

## The Catholic Record

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.  
 Single copies—10 cents.  
 Publisher & Proprietor, Thomas Coffey, L.L.D.  
 Editors—Rev. James J. Foley, D.D.  
 Associate Editor—R. F. Macdonald  
 Manager—Robert M. Burns.  
 Address business letters to the Manager.  
 Classified Advertising—10 cents per line.  
 Remittance must accompany the order.  
 Where Catholic Record Box address is required  
 send 10 cents to prepay expense of postage  
 upon replies.  
 Ordinary and marriage notices cannot be  
 inserted except in the usual condensed form.  
 Each insertion 50 cents.  
 The Editor cannot be held responsible for  
 unsolicited manuscripts. Every endeavor will  
 be made to return rejected contributions when  
 stamped addressed envelopes are enclosed.  
 The Catholic Record has been approved and  
 recommended by Archbishop Falconio and  
 Cardinal LaSalle Apostolic Delegates to Canada,  
 the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa,  
 St. Boniface, the Bishops of London,  
 Hamilton, Peterborough and Oshawa,  
 St. Catharines, and the clergy throughout the  
 Dominion.  
 In St. John, N. B., single copies may be  
 purchased from Mrs. A. A. McNeil, 340 Main  
 St. and John J. Dwyer.  
 In Montreal single copies may be purchased  
 from J. W. O'Brien, 14 Nicholas St.  
 In Ottawa, Ont., single copies may be pur-  
 chased from J. W. O'Brien, 14 Nicholas St.  
 In Sydney, N. S., single copies may be  
 purchased at Murray's Bookstore.  
 The following agents are authorized to  
 receive subscriptions and canvass for The  
 Catholic Record:  
 General Agents—M. J. Hagarty, Stephen V.  
 James, George J. O'Leary, Boston, Mass.;  
 Miss Bridget Saunders, Sydney; H. Chamberlin,  
 Hudson Ave., S. 348, W. Ottawa West; Mrs.  
 Geo. E. Smith, 220 St. Joseph St., Montreal;  
 P. O'Farrell, 98 Aberdeen St., Quebec City;  
 Miss Margaret E. Mulligan, Canora, Sask.

LONDON, SATURDAY, DEC. 30, 1922

THE CATHOLIC RECORD is deeply grateful for innumerable kindnesses and encouragements during the year just closed and wishes all its friends and readers a happy, prosperous, and holy new year.

### CONSOLIDATED SCHOOLS

An interesting pamphlet, "The Consolidation of Rural Schools," is printed by order of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario and issued by the Department of Education. Copies may be secured on application to the Department of Education.

It sets forth in catechetical form the advantages of consolidation. We have discussed this question before, and may deal later with some of the other considerations here presented for the information of the public; but just now we shall confine ourselves to the question of the grants provided for Consolidated Schools.

To give an adequate idea of these we cannot do better than quote the questions and answers of the pamphlet itself which deals with the grants very fully and very clearly.

"29. What Financial Assistance may be secured towards Building?"

"The Department of Education in the Regulations of Consolidated Schools, page 6, specifies the following grants:

(1) A fixed grant of \$3,000 for each consolidated school in operation before December 22, 1923.

(2) A building grant:

(a) When the cost of the building and site is less than 5% of the total equalized assessment of the consolidated school district, 80% of the cost of the building and site up to a maximum of \$9,000.

(b) When the cost is at least 5 but less than 10% of the equalized assessment, 87 1/2% of the cost of building and site up to a maximum of \$9,000.

(c) When the cost is 10% of the equalized assessment or more, 45% of the cost of the building and site up to a maximum of \$9,000.

"30. What financial assistance is given toward the Transportation of the Pupils?"

"Grants are paid by the Department of Education as follows:

(a) When the contract cost of transportation is less than 5 mills on the equalized assessment, 80% of the contract cost.

(b) When the cost is at least 5 mills, but less than 10 mills on the equalized assessment, 87 1/2% of the contract cost.

(c) When it is 10 mills or over, 45 per cent. of the contract cost.

(d) In districts and unorganized counties, 60 per cent. of the contract cost.

"31. What Assistance is Given in Providing Equipment for Consolidated Schools?"

"In addition to the regular equipment grants, the Department of Education will make an initial grant not to exceed a maximum of \$200.

"32. What Special Equipment is required in Consolidated Schools and what Grants are Paid upon it?"

"The Regulations require the following special equipment, except for reasons satisfactory to the Minister: (a) a musical instrument—a piano, an organ, or an instrument for reproducing musical records; (b) a projection lantern and screen and the necessary accessories, or a moving picture

machine; (c) an emergency medical and surgical chest.

"Upon this special equipment, the Department of Education will make the following grants: For the first year, 40 per cent. of the value to a maximum of \$400, and for each of the three years following, 20 per cent. of the value to a maximum of \$200.

"33. Are the Regular Grants ordinarily Paid to Rural Schools also Paid to Consolidated Schools?"

"Yes, the Consolidated schools share in all the grants, legislative and municipal, on the same basis as the ordinary rural schools.

"34. Are there any Special Grants made towards the Payment of Salaries of Teachers in Consolidated Schools?"

"There is a special fixed grant made by the Department of Education of \$100 for each full time teacher in a Consolidated school, whose salary is at least \$600.

"35. Are there other Grants Obtainable?"

"If a community hall and an athletic field are provided, a grant of 25 per cent. of the cost of that part of the building designed for a community hall will be paid by the Department of Agriculture, but such grant will not exceed \$2,000."

Immediately following is a question and answer which we must not omit. They have a wider bearing than perhaps was intended.

"36. Is not the Money used to Pay the large Grants really Provided by the People themselves? In other words are we not Taxed in order to Procure these Grants?"

"Not in the same way you are taxed to maintain your present school and to pay the salary of the teacher. While in one sense it may be true that the revenue of the Province, a large part of which is spent for educational purposes, really belongs to the people of the Province, yet it is also true that very little of that revenue is derived directly from the pockets of the people. The Province of Ontario derives its revenue mainly from such sources as succession duties, corporation taxes, subsidies from the Dominion Government, sales of Crown lands and timber limits, mining dues, motor licenses, etc."

A very fair idea of the enormously increased grants given for Consolidated schools may be gained from the foregoing questions and answers; but the Education Department's pamphlet adds a concrete illustration of how they work out. And this we must also quote, for it is very important that we be fully seized of the magnitude of these new school grants. We take again from the pamphlet:

"How to Calculate the Cost of Consolidation.

"For the purpose of illustration, let us suppose that six sections, having an average assessment of \$150,000 each, agree to unite in a consolidation. They propose to build a school of six rooms, and to establish a Continuation class in the school for which two teachers are to be employed. The remaining four rooms are to be used for Public School classes.

Assessment

"Total assessment of combined sections.....\$900,000 00

Building

"Cost of building and equipment including community hall \$50,000 00

Cost of site, 5 acres at

\$150..... \$750 00

If section decides to provide vans,

6 vans at \$400..... \$2,400 00

\$53,150 00

"The following building and equipment grants may be secured:

Building grant, maximum..... \$9,000 00

Fixed grant when school in operation... \$3,000 00

Grant for community hall..... \$2,000 00

Grant for equipment \$1,200 00

"Total grants for building and equipment..... \$15,200 00

Cost of building and site..... \$53,150 00

Grants receivable..... \$15,200 00

Amount to be provided for..... \$27,950 00

"Suppose debentures to run for 30 years at 6% are issued to cover this amount. The annual instalment to pay principal and interest will be \$37,950 multiplied by .072,649, that is \$2757.03. On an assessment of \$900,000 the debenture rate would be about 3 mills.

### Maintenance

"The cost of maintaining the school will probably be somewhere near the following amounts:

Salary of principal..... \$1,800 00

Salary of first assistant..... \$1,200 00

Salary of four assistants at \$1000 each... \$4,000 00

Salary of caretaker..... \$500 00

Cost of transportation, 4 vans at \$700 each... \$2,800 00

Fuel..... \$800 00

\$10,900 00

Legislative Grants

"The following grants would be paid by the Department of Education:

(a) For Continuation School

Fixed grant on teachers' salaries..... \$800 00

Additional grant on salaries..... \$450 00

Grants on accommodation and equipment, about..... \$150 00

\$900 00

(b) For Public School

Fixed grant on teachers' salaries (for Consolidated Schools only)

6 at \$100..... \$600 00

Grant on Salaries (20% on excess salary over \$800 up to \$900) 4

at \$60 each..... \$240 00

Supplementary grants (40% on excess salary over \$900 for each) 4

at \$200..... \$900 00

Grants on Certificates (assuming each teacher holds Permanent Second Class Certificates, and has had five years' experience) 4 at \$40..... \$160 00

Special grants for Manual Training, Domestic Science, Agriculture, about \$350 00

Total..... \$2,150 00

(c) For Transportation of Pupils

Grant of 80% of cost of transportation (80% of \$2,800)..... \$940 00

County Grants

"The county grant for Continuation School must be equivalent to the Legislative grant.

Grant on salaries and equipment..... \$900 00

Township Grants

For Continuation School teachers (\$600 + \$400) \$1,000 00

For Public School teachers 4 at \$600 each... \$2,400 00

\$3,400 00

Grand total of maintenance grants..... \$8,160 00

Cost of maintenance..... \$10,900 00

Amount receivable in grants..... \$8,160 00

"Amount to be levied by trustees on consolidated section... \$2,710 00

"On an assessment of \$900,000 this amount would be raised by a levy of about 3 mills."

The Consolidated Schools Act was passed in 1919. In spite of the munificent grants, the Consolidation idea was slow of acceptance. Now, however, there are twenty-five; seventeen in operation, several more will be in operation in January 1923; and the others at various stages of their establishment.

Sections are still free to consolidate or not; but there is something like a virtual compulsion by extraordinary inducement. Unless in their working out they should prove very gravely disappointing it is likely that Consolidated schools will eventually become the general rule in rural Ontario.

In a certain county the Boards of Trustees of several Separate School sections considered the matter of consolidation, went into it very fully with their Inspector, and with his enthusiastic approval, decided to consolidate.

They were told by the Education Department that the Consolidated Schools Act did not apply to Separate schools!

This seems incredible; but such is our reliable information.

Yet Clause XX of the Roman Catholic Separate School Act of 1863 reads as follows:

"Every Separate School shall be entitled to a share in the fund annually granted by the Legislature of this Province for the support of Common Schools, and shall be entitled also to a share in all other public grants, investments and allotments for Common School purposes now made, or hereafter to be made, by the Province, or the Municipal authorities, according to the average number of pupils attending

such School during the twelve next preceding months, or during the number of months which may have elapsed from the establishment of a new Separate School, as compared with the whole average number of pupils attending school in the same City, Town, Village, or Township."

We have italicised the words, "or hereafter to be made" as they cover precisely just such grants as those recently made by the Province under the Consolidated Schools Act of 1919, and the Departmental Regulations relating thereto.

And be it remembered that the rights we enjoyed under the Act of '63 were constitutionally guaranteed in 1867 by the British North America Act.

Leaving further consideration of this latest violation of the spirit and letter of our School rights for another time we shall conclude by giving Dr. Ryerson's comment on the above quoted Clause XX of the Roman Catholic Separate Schools Act of 1863.

Though the founder of our Common School System was anything but sympathetic to the principle of Separate schools, he here shows a sense of justice and honesty and straightforwardness that might well be an example to his successors in office.

Commenting on Clause XX of the Separate School Act he writes:

"This Section is a substitute for the first part of the thirty-third section of the Separate School Act of 1855. The point of difference is, that this Section gives Separate Schools the right of sharing in other Public Grants, investments, and allotments, for Common School purposes than the Parliamentary School Grant. The only public grant, or investment, that can come within this provision, is the Clergy Reserve Fund, when applied by Municipalities to Common School purposes.

This fund is distributed by law among the several Municipalities, according to the number of rate payers in each,—Roman Catholic ratepayers, of course, as well as Protestant. This fund forms no part of the Common School fund, and is not subject to Common School Regulations. When a Municipal Council chooses to apply the portion of the Clergy Reserve Fund apportioned to its municipality to Common School purposes, it ought to do so in the equal interest of all the ratepayers, and not in a way to exclude any portion. If the Common School Law allows portions of those rate payers, both Protestant and Roman Catholic, to have Common Separate Schools, they are acting under the law in availing themselves of this permission, as much as those who avail themselves of the permission, to establish Common Schools. For a Municipal Council to apply the share of the Clergy Reserve Fund placed under its control, to aid one class of these Schools, and not the other, is as clearly to exclude one class of ratepayers from their rightful share of that fund as if they were proscribed by name. Some Municipal Councils have acted very justly and fairly in regard to both classes of Common Schools; and if any other Councils have done, or should do, otherwise, the Legislature should surely protect rights of the minority against any such proscription."

What Dr. Ryerson says here about the Clergy Reserve Fund applies with tenfold force to recent school legislation in this Province, which "as clearly exclude one class of rate payers from their rightful share of [School Grants] as if they were proscribed by name."

DIVORCE IN ENGLAND

There is no law that in individual cases does not impose hardship, sometimes serious hardship. Short-sighted sentimentalists have always been found who would tinker with generally beneficial and time-tested legislation in order to relieve such cases of hardship. This has given rise to a legal aphorism: "Hard cases make bad law."

Not long ago Lord Buckmaster commented on the hard case of a woman whose husband was insane, but who could not under the existing law secure a divorce. The ex-Chancellor condemned in scathing terms the law that did not give relief in such a case.

It will be noted that single blessedness or widowhood, virtual or actual, is assumed to be an intolerable and unnatural hardship.

Wide publicity was given to Lord Buckmaster's strictures on the English laws governing Marriage and Divorce, though it is safe to say that had the hard case arisen from the working out of any other law any such comment on it would be treated with contempt for such maudlin sentimentality. What gave currency and weight to the comment in this instance is the assumption aforementioned together with the lowering or loss of the ideal Christian marriage.

However the neo-pagans have not things all their own way.

A regular correspondent of the Weekly Westminster enters the lists with this vigorous challenge:

"Given that Daniel Quilp has treated his wife so badly that she separates from him, I think it a piece of Turkish atrocity to permit him to marry another victim. And there is no case for permitting Mrs. Quilp to remarry either. No man of high moral sense will have anything to do with a woman who has been through the Divorce Court. You say that there is 'an immoral silence' about such happenings as that a man or woman may be married to a criminal or an insane person. I want to break that silence. Let us suppose that I married a wife, and that the most terrible of all earthly misfortunes happened to her—that she became insane. It would seem to me simply fiendish if I were to think of marrying another woman in circumstances like this. Will anyone come forward and say over his own name or pseudonym in the Westminster that he would be so brutal as to marry another woman in the supposed circumstances? I venture to say, not one. And I believe the least intelligent of your readers will understand the inference from silence."

The sickening assumption to which we have referred has done much to degrade marriage and to lower, if not to destroy, the Christian ideal of sexual relations.

A correspondent in the Saturday Westminster relentlessly forces the advocates of divorce for this reason to face the logical conclusion of their "hard case" principle:

"The sentimentalists," writes the correspondent, "are all in tears at the plight of a man or woman who, having experienced one unhappy marriage is restrained from trying again. Yet any reader of the daily papers know how often the remarriage of a divorced person is as unsuccessful as the first marriage. Still the sentimentalists declare no one must endure any privation or hardship, and a single life seems to them unmitigated hardship. What then of the two million women left partnerless for lack of the two million men who should be their mates? Obviously, polygamy is the only remedy. Why, then, do these humane Divorce reformers hesitate to recommend polygamy?"

Christian ideals still hold firmly enough to make most people shrink from simultaneous polygamy, though divorce has made successive polygamy so much a matter of course that it is now openly advocated as a natural right.

Though the Westminster correspondent may give a gentle shock to the humane divorce reformers of England by showing that logically they should advocate polygamy, there are humanitarians still more advanced who would chafe under such restraints as polygamy implies. We take the following from a highly reputable, intellectualist periodical of New York, The Nation.

A woman who signs her name writes:

"If 'spinsterhood' (a condition in which society denies women their natural right to normal sex expression) could function as a safety-valve to the imminent dangers of over-population, it would still be unjustified. It is for society to accept the one practical method of birth-control, education for universal knowledge of scientific contraceptives. It is also up to society to concern itself with adjusting its antiquated moral code to the facts of existing conditions and make it possible for all women as well as all men to experience the normal sex expression that is necessary to a normal life."

The italics are the writer's own.

Once abandon the decencies imposed by Christian teaching and there can be nothing but progressive decadence of Christian morals.

If our English friends do not fight strenuously against divorce extension now, it will take more than a suggestion of polygamy to shock the next generation of English men and English women.

## THE GREAT MIRACLE OF CHRISTMAS

By THE OBSERVER

In this materialistic and rationalistic age, it is the fashion with many people to say that there are no miracles. It is the fashion to say that no power ever interferes with the order and rule of nature, and that it is absurd to think that God would suspend or interfere with the operation of any natural law. I do not understand how anyone can be sure He would not. Is He not the author of nature? Did He not make the world? Did He not make whatever laws there are which regulate the whole of creation? Of course, if a man be one of the fools who say within their heart there is no God, he will not see how there can be any Divine interference with the world; but then he has on his hands the task of accounting for the existence of the world; of showing us how the world came into existence, and how it is kept going; and needless to say that cannot be done without taking God into account. So I wish to refer only to those who do believe in God, but who feel sure that He never works miracles.

The first miracle with which men are concerned is, of course, the creation of the world itself and the creation of man. Those who believe that God made the world and made man and all everything that is in the world, believe in a gigantic miracle; beside which all the miracles that they disbelieve are only small and occasional exertions of the same divine power which called the world out of nothing and formed the wonderful body of man from the slime of the earth so made, and those who admit the miracle of the creation ought to be slow to question the performance of lesser miracles by the same almighty power which did that greater one.

What can be more miraculous than the creation of the world, the sun, the moon, the stars, the ordered arrangement of them all in their respective orbits, the perfect arrangement and balance of forces which keeps each of them in its place, and maintains a regular and constant relation of one to another? How can anyone who believes in that great miracle strain at believing that the same God who did that, and does it every day, could not, if He would, alter or suspend any part or portion of it? But, they say, "Yes He could, but He will not." How do they know that? How can they possibly know whether He would or not? No such knowledge is possible in the negative. If God had never done a miracle since the creation of the world the mere fact that He had done that great miracle would make it plain that He could, if He wished to do so, perform other miracles as well.

And so, if there were no known miracle but that first great miracle of creation it would be impossible to deny that other miracles were possible. But there is another great miracle known to and admitted by all who believe in the event we are now to celebrate once more. The Incarnation is a miracle so great that the human mind cannot fully realize all that it is and involves. God became man. The infinite was closely united with the finite. Divinity and humanity are united in Jesus Christ, who is both God and man. It is a miracle, a wondrous miracle, a miracle of God's love and mercy. How can those who believe this, put any limits to what God may or may not, will or will not do?

The smaller miracles ought not to present any difficulty to those who believe that God created the world and all that is in it; and that afterwards He redeemed us by coming Himself into the world and suffering an ignominious death for us. What is it that a man should be healed of a sickness or a wound compared with the making of the world; the making of man, the making of that most wondrous organism, the human body, out of dust and slime? But some people say that God does not now do miracles. How do they know that? Assuredly He never told them He was going to cease doing so; and how else could they possibly know?

There are many people who go so far as to admit and believe the miracles that are recorded in the Bible, but who nevertheless say there are no miracles nowadays. How do they know? We could understand a man who believed in no miracles at all; denied that there ever had been any done by God, for there would be at least an appear-

ance of consistency about him; wrong and ill-informed though he would be; but it is not consistent to admit that God has in the past done miracles, and then arbitrarily and without a scrap of proof, to assert that He has given up the doing of miracles for good and all.

The truth is that in many cases the reluctance to believe in miracles is due to a certain worldliness of temper and spirit. Men are perfectly in love with this world, and do not want to be reminded too sharply that we and the world we live in are all together in the hands of God. We like to dream that we control this world and that all will go as we want it to go. The same worldliness that made the Jews unwilling to recognize our Blessed Saviour, though He clearly fulfilled before their eyes the prophecies that they knew had been made in their Scriptures concerning the Redeemer Who was to come, prevents men from seeing God in the works of His hands, in creation, in the Incarnation, in all the well-proven and notorious miracles that are being wrought in the world every year we live.

### NOTES AND COMMENTS

THERE HAVE recently been offered for sale several relics of Prince Charles Edward Stuart, the disposal of which cannot fail to be matter of concern to all with Jacobite blood in their veins, and they, despite the march of time, are numbered by the thousand on both sides of the Atlantic, and at the far-flung outposts of the English-speaking world. That the owners should be willing to part with such treasured possessions at all, except, perhaps, to some public depository of national relics, will not easily be understandable to descendants of those who gladly, and with no thought of earthly reward, risked all and suffered the loss of all for the "Cause." And, as it cannot be too often repeated, whatever the shortcomings of certain of its representatives there must surely have been high qualities in a Royal House that could have called forth a loyalty as absolutely pure and selfless as any the world has ever seen.

FIRST AMONG the relics in question is what is reputed to be Bonnie Prince Charlie's own Royal Standard, borne, so it was claimed, at Culloden by the Duke of Atholl or Marquis of Tullibardine, as he was known throughout the "Forty-Five." As the Duke, however, was in command of the Jacobite cavalry he could hardly have been the standard bearer, nor could it have been his brother, Lord George Murray, who was the Prince's Lieutenant-General. A third brother, being of Hanoverian tendencies, and remaining neutral, was not in the affair. The Prince's flag, according to Lodge's Peerage, was captured by one George Burgess, an officer in Cumberland's army, but from whom taken is uncertain. That the one just disposed of is really one of the fourteen taken in the battle there cannot be much doubt, but a little consideration will show that it is not the Standard.

In the first place, the general description of the Royal Standard as given by Andrew Henderson, and also by Robert Chambers, is that it was "a square piece of red silk, representing a white standard in the middle." Now the flag which has just changed hands, is white, with four broad horizontal bars in blue, and narrow red lines intervening. This of itself effectually disposes of its claim to be the Prince's own Standard. Further, the colors captured at Culloden were taken to Edinburgh and then marched in procession from the Castle to the Market Cross, and there burned on 4th June, 1746. Prince Charles' Standard on the other hand, accompanied him when he retired from the field, and at Falis Ford, on the Nairn, was on 17th April, handed over to the Duke of Perth by Leslie, the standard-bearer, and was taken on board ship by the Duke when he embarked for France. He died at sea, however, 11th May, 1746, and the fate of the Standard is unknown. If still in existence it is probably in keeping of some Jacobite family in France. Exact identification of the flag just sold would none the less be interesting.

THE OTHER relics of the Prince now, as per an announcement in the