carrying out his religious convictions? We say, decidedly not. We may concede, and willingly we do concede, that the Government has the right to insist that he shall give his children a fair education according to his condition in life, but no government has the right to tell parents that they shall not instruct their children efficiently in religious truth as well as morals, for religious truth is the basis upon which morality is founded, and without it there can be no solid morality. This principle is founded both on natural divine law and on the teaching of Scripture, which of itself should suffice in this Christian country to establish a moral obligation. Thus in Deuteronomy, iv. 9, we have the command of God addressed to parents: "Forget not the words that thy eyes have seen, and let them not go out of thy heart all the days of thy life. Thou shalt teach them to thy sons and to thy grandsons."

Now we know well that but few parents have the time at their disposal to obey this law personally; or the ability, even if they have the time. Who can deny them, therefore, the right to employ teachers who have the necessary capacity? Certainly not the Government, nor any majority in a civil province.

But our hypothetical Catholic will not get this religious teaching in the Public schools, and therefore he has the natural right to establish and support a school which will furnish what he desires.

In Manitoba, if he does this, he will be obliged to pay a double tax. He sends his children to the Catholic school where he finds that the kind of education he wishes for his children is to be obtained, and is punished by being compelled to pay also for the education of the children of his fellow-settler. But the fellow settler, being a Protestant, wishes to have his children taught without any reference to God and religion. The law provides adequately for the education he wants, and besides imposes a tax on the Catholic settler for the benefit of the Protestant. This is liberty with a vengeance! It is a premium set upon non-religious education, and a penalty upon Catholic religious education. In other words, the law discriminates to the disadvantage of Catholics. This is the ideal School system for the Mail and Empire, the Baptist Conventions, the Presbyteries, and the Orange Lodges which are clamoring for "no Separate schools."

Let it be distinctly understood that Catholics have no desire to coerce Pro-

testants to support Separate schools, or to send their children to Separate schools. What Catholics aim at is that they shall have the liberty to send their children to the schools which give the kind of education they wish their children to get without being obliged in addition to support also the schools which their Protestant neighbors prefer. We want equal liberty and equal rights for Catholics and Protestant, and this can be had only by means of Separate schools.

But under this arrangement, do not the Protestants pay for Catholic schools when public moneys are apportioned to schools? No. These public moneys come equally from Catholics and Protestants, no matter by what road they have reached the public treasury, and Catholics are entitled to a just share from whatever funds are apportioned from the treasury for educational purposes.

The Autonomy Bill proposes to divide all school appropriations according to this just principle. There is, therefore, under its provisions, no coercion, no injustice inflicted upon any one, and these provisions are just and equitable. No one will complain of not having the power to deal unjustly with Catholics, but those who wish to deal unjustly, and the more earnest they show themselves to be to have the power, the more disposed do they show themselves to be to exercise it.

But, it is said, why not leave it to the provinces themselves to determine whether or not they wish for a system of Separate schools? To this we answer that in a Confederation of self-ruling provinces there must be necessarily a yielding of certain powers to the supreme Government. Quebec and Ontario yielded the power of interference with the Separate school systems in force in these provinces respectively so that the vested rights of the Catholic and Protestant minorities in those provinces should be respected; and the same reason exists for the preservation of the vested rights already existing in the North-West.

Since 1875 Separate schools for both Catholics and Protestants have existed, and have been treated as part of the School system; and now we have been told by statesmen and educationists that there is really no serious objection among the people of the North-West against the perpetuation of the same privileges which are already possessed by the minorities in the two new provinces. In fact, outside the Orange lodges, and a few presbyteries and Baptist conventions there have been no serious protests from that quarter against the autonomy bill and it remains to be proved that those who have protested represent the will of the people. A more secure test is the voice of the Parliamentary representatives of the districts concerned, and we are told that these will be almost if not quite unanimous in favor of the bill as it stands. But even if they were not in favor of it, it is but an act of justice upon which the High Court of the Dominion Parliament has the right to adjudicate. There is no injury inflicted or proposed to be inflicted upon the majority, but solely an existing privilege is perpetuated to the minority to which they are entitled by every consideration of liberty and equity. The desire of coercion is altogether on the part of those who are opposed to the passage of the educational clauses of the autonomy bill.

A SET BACK FOR OBSTINATE OFFICIALDOM.

We have a new instance of the kind demeanor of civic officialdom toward Catholics in a suit-at-law gained by the Separate School Trustees of Sandwich East No. 1 over the Council of the town of Walkerville. The decision was rendered by Chief Justice Falconbridge, and Justices McMahon and Clute in the Divisional Court at Osgoode Hall, Toronto, on appeal, on the 29th March.

The case was that the Town Council refused to pay to the Separate school, the taxes of a number of ratepayers who were supporters of the Separate school. The taxes thus retained for the Public school were levied for the year 1903. The Divisional Court ordered payment to be made to the Separate school trustees, and the town was ordered also to pay the cost of the suit.

In spite of occurrences like this, wherein justice was clearly on the side of the Separate School Trustees, Catholics are blamed by certain busybodies, because they do not rely implicitly on the high sense of justice of the Protestant majority which elects town councillors and other officials, to do full justice to them in school matters, and so we are told that it is insulting to the Protestant majority in the North-West to ask that our rights be clearly defined by the law under which two new Provinces are to be formed. We should leave the matter, forsooth, entirely in the hands of a future Protestant majority which is just as likely to be hostile

at times to Catholic rights, as was the Legislature of Manitoba as a result of a no Popery campaign inaugurated by the late Dalton McCarthy, Q. C.

We are very well aware that we have surer hopes of success from the broad-minded Parliament of the Dominion than from the Government and Parliament of a Province which is overwhelmingly Protestant, and is more easily swayed by a tide of bigotry excited by narrow-minded politicians.

It is difficult to believe that the Town Council of Walkerville were ignorant of the law allowing Catholics to become Separate school supporters when they are within three miles of a Separate school, even in a different municipality. They should, therefore, have paid the taxes without demur to the Separate school which was entitled to them, without being forced by a law-suit so to do.

VERY DOLEFUL.

A lugubrious meeting was that of the "Citizens' Committee on Provincial Rights" held in the parlors of the Young Men's Christian Association, Toronto, on Wednesday afternoon, March 29th. Mr. Stapleton Caldecott occupied the chair, but announced that he must retire from the chairmanship owing to the strict orders of his physician. He suggested a successor in the person of Mr. J. W. Flavelle, but it was decided to leave the selection of a chairman to the Executive of the Committee which would meet on Friday 31st March.

Mr. Goldwin Smith, whose antipathy to the Catholic Church and to everything Irish and French on account of the Catholicity of these nationalities, was not present, but he wrote a letter enclosing \$50 as his subscription toward the payment of the expenses incurred by the Committee in resisting the passage of the educational clauses of Sir Wilfrid Laurier's autonomy bill.

The statement of the Toronto Mail and Empire to the effect that the clauses referred to by the Apostolic Delegate for approval was somewhat changed by Mr. Smith, who said that Sir Wilfrid is acting "manifestly under the pressure of his sacerdotal supporters, to impose permanently on the North-West the principle of Separate schools, violating thereby the vital principles of separation of the Church from the State, and of the equality of all religions before the law."

In another article in this issue entitled "The Question of Coercion," we show sufficiently that the Autonomy Bill does not violate the equality of religions before the law. We have no objection that Protestants shall have their Separate schools, if they want them. But they have told us over and over again, or at least some sects of them have declared, that they do not want them—that in fact what they want is "unification of all the population of the Dominion."

We have no objection that they should unify themselves, if they can do it; but as the Catholic Church of Canada is in itself perfectly unified, we are satisfied to let the sects work out their own unification as they can. We are not prepared, however, to adopt their plans of unification, in regard to Catholics, as we prefer to keep the faith which has been handed down through the ages from the date when the Divine Founder of Christianity built His Church upon a rock against which the gates of hell shall not prevail.

We wish for equal rights for all; but as Protestants are permitted under the law to have schools conducted according to their own religious views—that is to say without any religious teaching at all, we Catholics wish to have the right to establish schools, to be supported by our own money, and in which religion shall be taught. This is the true reading of equal rights: each religion to have schools which accord with its conscientious convictions, and no discrimination to be made between schools on account of their religious or non-religious character: no penalties to be imposed on the schools in which there is religious teaching, and no premium to be given for godless education. To make such discrimination would be to encourage Atheism at the expense of Christianity.

Mr. Smith asserts that a Separate School system implies the union of Church and State. This is a gross misrepresentation of the case. We have a Separate School system in Ontario; but where is the union of Church and State?

Our teachers learn their profession in the same High Schools, Collegiate Institutes, Model and Normal Schools, as the Public school teachers. It is true a percentage of our teachers have hitherto taught upon a qualification attested by the religious orders to which they belong. But it must be remembered that even these teachers were qualified by a rigid course of study in their respective communities, and their average experience in actual teaching is at least three or four times the average experience of Public

school teachers. But the religious community qualification no longer exists by a recent judicial decision; and the autonomy bill does not provide for the community qualification at all, so that no exception can be taken to it on this ground.

The teaching of religion is not the basis of the apportionment of the Government grant to Separate schools, but these schools receive their apportionment of Public moneys on the same ground as the public schools, viz., that they teach the same subjects which are taught in the Public schools, and they are visited by the Government Inspectors, who judge their efficiency by the same standard whereby the Public schools are judged.

The union of Church and State in connection with the Separate schools is but a figment of Mr. Goldwin Smith's brain; and we do not hesitate to say, what has already been asserted more than once by the Minister of Education, that the Catholic schools of Ontario are fully up to the standard of the Public schools.

Mr. Smith said, as we have already stated, that Sir Wilfrid Laurier acted under pressure of his sacerdotal supporters. And, pray, who are they who are opposing the educational clauses of the bill? The Orange Lodges, in the first place, well known to be inveterate persecutors; and beyond these nearly all who have taken up the matter are ministers of the various Protestant sects, while the Catholic priests have been comparatively quiet, relying on the justice of their cause. The ministerial opponents of the measure rely upon the amount of noise they can make. They include the Bishops of the Anglican Province of Rupert's Land, Baptist Clerical assemblies and Presbyteries composed chiefly of Presbyterian ministers. Here surely are ecclesiastical bills enough, though we admit that Mr. Smith's term "sacerdotal" is not applicable to them—but that is because they could not even by stealth obtain the Christian priesthood, to which the term "sacerdotal" applies almost exclusively in this country at all events.

We have said that the meeting in question was a lugubrious one—and it might be; for the principal speakers of the occasion admitted that their efforts to stop the cataract had utterly failed!

The Rev. Dr. Chown told the meeting, according to the Globe's report, that "he was in Regina when the news of the details of the autonomy bills arrived. Every detail of these bills was talked about except the school clauses, and the same was the case in other parts of the West."

It appears from this that it is the East, that is to say Ontario—nay, but a small part of Ontario—that is buying itself on behalf of the West, which is taking itself very coolly on the matter!

We do not doubt Rev. Mr. Chown's statement; for it appears that the Western Members of Parliament express themselves as quite satisfied with the bill in its present form. They would not do this if their constituents were not satisfied with it.

The information given by Rev. Mr. Chown was well calculated to create consternation in the camp. But the worst bombshell was thrown into its midst by the noisiest of all the opponents of the educational clauses, Mr. J. S. Willison, editor and proprietor of the Toronto News.

"My heart is as an anvil unto sorrow,
Which beats upon it like a Cyclops hammer
And with the noise turns up my giddy brain,
And makes me frantic!"

Mr. Willison said:
"The work of protests and petitions will be useless, for the bills will go through the House of Commons with a majority of from 80 to 90. It will be useless to petition the Governor General or approach the Government. What has to be done is to remember the supporters of the bills at the next election. Many, no doubt, will forget. I will not forget."

Mr. Willison has come to the consciousness that the secret meetings of Grand Sovereigns and Grand other things decorated with purple and scarlet, who indulge in bigotry every July 12th no longer rule our Dominion.

"No agitation," said Mr. Willison, "will prevent the autonomy bill from passing. The Liberals in caucus have decided to support it, and in all my experience I have never known a party to go back on its caucus agreement. The Liberals, with one exception will support the bill. They have a majority of 65. There will be also a number of Conservatives who will vote with the Government. What I would suggest is the issuing to the press of a statement against the school clauses: then organize, as has frequently been done in Britain, a great party to oppose those who vote for the bill. I do not believe in a third party, but we should flood the country with literature on the subject, hold meetings in every place where a by-election may be necessary, and at the general election pledge candidates to vote against the Government which carried the bills. Then, should Mr. Haultain fail to appeal to the Courts, for a decision on the constitutional issue, the committee could do so. Any party, or any newspaper could easily raise funds enough

to test the constitutional issue in the courts."

Mr. Willison was asked by the Rev. W. Frizel whether he would favor the sending of a deputation to Ottawa to oppose the autonomy bills at whatever stages opposition might be found to be most effective. The answer of Mr. Willison was that he believed it would not be of the slightest use. These views stated so unreservedly threw a wet blanket over the deliberations of the Committee, and in their desperation it was finally determined that the Executive Committee should make arrangements for a petition, post card, and public meeting campaign against the hated educational clauses. This was the course proposed by Mr. W. G. Fee, which was carried in preference to the proposition of Dr. Bruce who moved that a memorial be drawn up in triplicate for presentation to the Governor General, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, and Mr. R. L. Borden praying that the bill be delayed till an opportunity be given to the people to express their opinions on the matter.

It is well known that the opposition to the bill is engineered from Toronto chiefly, but it is a matter of surprise that one of the speakers, Mr. H. C. Hocken, virtually admitted this to be the case. He said: "There is a feeling abroad that Toronto is the only place taking an active interest in the opposition to the bills."

Mr. Caldecott evidently understood this to be a declaration that the Orange lodges are pulling the wires which move the puppets, and he interposed the remark that he does not wish to be ruled either by the Church or the Orange order.

This brought Mr. Hocken to his feet again with the declaration that "the Orange Order stands for civil and religious liberty, while Rome stands for tyranny."

The Rev. Dr. Chambers also here added his testimony that "the Orangemen are staunch, true and loyal."

Of course, the Orangemen were staunch, true and loyal, when they were plotting in 1836 to set aside Queen Victoria from the throne: when under their Grand Master's leadership, the publicly insulted Governor-General Lord Elgin by hoisting a pirate's flag on Brockville wharf when his Excellency intended to land at that town, and when they insulted King Edward VII. then (in 1860) Prince of Wales, at Kingston, Belleville, Peterborough, Oshawa, and Toronto. They were the maintainers of civil and religious liberty when they poured into Toronto by thousands, and established a military camp on the streets about forty-nine years ago, with the avowed object of preventing the Catholic school children from marching from their schools to the church. We should act a "brave" to the epithets bestowed upon that Order by Messrs. Hocken and Chambers.

The intensity of the shame felt by the Citizens' Committee on the discovery that they cannot rule the Dominion of Canada is made manifest by the fact that one of the Committee expressed a wish that the newspapers should not publish Mr. Willison's remarks; but this did not prevent their publication.

REVIVALS IN WALES AND ENGLAND.

A movement called a revival of religion has been going on for some time in Wales under the auspices of a young man named Evan Roberts, who has aroused a religious enthusiasm throughout South Wales, and which has spread also to North Wales where it is moving with irresistible force from the smaller towns and villages towards the great centres of population where the peasantry have been apathetic and even atheistic, according to an article which recently appeared in the New York Sun.

Evan Roberts, the soul of their movement, is the son of humble parents, his father having been employed at the pumps underground in the coal galleries that stretch out under the sea. When the young Evan was twelve years of age he was taken from school to help his father in working at the pumps. He was afterwards apprenticed to a blacksmith, and his master said he would become expert at the trade were it not for his constant desire to preach. The young lad and his brothers and sisters were seven in number, and all aided in buying a release from his apprenticeship, after which he began to preach to a small company at the village of Loughor in Glamorgan, South Wales, and on its being ascertained that he had a natural ability for religious speaking, and that he exerted a magnetic influence over those who heard him, he devoted himself entirely to preaching without being ordained a minister of any sect. One of his sisters assists him in his preaching which does not touch upon any special dogmas of religion, but consists solely of exhortations to follow the example of Christ. It is stated that up to the present time

about 30,000 followers attend his and his sister's sermons.

It is to be remarked that the Anglican Bishop of St. David's has expressed approval of his efforts, saying there should be general thankfulness that there is, owing to Evan's preaching, a revival of the religious fervor of former days which had almost died out among the coal workers of the principality of Wales. This testimony is all the more striking as the Church of England was decidedly opposed to the revival methods of preaching on the highways and by-ways, practiced by the Wesleys and Whitfield over a century ago.

We are informed that Evan Roberts does not preach any denominationalism, which is as much as to say that his followers are not taught any special religious dogmas. The preaching is, therefore, composed chiefly of sensational appeals of a general kind to believe and trust in Christ.

Bishop Owen of St. David's, in a pastoral letter to his clergy, written with special reference to this revival, gives a cordial encouragement to the preaching of Mr. Roberts, and expresses thankfulness that the preaching of the latter has borne so much good fruit.

Of course, anything which causes the people to lay aside their religious apathy will be beneficial to some extent, but the religion of Christ is a religion with dogmas or truths to be believed, and in sending out His Apostles Christ told them to teach all nations to observe what He had commanded them, and, therefore, we cannot expect that a revival which does give prominence to the doctrines not taught by Christ concerning God the Father, the Incarnation, the Sacraments which Christ instituted, etc., can have any permanent effect. Sensational preaching may for a time excite a species of emotional religious fervor, but to be lasting, it must be based upon the truths of Christianity, and therefore upon the dogmas of revelation. This seems to be entirely overlooked by Mr. Roberts, who contents himself with stirring appeals to cling to Christ, without insisting upon the external means of grace which Christ instituted, the sacraments and the perpetual sacrifice, all of which belong to the very essence of Christianity. Without these there is no solid basis for Christian faith and practice.

It was the intention of Evan Roberts to go to London to start a revival there similar to that in which he found so much success in Wales, but, it has been said that he abandoned his intention of so doing, for the reason that he has been forestalled by a company of revivalists from Colorado who have brought revival methods into contempt and ridicule by their buffoonery, and have thus destroyed whatever hopes of success Mr. Roberts expected from his own methods.

The Colorado prophets and preachers call themselves "the American Pentecostal Dancers," from the fact that dancing in a most ridiculous manner is a part of their programme. In the midst of a hymn, sung at a recent Saturday night meeting at Camberwell Baths, the whole party of Colorado revivalists danced violently around the platform, swinging each other about after the manner of a cake walk, or a vaudeville show. On this occasion one of the girls slipped off the platform to the sidewalk floor, in her excitement, but she would not give up her dance. Not having a partner, she seized a chair and whirled it around as if it were a partner. She shrieked out "an Australian bush cry," Co ee, which was repeated throughout the room on all sides.

The rowdies, who regularly attended these meetings for the fun of the thing then began to ring a bell, which was passed around the room from hand to hand and made to tinkle mysteriously, first in one place, then in another, till all was confusion.

One of the dancers, Mrs. Kent-White, objected to the audience clapping their hands; but another of the company, the Rev. Mr. Harvey, declared that the clapping of hands is most pleasing to God, and that the Bible is full of it, as well as of dancing, so he encouraged all to join in these acts with all their might. As to the dancing, he said, they might as well practice it here, for if they ever get to the Pearly Gates, they would find plenty of it.

The Morning Leader of London states that the catcalls and the red-hot holiness exclamations of the whole company of revivalists was the most shocking parody on religion which is possible to picture to oneself.

Mrs. Kent-White gave way to a frightful paroxysm of rage on account of the catcalls and howlings and declared that she would bring the offenders before the magistrates on a charge of interrupting divine service. Their meetings, she said, had been "sometimes similarly interrupted in the United States, but the ignorant howlers had been heavily fined, and she thought they would be similarly dealt with in Eng-

land, if there is any country. The described as being Dowie's outpouring, our readers have we have sometimes his invective in members of the Mrs. Kent-White's their applause and injah." The spe pleased with these encouraged the this way, their ap proval of what she

Mr. Kent-White the prophets w to her anger, th abuse the offenders are sowing the win to reap the whil rarely punished We have seen men before and they from heaven. I v men whom the sn snake that bites be the man up her God than the man terrapts divine wo "At Denver C struck down our scribed on it, "God." In five we down to death, and when he struck h Almighty struck h

These revivalists ever they appear people become dis sard exhibitions, tional they may b fruitful in produc timent, and these on a distrust of M has discovered th for his preaching decided not to att We would not sfully of any exite people to l ly, and we would done on this sub, we are convinced which temporary is aimed at, are permanent good, people to neglect, tion which God h ministered by H tawful ministry Apostles; for C St. Paul says: "God . . . ministry of recon He hath placed in cillation. We a dors for Christ, ing by us." (2 C

Let a man se ministers of Chri of the mysteries is required amon man be found h (2-2.) "Neither dot honor to himse, by God as Aaron Whosoever as office w'thout be to by the propo ity, and ordaine down in Holy Sc tions of the Chu position of the h are guilty of the and his compan were destroyed number of two assumed the sa they had no cla

QUICK WORK

Until recentl have held the re the granting of for and granted last week, New palm in this dis

On the 16th mised couple sons, who were concerned, app tions severing these cases ther were to be de parent.

The fallacy of the Protestant which the party innocent party as in the fifty-f offered, with a it evident that tween the two of the fifty-five

As a matter was taken for stances where and thus in eve party would be ant Episcopal cent party" w lege of marry fendant or "c luded from th ever, would g these respond and ministers question, ever ministers shou

Owing to a seventeen cas of, but in all reserved, whic