

The Catholic Record.

Published weekly at 424 and 426 Richmond Street, London, Ontario.

Price of subscription—\$1.00 per annum.

REV. GEORGE B. NORRIS, Editor.

REV. WILLIAM FLANNERY, Editor.

REV. THOMAS COFFEY, Editor.

REV. THOMAS COFFEY, Editor.

REV. THOMAS COFFEY, Editor.

REV. THOMAS COFFEY, Editor.

REV. THOMAS COFFEY, Editor.

REV. THOMAS COFFEY, Editor.

REV. THOMAS COFFEY, Editor.

REV. THOMAS COFFEY, Editor.

REV. THOMAS COFFEY, Editor.

REV. THOMAS COFFEY, Editor.

REV. THOMAS COFFEY, Editor.

REV. THOMAS COFFEY, Editor.

REV. THOMAS COFFEY, Editor.

REV. THOMAS COFFEY, Editor.

REV. THOMAS COFFEY, Editor.

REV. THOMAS COFFEY, Editor.

REV. THOMAS COFFEY, Editor.

REV. THOMAS COFFEY, Editor.

REV. THOMAS COFFEY, Editor.

REV. THOMAS COFFEY, Editor.

REV. THOMAS COFFEY, Editor.

REV. THOMAS COFFEY, Editor.

REV. THOMAS COFFEY, Editor.

REV. THOMAS COFFEY, Editor.

REV. THOMAS COFFEY, Editor.

REV. THOMAS COFFEY, Editor.

REV. THOMAS COFFEY, Editor.

REV. THOMAS COFFEY, Editor.

REV. THOMAS COFFEY, Editor.

REV. THOMAS COFFEY, Editor.

REV. THOMAS COFFEY, Editor.

REV. THOMAS COFFEY, Editor.

REV. THOMAS COFFEY, Editor.

REV. THOMAS COFFEY, Editor.

REV. THOMAS COFFEY, Editor.

REV. THOMAS COFFEY, Editor.

REV. THOMAS COFFEY, Editor.

REV. THOMAS COFFEY, Editor.

REV. THOMAS COFFEY, Editor.

REV. THOMAS COFFEY, Editor.

REV. THOMAS COFFEY, Editor.

REV. THOMAS COFFEY, Editor.

REV. THOMAS COFFEY, Editor.

REV. THOMAS COFFEY, Editor.

REV. THOMAS COFFEY, Editor.

REV. THOMAS COFFEY, Editor.

REV. THOMAS COFFEY, Editor.

REV. THOMAS COFFEY, Editor.

REV. THOMAS COFFEY, Editor.

REV. THOMAS COFFEY, Editor.

REV. THOMAS COFFEY, Editor.

REV. THOMAS COFFEY, Editor.

REV. THOMAS COFFEY, Editor.

REV. THOMAS COFFEY, Editor.

REV. THOMAS COFFEY, Editor.

REV. THOMAS COFFEY, Editor.

REV. THOMAS COFFEY, Editor.

REV. THOMAS COFFEY, Editor.

REV. THOMAS COFFEY, Editor.

REV. THOMAS COFFEY, Editor.

REV. THOMAS COFFEY, Editor.

REV. THOMAS COFFEY, Editor.

REV. THOMAS COFFEY, Editor.

REV. THOMAS COFFEY, Editor.

REV. THOMAS COFFEY, Editor.

REV. THOMAS COFFEY, Editor.

REV. THOMAS COFFEY, Editor.

REV. THOMAS COFFEY, Editor.

REV. THOMAS COFFEY, Editor.

REV. THOMAS COFFEY, Editor.

REV. THOMAS COFFEY, Editor.

REV. THOMAS COFFEY, Editor.

REV. THOMAS COFFEY, Editor.

REV. THOMAS COFFEY, Editor.

REV. THOMAS COFFEY, Editor.

REV. THOMAS COFFEY, Editor.

REV. THOMAS COFFEY, Editor.

REV. THOMAS COFFEY, Editor.

REV. THOMAS COFFEY, Editor.

REV. THOMAS COFFEY, Editor.

REV. THOMAS COFFEY, Editor.

REV. THOMAS COFFEY, Editor.

REV. THOMAS COFFEY, Editor.

REV. THOMAS COFFEY, Editor.

REV. THOMAS COFFEY, Editor.

proving himself to be every time he opens his mouth.

Entering into details of the poverty witnessed in some parts of Ireland, and brought on, of course, by the priests, Mr. Weaver says: "The walls of the huts they live in are built of mud, and the roofs are thatched—generally but one room 12x12—and in it the whole family live, including fowls and pigs. Beds are suspended from the roof"—like Mohammed's coffin, we know.

These are some of the details of poverty prevailing in the south and west parts of Ireland. They are grossly exaggerated, however, if not burlesqued, by this canting hypocrite from Grimsby. Neither can the existence of such be attributed to the priests, who often have to part with their libraries to keep their flocks from starving, but to Protestant England, which handed over to Oliver Cromwell's followers all the best and most fertile lands in the country and now permits them to grind the lives out of the tillers of the soil.

Evangelist Weaver, however, confines his description to mud walls, ragged clothes and defective chimneys, and in these the Free Press finds a pendant for "Darkest England," for it heads Weaver's lucubrations with the title "In Darkest Ireland."

There is every difference, however. In Ireland there is poverty—in England crime; in Ireland mud walls—in England dens of infamy worse than those mentioned in Dante's description of hell; in Ireland there is suffering from cold and hunger—in England a population sodden with drink. So says Gen. Booth in his book, "Darkest England," and he adds: "Steeped in vice and eaten up with every social and physical misdeed. These are the dens of darkest England, amidst whom my life has been spent and to whose rescue I would summon all that is best in the manhood and womanhood of our land."

In the same book we find written the following: "And what a slough it is," he says, "no man can gauge who has not waded thereof, as some of us have done, up to the very neck for long years. Talk about Dante's Hell, and all the horrors and cruelties of the torture chamber of the lost! The man who walks with open eyes and with bleeding heart through the shambles of our civilization needs no such fantastic images of the past to teach him horror. Often and often, when I have seen the young and the poor and the helpless go down before my eyes into the morass trampled under foot by beasts of prey in human shape that haunt these regions, it seemed as if God were no longer in His world, but that in His stead reigned a fiend, merciless as hell, ruthless as the grave. Hard it is, no doubt, to read in Stanley's pages of the slave-traders coldly arranging for the surprise of a village, the capture of the inhabitants, the massacre of those who resist and the violation of all the women; but the stony streets of London, if they could but speak, would tell of tragedies as awful, of ruin as complete, of ravishment as horrible, as if we were in Central Africa, only the ghastly devastation is covered, corpse-like, with the ghastly artificialities and hypocrisies of modern civilization."

All these horrors General Booth is taking upon himself to remove; and let us hope that he will succeed. Mr. Weaver, the Evangelist, however, left the poor people of Ireland, his native land, to shift for themselves. He came out here to settle amidst the vineyards and peach groves of Grimsby. All the sympathy his selfish nature prompts him to is to vilify his own countrymen—to hold them up to ridicule—to lie about them. All honor to Booth! We know what Scripture says will be the portion of the hypocrite and the liar.

THE MANITOBA SCHOOL LAW.

Judge Killam, of Manitoba, has given his decision in the suit which was brought before him to dispute the constitutionality of the tyrannical school law which was passed at the last session of the Legislature of that Province. The decision is adverse to the Catholic claim that the rights which Catholics exercised when Manitoba was made a Province of the Dominion should continue to be recognized as part of the school system of the Province, and if Judge Killam's decision prove to be the law, the Catholics will be taxed for the support of the Public schools, notwithstanding the fact that they have schools of their own to which they send their children.

The case has been appealed, however, to the whole bench of judges, and if Judge Killam's decision be sustained, it will be brought before the Privy Council in England.

The Catholic claim is that when Manitoba was constituted a Province, Catholic schools existed, and were aided by a State subsidy. In fact, the school system at the time was a denominational one. Catholics and Protestants alike had their denominational schools, which were supported in part by Provincial subsidies. The Confederation Act guarantees to Catholics or Protestants when in the minority in any Province, the safety of such rights to Separate or dissentient schools as they may have had at the time when they entered into the Confederation. It was on this ground that the Catholics of Win-

nipeg objected to being compelled to pay a tax for the Public schools, inasmuch as they support and send their children to Catholic schools, just as they did before Manitoba became a Province.

Judge Killam has decided that the intention in framing the Act which protects minority rights was merely to preserve intact those rights which the minority possessed under Legislative enactment; and, as there was no law under which the Catholics of Manitoba enjoyed Separate schools, he maintains that they are subject to school legislation abolishing the privileges they have hitherto enjoyed.

It is quite possible that the higher courts, to which the question is to be submitted, may sustain Judge Killam's decision; but the law is none the less odious and oppressive on this account, and it was enacted with the design of inflicting gross injustice upon Catholics.

The right of parents, or, to speak more correctly, their duty, to provide a thoroughly religious education for their children cannot be disputed. Independently of any human law which imposes upon parents the obligation of training their children in the way they should go, the natural and divine laws agree that parents are under this obligation. Parents are bound to love their children and to preserve them as far as possible from exposure to the contagion of vice. They are bound to take care that they shall be properly instructed in those secular branches which best their condition in life; but their duties do not end here. They are also bound to instill into them in their tender years the principles of religion and good morals which will be their safeguard during life.

The anti-Catholic press of Ontario, and especially the Mail, are constantly dining into our ears the duty of the State to provide for the education of children, and we do not deny that it is advisable that the State should assist parents in the discharge of their duties. But we do deny the inference which many recent issues of the Mail would have us draw, that the State has the right to take the education of the child out of the hands of its parents entirely, and to decide the whole character of the education which shall be imparted. The State cannot relieve parents of their natural obligations towards their children. The divine law which is given to children is the expression of the law which nature itself dictates:

"My son, hear the instruction of thy father, and forsake not the law of thy mother: that grace may be added to thy head and a chain of gold to thy neck." (Prov. i, 8.)

As the child is bound to receive instruction from his parents, the parents are equally bound to impart it.

"And you, fathers, provoke not your children to anger; but bring them up in the discipline and correction of the Lord." (Eph. vi, 4.)

We maintain, therefore, that the State has done its whole duty when it enables parents to educate their children in accordance with their conscientious convictions; and, further, we acknowledge that for the good of the community the State does well to insist that parents shall fulfil their obligations, and to facilitate their fulfilment by extending appropriate aid to education. But it is an undue interference with parental rights to throw any obstacle in the way of those parents who desire to educate their children thoroughly—to educate them religiously and morally as well as in secular matters. This is what the Manitoba Legislature has done.

The Government of a country is, of course, backed up by the physical force which is at its command, but it is none the less a tyranny to interfere with the conscientious convictions of the people, and the Catholics of Manitoba are quite in the right to resist to the last the iniquitous legislation which was adopted at the instigation of Mr. Dalton McCarthy while fanatical agitators were exciting an anti-Catholic spirit throughout the Dominion.

Whatever may be the result of the suit which is now pending in the courts, we hope that the Dominion Government will do justice to the Catholic minority. It was the proud boast of the fathers of Confederation that the provision which was inserted in the British North America Act, which gives to the Dominion Government the right to veto the Acts of the Provincial Legislatures, was intended as a protection of the minority in each Province against the possible hostile legislation of the majority. It was foreseen and foretold that such hostile legislation might arise out of religious differences, and the provision was avowedly introduced chiefly for the protection of the minorities in each Province. If there is any case possible in which the power of the veto ought to be exercised that case arises in the anti-Catholic school law which has been placed on the statute books of Manitoba.

It is well understood that the conscientious convictions of Catholics on the subject of education are firm and unalterable. The Catholics of Manitoba do not ask that Protestants shall be taxed for the support of Catholic schools; and so there will be no injury done to any one by preserving to Catholics the liberty they have hitherto

enjoyed, but a great wrong will be inflicted if, while Catholics sustain their own schools, they are to be obliged also to educate the children of Protestants who object to helping Catholics. Catholics do not need, nor do they want such help; but it is a reasonable demand that they shall be allowed to spend their own money in supporting schools which they approve of. It is in order that these just demands may be conceded that we ask the Dominion Government now to exercise the veto power.

The reasons we have given are quite sufficient to justify such a course. But there are other powerful reasons especially applicable to Manitoba why it should be exercised. It will be remembered that when the North-West resisted the assumption of Governmental powers by Governor McDougall, who was sent by the Dominion Government to fill that position, Archbishop Tache, who was then in Rome, was sent for by the Dominion Government to use his influence for the preservation of peace. His Grace succeeded in arranging a peaceful settlement of the trouble, and it is certain that the permanency of the Catholic and Protestant school system was one of the conditions on which a settlement was agreed upon. Protestants were then in a minority; but both Catholics and Protestants were agreed upon the importance of preserving freedom of education in the matter of religion. Now that Protestants are in a majority in the Province, it is with a very bad grace that they endeavor to break the compact, which was then made. It is certainly the duty of the Dominion Government, which was a party to the compact, to see that it be carried out, as it certainly would have interfered before now if it had happened that Catholics had maintained their original predominance in that Province, and had endeavored to break their compact by abolishing Protestant denominational schools.

It has been stated, and we shall probably see it stated again, that we are inconsistent in demanding that the veto power be exercised now, whereas we were opposed to its exercise when the Jesuit Estates Bill was under consideration. There is no inconsistency whatever in our position on the two questions. The question now regards the infliction of an injustice upon the Catholic minority in a Province; whereas the Jesuit Estates Act inflicted no injustice on the Protestant minority. On the contrary, a sufficient sum was apportioned for Protestant education to make the law equitable if it had merely provided for a Government grant for educational purposes, and that sum has been accepted by the representatives of the Protestant minority as sufficient to meet their equitable claims. It is to be remarked also that there is another essential difference between the two cases. The sum paid to the Quebec Bishops and Jesuits was intended for the cancellation of a just claim on property of which they had been unjustly deprived. The Protestants had no such claim; so that if any had the right to complain of the Jesuit Estates Act, it was the Catholic majority, and not the Protestant minority. We deny, therefore, that there is any parity whatsoever between the two cases. The demand for the veto of the Jesuit Estates Act was dictated purely by the spirit of Orange and Ministerial bigotry, and therefore we opposed it as it would be a deliberate insult to over 42 per cent. of the population of the Dominion.

DISGRACEFUL PROCEEDINGS IN A COLLEGE.

Several Protestant colleges and universities have of late been gaining for themselves a notoriety for the disgraceful proceedings of their students. It is but a short time since a Michigan institution was in open armed rebellion. In Canada too there have been disgraceful scenes enacted under the name of hazing, but Queen's College of Oxford has recently surpassed in combined profanity and cruelty almost anything we could conceive. Fifteen or sixteen young men dressed themselves in masquerading costumes, one representing a Bishop with mitre and crozier and vestments pertaining to the episcopal order, while others were attired as nuns and acolytes with censers, the remainder wearing surplices. In this guise they marched in procession each carrying a cup filled with whiskey, of which they took from time to time copious draughts. They bore also a basket of biscuits.

In this manner they went to the bedrooms of the Freshmen, battering open the doors and dragging them from their beds to force them in their scanty night dress to take part in their orgies. A mock High Mass was then celebrated, and the nude Freshmen were forced with blows of switches and sticks to go through the ceremonies, and to drink quantities of the whiskey and to eat the biscuits.

One student was afterwards dragged from bed, and his night shirt being torn from him into shreds, he was tied to a tree and left there stark naked until morning.

The perpetrators of these outrages were

known and on complaint of the ill-treated Freshmen they were duly punished by the faculty, though the majority of the students, namely, seventy out of one hundred and five, passed a vote of censure on those who laid the complaint.

The minority are now in nightly fear of violence, and are compelled to maintain an armed watch, pistols, swords, and bludgeons being freely displayed and weapons of defence.

It is impossible to conceive that occurrences like these should take place in an institution where a religious training is given to the students, and it is probable that this is the very reason that such things do not occur in the numerous Catholic educational institutions of America and England.

The enemies of Catholic education might learn from the frequency of such occurrences as we have described that a religious training is not so useless a thing as they imagine it to be.

THE TORONTO MAIL ON THE IRISH PROBLEM.

The Mail of the 5th inst. takes occasion from the message sent by the Irish delegates who are now in America to the Nationalist Parliamentary party at London, to represent the Irish Nationalists as imbued with an intense hatred towards the British people. Among the statements made in that document, which is signed by all the Irish delegates except Mr. Harrington, blame is thrown upon Mr. Parnell for using "deplorable expressions of ill-will towards the British people." Among the signatures are found the names of Messrs. William O'Brien and John Dillon, and the Mail asserts that both these gentlemen have frequently expressed most violent hatred of England.

The desire of the Mail is evidently to create ill-feeling against the Irish delegates, and especially against Messrs. O'Brien and Dillon, who at present lie under a sentence of six months' imprisonment to which they will be subjected immediately on their return home, if they really do return while the present Government remains in power.

And for what has this sentence been passed upon them? Because they have signed the people in the families threatened districts of Ireland to give their hard-earned earnings in the first place to avert famine and starvation from themselves and their families, and to pay no rents until the grim skeleton of famine be driven off. In the best of times, it is acknowledged that self-preservation is nature's first law. The first claim of the tenants to furnish themselves and their families with the necessities of life is therefore legitimate. It would not be very wonderful, then, that the people of Ireland should return hatred to those who would, under protection of bayonet, battering-rams and batons, snatch from them the means of sustenance, for the purpose of enabling the landlords to collect rents largely in excess of the value of holdings, especially at a moment when that money is needed to save the lives of the tenantry.

However, it is not true that either Mr. O'Brien or Mr. Dillon incited hatred of the British people, as the Mail asserts. The Mail states that Mr. O'Brien's blame of Mr. Parnell for using expressions of ill-will against the British people is "the pot calling the kettle black;" and it attempts to prove this by stating that United Ireland, of which journal Mr. O'Brien has been editor for nine years, abounds in worse expressions than those which the Home Rule envoys now condemn. United Ireland did indeed expose acts of the tyranny which have been perpetrated from day to day upon the Irish people, and called upon the latter to unite in resisting the tyranny and punishing the oppressors, but this was to be done by lawful means, namely by voting against them at the polls, and by uniting in self-defence. It incited hatred for the oppression, and the punishment by lawful means of those who perpetrated it. It urged the Irish people to do what every voter is urged by political leaders to do, to assert their rights as men in order to secure self-government, the only remedy for the evils under which Ireland is groaning. In doing this it is necessary to sweep out of political existence those who support Government by oppression and coercion, but United Ireland did not incite hatred for the people of England as such. On the contrary, there have been frequently most conciliatory articles in that journal, and expressions of most hearty good-will toward the English and Scotch people.

It is thoroughly well recognized in the columns of United Ireland that there is in the British public an innate love of fair play which would lead them to do justice to Ireland if they were only made conscious of the nature of her just demands, and of the sufferings to which her people are subjected. But it is of no use to deny that until the last three or four years the British people have been apathetic as regards Ireland's demands. It has been the custom of the people of England to consider Irish politicians as simply bothersome obstructionists, who by asking Parliament to give relief by removing Irish grievances,

only put an obstacle in the way of legislation useful to England. Apathy becomes culpable when it prevents a ruling race from enquiring into the wrongs which are endured by those who are suffering from misgovernment, and in this respect the people of Great Britain were blameable for the treatment of Ireland. This will account for such strong expressions as United Ireland and other Irish Nationalist journals used when denouncing alien government—and all who sustain it for Ireland.

It will be remembered that the Mail has always been ready to misrepresent Ireland, and this late charge against the prominent leaders of the Nationalist movement is quite a piece with former statements of that journal in regard to the people of Ireland. When Mr. Wilfred Blunt was in prison for attending a political meeting in Ireland the Mail pretended that because Mr. Blunt was an Englishman, the Irish Nationalists had no sympathy for him, but were secretly delighted because he was subjected to such ill-treatment. But the statement was falsified by the enthusiastic receptions with which that gentleman was everywhere honored by the people, by the resolutions of sympathy which were everywhere passed by branches of the League, and by the unanimous condemnation of the Government by the Nationalist press for dealing with him so harshly. The Mail's assertions now have no more truth in them than had its statements regarding Mr. Blunt. The people of Ireland have no oppression, and the real oppressors, no doubt, come in for a share of the detestation, but the people of England are not hated as such. Irishmen, on the contrary, regard those Englishmen with affection and respect who have shown some sympathy with the suffering population.

The Mail also states that Mr. O'Brien and the Nationalists generally want confiscation of the landlords' estates in Ireland. There is no truth in this. If the titles of the landlords were closely looked into, many of them would be found to have arisen out of confiscation, and they might very justly be disputed on this ground, but the Irish tenantry do not seek that so radical a measure of relief be afforded them. They ask only that they should have their holdings at a fair rent instead of the rack rents they have been forced to pay; rents which cannot be paid from cultivation of the soil. They ask that they shall not be charged rent for improvements which they themselves have made, and that the land laws be made in the interests of the people of the country instead of for the perpetuation of an absentee landlord aristocracy. These demands are based upon the principle of eternal justice, and they must be granted before the Irish people can be expected to waste much love upon their oppressors.

A PROTESTANT MOVEMENT FOR RELIGIOUS EDUCATION.

In response to an invitation issued by the Presbyterian Synod, the ministers of twenty-three Protestant bodies met recently at the University of New York to take into consideration the necessity of introducing moral teaching into the Public schools. The Baptists refused to cooperate in the movement, but nearly all the other Protestant denominations of New York and New Jersey were represented. The Secretary of the Committee of Arrangements stated that the Baptists had mistaken the purpose of the Conference, but though the Baptist Pastors' Conference had refused to send delegates, many Baptist clergymen were present as individuals, and they were invited to take part in the deliberations.

One of the speakers, Professor Crooks, of the Drew Theological Seminary, spoke strongly in favor of making concessions to the Catholics in order that some practical conclusion might be reached whereby morality would be taught, and also such doctrines as are believed equally by Catholics and Protestants.

The general feeling of those present was in favor of teaching Christianity in the schools, without countenancing a union of Church and State, and resolutions to this effect were adopted. A committee was also appointed to carry on the agitation, and to consider the advisability of preparing a text-book of religious instruction which might be acceptable to all denominations, so that it could be used in the schools.

Catholics cannot be satisfied with any such half measures as these gentlemen would wish to adopt. Catholic children must be taught the Catholic religion without the limitations which they would wish to impose; and the only way in which Catholics can be justly dealt with is for the State to assist the Catholic parochial schools equally with other schools, in proportion to the results attained in secular studies. It is a good sign of the times, however, when we find that a convention of Protestant ministers has recognized at last that the position taken by Catholics from the beginning in favor of religious education is the only safeguard against infidelity and immorality.