

The Catholic Record.

Published Weekly at 181 and 183 Richmond street, London, Ontario.

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

EDITORS:
REV. GEORGE R. NORTHGRAVES,
Author of "Miracles of Modern Infidels,"
THOMAS COFFEY.

Publisher and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY,
Messrs. LUKS, KING, JOHN NICHOL,
J. NEVEN and M. C. O'DONNELL 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 Arch-
bishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa, and St.
Boniface, and the Bishops of London, 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.

Advertisements must be paid in full before the paper
can be stopped.

London, Saturday, Aug. 13, 1892.

A NEW CRUSADE.

The decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council given on the 30th ultimo on the Manitoba School Acts, as we announced it last week, has already given occasion to considerable discussion in the columns of the Ontario and Quebec press; and it cannot be denied that the Catholics of both Provinces are both surprised and grieved on account of it. Yet there is no reason that we should consider the question in any other than a peaceful, moderate and just spirit.

The *Mail* is among the journals which triumph in the reversal of the decision of the Supreme Court of Canada. At this we are not surprised, for that journal has for years entertained the ambition of being the recognized organ of a no-Popery party in the Dominion.

There was a time when the *Mail* was an advocate for fair dealing, but its character was completely changed when it became a no-Popery organ; and the public well remember that at last the Conservative party of the Dominion at least was compelled to repudiate it openly, and since that time it has been bidding with very little concealment for recognition by any party which would accept it as its mouthpiece. It received no encouragement from any of the existing parties, and it then began to look for the establishment of a new party on the ruins of both the old ones, the shibboleth of which should be opposition to Catholics and to the Catholic Church in all things. It does not proclaim its purpose; for such an avowal would defeat itself. But that purpose is sufficiently proclaimed by its position taken on every question in which Catholics are particularly concerned.

Under these circumstances we are not surprised at the bitterness exhibited by that journal in an editorial article which appeared in its columns on the 2nd inst., under the title "Hands Off," and in a series of articles which is being published by it day after day.

In the article to which we have specially referred we are told that the decision of the Privy Council is final and that "the French denying the right of the Manitobans to legislate with freedom upon the school question" have made "their appeal to Caesar" and "have received their answer," and "they shall now abide by the result."

It adds: "It is idle to talk of a reversal, through the intervention of the Dominion Parliament, of the interpretation the highest court has set upon the charter of the Province as inscribed on the statute book. The English-speaking people are long suffering and tolerant. But our French Canadian friends may as well understand, at once, that good nature has its limit, and that in the case of British Canada the limit will be far exceeded when the attempt is made to subvert the constitution and to over-ride the will of a province for the sake of a race or Church. The tribunal of last resort has pronounced Manitoba free; and free that Province shall be if the English population has any voice in the government of this country."

Another article tells us that "It is infinitely better that the French-Canadians should be in anger owing to their inability to oppress and control Manitoba than that the Manitobans should have to complain or threaten because of an attempted restriction of their freedom by an outside Province, a foreign Church and a separate race."

This language can be interpreted only in one way. It is a threat of violence professedly against the French-Canadians, but really against the whole Catholic population of the Dominion, if any wish be manifested to protect their co-religionists of Manitoba in the enjoyment of that Catholic education which they did enjoy until the Manitoba School Act of 1890 was passed.

As a natural fruit of the *Mail's* violence, there are already published, especially in its own columns, many letters of similar purport; and Alder

man Bell, of Toronto, is threatening an uprising in Ontario (of Orangemen, of course,) unless Separate schools be abolished.

We are quite aware that there is, especially in Ontario, a certain class who take a delight in indulging in threats against the Catholics of the Dominion. Sometimes these threats are directed against all Catholics, and sometimes only against French-Canadians professedly. But we can readily see the ultimate object of these would-be persecutors. We cannot forget that not long ago the *Mail* was filled with letters and speeches by laymen and ministers alike denouncing Catholics, especially the Catholics of Quebec, and calling upon all English speaking Protestants to assist in putting an end to "Romish aggression," by force of arms if necessary. Mr. Dalton McCarthy's twelfth of July speech at St. Catharines, in which he threatened Catholics first with ballots, and next with bullets, was but one specimen out of the many of the means adopted to separate the people of the Dominion into two hostile camps hating one another. One writer threatened to inundate the Plains of Abraham with 200,000 armed "picnickers" from Ontario, the purpose being to intimidate the French-Canadians into suppressing their love of their race and religion, the Catholic religion being described as "the deadly foe" of "British constitutional liberty and enlightened human freedom," which "should be dealt with accordingly."

The occasion of all this vituperation and abuse was an Act of the Legislature of Quebec which certainly was not framed for the purpose of inflicting any injury on Protestants or Protestantism. It was as lawful for the Quebec Legislature to apportion the public funds of the Province for educational purposes as for that of Ontario to do the same, which, in fact, it does year after year, and it is acknowledged that the Quebec Legislature, while devoting \$400,000 to Catholic educational purposes, dealt fairly with Protestants by paying for Protestant education at the same time the full amount to which their population entitled them.

The Jesuit Estates Act, even if viewed as a solely educational appropriation, was a perfectly legitimate and fair measure, whether the appropriation were for past or future services in the cause of education, and that it was so regarded was evidenced by the fact that it was supported by the entire Protestant vote of the Legislature. It is seldom indeed that there is such a proof of the equity of a Legislative measure as the obtaining of the entire vote of those who might be supposed to have been injured by it. We say nothing here of the wisdom of settling forever a claim which amounted to more than five times the value of the sum by which it was settled.

The *Mail* was in the front of the anti-Catholic agitation excited in 1888 and 1889, so that no one will be surprised at a similar exhibition of bigotry in 1892. We have evidence that it will appear in the same character as before. Its efforts as an agitator will not prevent Catholics from seeking justice, but they will undoubtedly raise much ill feeling through all the Provinces of the Dominion. This is a result which all patriotic Canadians must deeply regret, for if there is anything which will break up the Dominion, this raising of racial and religious dissensions is the thing which above all others is likely to do it. The French-Canadians cannot change their race if they would, and they will not change their religion if they could. British Canadians are in precisely the same position in regard to their race and religion. If the Dominion is to last, therefore, there must be mutual toleration exercised by Canadians of all races and creeds. All should work for the common good of the country.

The *Mail* says "The English speaking people are long suffering and tolerant." Of course this means English speaking Protestants. Of their long suffering we have to say that their patience has not been tried by any injury which Catholics of any race have either inflicted or attempted to inflict upon them. It is notorious that the French-speaking population of Quebec have never treated them in any other way than with the greatest fairness. But we are told they are also tolerant. If this be true, would they not prove their tolerance better by showing that same generosity towards the Catholic minorities of the various Protestant Provinces which is extended to them in Quebec by the Catholic majority, rather than by join-

ing the *Mail* in a no-Popery crusade?

We here willingly admit that there are many Protestants in Ontario who are truly liberal; and to this fact it is due that hitherto the efforts of the *Mail* to impose a galling yoke on the Catholics of this Province have been unsuccessful. Yet we have good reason to doubt whether this would have been the case if the Catholics of the Province had been left entirely at the mercy of a majority of the Protestants. It must be remembered that Catholics are a factor in the election of a Legislature, and in the formation of a Government. It is known that a considerable Protestant vote is always ready to respond to any appeal against Catholics such as the *Mail* is now making. But there is no such readiness on the part of Catholics to raise an outcry against Protestants, even in Quebec. The Catholics have therefore proved themselves to be tolerant. We have a right to ask that Protestants shall also be tolerant towards the Catholics of Manitoba.

In another column we treat of the constitutional question at issue. We shall here only add that in view of the fact that the *Mail* has hitherto been loud in maintaining the right of Ontario to interfere with legislation in Quebec, it is somewhat amusing to find the same journal finishing its article "Hands Off" with the following sentence:

"French Canada must confine itself to French Canada and avoid interference with the affairs of the other Provinces."

Is any further proof requisite that the cry of the Equal Rights Party, "Equal Rights to all, Special Privileges to none," means, if the party has still any life in it, "All rights for Protestants, none for Catholics?"

It must further be borne in mind that the right to interfere with Quebec was claimed when the rights of Protestants were not only equitably, but generously, preserved, whereas liberty is claimed for Manitoba to take away entirely the rights of Catholics.

But it may be asked, how will the Catholics of Ontario and the Dominion bear themselves if a new no-Popery agitation be excited?

We answer that we are law-abiding citizens. We are not disposed to acts of violence, but we shall not be deterred by the bluster of any society or organization from using our rights as British subjects; and in the exercise of those rights we shall defend the rights of our brethren and co-religionists in every Province, not excepting Manitoba. The Catholic Church is in Canada to stay, and there is no organization in Canada powerful enough to deter us from asserting our rights in every way which freemen are accustomed to use.

A RITUALISTIC CASE.

A cable despatch announces that the case of Dr. King, the Anglican Bishop of Lincoln, Eng., which was brought up on appeal before the Archbishop of Canterbury for trial, has been dismissed on nearly all points. The charges which are thus disposed of regard certain so-called Ritualistic practices which were introduced by the Bishop into Lincoln Cathedral and another church during the Communion service. The Archbishop has had the case under consideration since 1888. The practices complained of were the mixing of water with wine during the Communion service, standing on the west side of the Communion table, the singing of the prayer "Agnus Dei," ("Lamb of God,") and the use of lighted candles. On the subject of the breaking of the bread, the decision was that Dr. King had misinterpreted the order of Communion and his use of the sign of the cross in giving the benediction was declared unjustifiable.

The charges were made by an organization known as the "Church Association," though nominally by certain aggrieved parishioners who complain of contravention of the statutes of the Church of England in regard to certain observances.

When this case was first brought before the Archbishop, Dr. King himself declared in an address to the students of the Chancellor's schools in Lincoln that the question at issue is "for the sacerdotal character of the Christian ministry." In fact the complainants aimed at driving out of the Church what they are pleased to call Ritualism, but it is conceded that by the result of the trial Ritualism has triumphed.

The Archbishop, in giving judgment, pleaded for greater toleration among those who belong to different parties in the Church, and exhorted them not to entertain exaggerated suspicion of practices not in themselves illegal. This appears to be the chief point on

which Evangelicals offend in Canada, as well as England. It is announced, however, that the prosecutors are dissatisfied with the decision, and that they will take the matter before the House of Lords.

It must be acknowledged that the use of symbolic ceremonies, expressive of the dogmas of religion, had not been used to any considerable extent in the Church at England until the Ritualistic movement became popular. At first the great body of Anglicans regarded such ceremonies as superstitious and likely to lead to Rome, and this notion produced much of the opposition to them. But the decision of the Archbishop of Canterbury ought now, at least, to convince them that they are not superstitious, since they are lawful, and very commonly practiced in their own Church. Catholics know that an appropriate Ritual contributes to a lively faith by placing religious dogmas more directly before the mind through the medium of the senses. The ceremonial of the Catholic Church is admirably adapted to this purpose; but the ceremonial of the Ritualists is altogether an empty form, since they are destitute of the reality which the Catholic ceremonies imply. They have no priesthood, and consequently none of the sacraments which depend upon the sacerdotal character for their validity.

It is a curious fact, which illustrates the completely human and civic character of the Anglican Church, that the present decision of the highest ecclesiastical authority in the Church does not end the trial. The court of last appeal is that body which is certainly a mere creature of the State, the House of Lords, made up of men of all creeds, and many of them of very dubious morals.

THE CONSTITUTIONAL QUESTION IN MANITOBA.

In an article on "the Manitoba Decision" the *Empire* gives an advice to those who have occasion to deal with that subject to do so "in a spirit of fairness and moderation" so that "the anticipations of coming agitation" which have been freely indulged in "will be doomed to disappointment."

The advice is good, and we have no desire to treat this question in any other spirit than that which the *Empire* recommends. We have not done so in the past, nor shall we do so in the future. It must be conceded that the Catholic interests involved in the matter are of great importance; yet it is all the more important that we should speak fairly and moderately, as the enemies to Catholic education, writing even after the *Empire's* advice had been given, have shown no disposition to follow it. This is evident from some articles of the *Mail* on which we make some comments elsewhere in this issue of the RECORD.

We must say we did not expect the Privy Council to decide as it has done. It is undoubted that hitherto Catholics and Protestants alike had Separate schools in the Province; and though there was no positive law establishing such schools as part of the school system, it seemed to us that as denominational schools in practice received a portion of the school funds of the province, it could be said that "in practice" such schools had certain rights and privileges.

The clause of the Manitoba Act which bears upon the subject is as follows: "Nothing in any such law shall prejudicially affect any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools which any class of persons have by law or practice in the Province at the union."

When the Manitoba Legislature passed the School Acts by which Separate schools were abolished and secular schools established, it was contended on behalf of the Catholics that the constitution was violated, and that the local School Acts were therefore void. The Supreme Court of Manitoba, however, maintained the Acts, Judge Dubuc dissenting. The matter was then brought before the Supreme Court of the Dominion, the Judges of which agreed unanimously with Judge Dubuc that although there was no law establishing Separate schools in the Province before the Union, the Provincial Legislature had taken away an existing privilege, and had therefore exceeded its powers. This is the decision of the Supreme Court which is now said to have been reversed by the Privy Council.

The full text of the decision has not yet reached us, so that it is impossible to say on what grounds the decision of the Supreme Court of Canada has been reversed, if that of the Privy Council has been correctly reported by the cable despatches received. If the

report be correct the conclusion seems to be inevitable that the Privy Council holds that no right or privilege held by either law or practice was prejudicially affected by the Manitoba school legislation.

Are we to conclude from this that the Catholics must quietly allow matters to rest in this condition? We venture to say, whatever may be the actual decision of the Privy Council, that what is reported is not, at least, the state of things which the Dominion Legislature intended on the establishment of Manitoba as a Province of Canada.

The people of Manitoba were mostly of French or mixed Indian and French origin, and were Catholics at the time. They had a strong presentiment when the territorial rights of the Hudson Bay company were purchased by Canada that the Dominion would not respect the settlers' rights, and the entry of the Hon. Wm. Macdougall into the territory as its first Governor met with an armed resistance, so that the new Governor could not take possession. This was the state of affairs toward the end of 1869, and the Canadian Government thought it prudent to telegraph to Archbishop Tache, of St. Boniface, to come from Rome to act as an intermediary for the re-establishment of peace.

His Grace acceded to the request; and as the Canadian Government promised to guarantee the settlers' rights, he was able, with the assistance of other representatives of Canada, to bring about a peace by assuring the settlers that their rights would be kept sacred. The Bill of Rights then agreed upon included the permanence of the denominational school system and the preservation of the French language.

There was nothing unreasonable in these demands. A Separate school system inflicts no injury upon the majority, but a Catholic minority values it most highly. In the present case it was even expected at the time that the majority in the North-West would continue to be Catholic as it was then, so that the demand for Separate schools was really more in the interest of Protestants than of Catholics; but the Catholics were quite as willing to concede them to Protestants, as they were anxious to preserve them for themselves; and this was fully understood when the Bill of Rights was agreed to as a basis of peace.

The Canadian Parliament thoroughly understood the position, and in passing the Manitoba Act the members fully believed that they were securing the right of denominational schools for both Catholic and Protestant local minorities, and with this understanding the Separate school clause of the Manitoba Act was passed by vote of eighty-one to thirty-four.

The Privy Council's decision, if correctly reported, makes it clear that the Manitoba Act is one of those Acts of Parliament through which a coach and four can be driven. That is no reason why the present Manitoban majority should be permitted to ride roughshod over the minority. If the Manitoba majority had remained Catholic they would not have entertained the desire of doing so. But as the course of events has made the majority Protestant, it is now plainly the duty of the Dominion Government and Parliament to remedy what was possibly bungled before, and to pass such legislation as will restore to the Catholic minority the rights of which they have been dishonestly deprived. We have no dread of the bluster in which the enemies of Catholic education are indulging, and we must insist upon it that justice, which for the present is being trampled under foot, be again made the supreme arbiter of the controversy.

Some of the French-Canadian journals are angered to such an extent over the decision of the Privy Council as to threaten an immediate movement towards annexation, as the decision proves that the rights of the French-Canadians of the North-West are not to be respected, under the present Constitution of Canada; and they infer that the next move will be to attack the French-Canadians generally. It is perfectly true that minorities have rights which majorities are bound to respect, and if such rights are not regarded, the minority has the right in conscience to look for justice elsewhere. We believe, however, that there is sufficient love of fair play, honor and honesty among the people of the Dominion to carry out the agreement made with Manitoba in 1870, and to protect the minority there. There is no need for any

but constitutional means to secure justice and equality.

DISCOVERED A MARE'S NEST.

The Toronto *Mail*, which wishes to pass as a most acute judge of men and of the principles of justice, professes to be much shocked because a certain denominational journal, which it does not name, condemned in strong terms the wanton and lying attack made by Rev. Dr. Douglas, of Montreal Methodist College, upon Sir John Thompson, while it had not a word of condemnation for the noble appeal made by His Grace the Archbishop of Kingston to his priests to aid the Irish Nationalist cause by taking up collections for their campaign fund.

We admit that the RECORD is the denominational journal to which the *Mail* here refers, but we do not choose to prove seriously that Archbishop Cleary's appeal for the liberation of a long-suffering nation from a cruel tyranny is not to be compared with the scurrility of a person who in his pulpit substitutes personal vituperation for the Gospel he pretends to preach.

We will let the public judge at his proper value the pertness of a buffoon who would presume to compare the two cases, and to palm such nonsense on the public.

"All snarlers are more brisk and pert than those who understand an art."

A LIBERAL GOVERNMENT SURE.

The Imperial Parliament was opened on Thursday, August 4, and the two parties which were so recently engaged in appealing to the electorate are now face to face in battle array in the House of Commons. The London *Times* has recently been very busily engaged in instructing the Irish Nationalists in such secrets of diplomacy as will enable them to harness Mr. Gladstone and thus make it impossible for him to rule, and thus to restore Lord Salisbury to power, making it incumbent on the present House to sustain him, or otherwise forcing a new election to be held in the shortest possible time.

It is, of course, possible for seventy-nine Nationalists to give Mr. Gladstone a great deal of trouble in a House wherein his majority is only forty, counting all shades of Liberal politicians; but it is not to be expected that the Nationalists will take their policy from the *Times*, and we are pleased to find that when Mr. Gladstone appeared in the House it was the Irish party which manifested the greatest enthusiasm, thus showing the world, and especially the people of the three kingdoms, that all the reports of a want of confidence having arisen in the Nationalist ranks against the Grand Old Man are pure fabrications.

The Parnellites were especially named as being extremely bitter against the Liberals. The *Times* declared only a few days ago that their bitterness towards both Mr. Gladstone and the Nationalists is as intense as ever, and that "they wish to impale both on the horns of a dilemma." The Tories live in the hope that this is the case, and the *Times*, as the chief Tory organ, takes special pains to egg them on to assume this attitude. It is satisfactory to know that even if the Tory party succeed in this policy, the Parnellites can only diminish without wiping out the Gladstonian majority. But already there are signs that the few Parnellite members who are in the House will co-operate with the Liberals, even though they may do so coldly. They have agreed with the other oppositionists to carry out the programme of minimizing the speech-making on the address, so that a vote of non-confidence in the ministry may be carried.

With this point in view, Mr. Sexton will be the only Irish speaker on the address.

Tuesday was the day on which it was decided to bring on the vote, and before this issue of the RECORD shall have reached this continent that the Salisbury Government has succumbed, and that Mr. Gladstone has formed a new Cabinet with the upright and energetic Mr. John Morley as chief Secretary for Ireland, and the other places filled by men who stand pledged to give good government to that country. The new Ministry will consist for the most part of the same men who formed the Government of Mr. Gladstone in 1886, which presented the Home Rule Bill to the House. Not one of these has flinched from the position which they took in that year; but they have advanced throughout the granting of such a Bill, as will completely

meet the need and desire

Mr. Justin McCarthy himself in such a what the future will be He has said

Rule Bill will certainly forward at the earliest but that the Irish desire to impede other tion. It is under the Home Rule will be of legislation, while a vote bill will also be an improved Register Act.

This is a wise decision cannot but commend of Home Rule to the it should be necessary new election before induced to pass the erals will return to arger following the Lords will not dare

EDITORIAL.

We extend our best wishes to the pastor and people because of the great the destruction of church by fire on This is the second calamity has befallen did not originate in the large knitting side of the street.

The Duke of of those who pro the Protestants harshly and unfairly Rule be granted comes interesting Lordship deals with he has the power is Lord Lieutenant Donegal, and in the appointment George Trevelyan stated how His Grity in the district offices. In Tyrone half of the population are 6 Catholic n Protestant. In Catholics numbered 000 of the population lie and 130 Protestants This is the religion the Ulster Orange and the disturbance them so much. opposed to a hypothesis the majority over the tyranny of the majority is with thing.

In view of the the surest method federation of Canada Dominion over is to create dis people, to disregard present condition lieve that it is gather harmonious is it not suspicious some other jour in creating such Canadian publication the *Mail* was le work it leaked editor, who was of the no-Popery engaged in a to deliver up the ton rule. Can editorial staff at negotiations? This were the case

We feel gratulating Sir his son, Mr. J. success of the College, England son, now eight completed his the college an matriculation don University pected that Canada to enter

The Montreal ult, acknowledged tants would be given to Irish Rule Bill which to Ireland would so we may ex to be indigna ation of a com the hands of majority" in that the Mani favor, that th direction, whi land would be ection. This found to be d Catholics, or denomination that their rig