

The Catholic Record

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.
United States and Europe—\$2.50.
Publisher & Proprietor, Thomas Coffey, Ltd.,
Editors (Rev. James T. Foley, B.A.,
Thomas Coffey, Ltd.)
Associate Editor H. P. Macdonald
Manager—Robert M. Hurst

Address business letters to the Manager.
Advertisements for teachers, situations, want-
ed, etc., 50 cents each insertion. Remittance
must accompany the order. Where Catholic
Record box address is required send 10 cents to
proprietor of postage upon replies.
Obituary and marriage notices cannot be
inserted except in the usual condensed form.
Each insertion 50 cents.

The Catholic Record has been approved and
recommended by Archbishop McNeil and the
Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa,
and St. Boniface, the Bishops of London, Ham-
ilton, Peterborough and Oshkosh, N. Y.,
and the clergy throughout the Dominion.
In St. John, N. B., single copies may be pur-
chased from Mrs. M. A. McNeill, 489 Main St.
and John J. Dwyer.

In Sydney, N. S., single copies may be pur-
chased at Murphy's Bookstore.
In Montreal single copies may be purchased
from J. Milloy, 241 St. Catherine St. West.
In Ottawa, Ont., single copies may be pur-
chased from J. W. McNeill, 141 Nicholas St.
The following agents are authorized to
receive subscriptions and orders for the
Catholic Record:

General Agents—M. J. Hagarty, Stephen V.
James, George J. Quigley, Resident Agents—
Miss E. Milroy, 241 St. Catherine St. West,
101 Ave. West, Vancouver, B. C.; St. John's,
Nfld., 20 Rochester St.; Ottawa, Mr. Geo.
E. Smith, 2283 Main St.; Montreal, Miss
Josephine McDonald, 101 Wentworth Block,
Windsor, Man.

LONDON, SATURDAY, NOV. 12, 1921

MR. HOCKEN'S "LITTLE LEARNING"

The Canadian Club of Toronto two weeks ago gave His Grace, the Archbishop, an opportunity of presenting the grounds on which Separate School supporters base their claim for an adjustment of the assessment law that will permit Separate Schools to obtain an equitable share of taxes on public utilities and of corporation taxes where the proportion of stock held by Catholics cannot be determined.

In the praiseworthy desire of hearing both sides of the question the Club, a week later, listened to Mr. H. C. Hocken present the case for those opposed to any measure of relief for the present anomalous and unconstitutional condition of things.

We cannot say that the Canadian Club of Toronto were happy in their choice of a spokesman to reply to the Archbishop.

Here is one good reason: On July 18th last Mr. H. C. Hocken, in a letter, over his own name, to the Toronto Star, made certain specific charges and allegations on the very subject now very properly engaging the attention of the Toronto Canadian Club.

On July 20th Archbishop McNeil, over his own name, wrote to the Star utterly refuting Mr. Hocken's charges, exposing the inaccuracy of his information, and not idly charging but proving to the hilt that Mr. Hocken and his associates in Toronto were actually guilty of the very worst charge that he had falsely imputed to the Bishops.

Mr. H. C. Hocken has ever since been discreetly and eloquently silent. He has neither withdrawn his false accusations nor attempted to substantiate them; he has never denied the legalized robbery of Catholic taxes in the matter of the Toronto street railway, nor has he attempted to justify it. One might think that, in the circumstances, Mr. Hocken would have hesitated to accept the invitation of the Canadian Club to reply to the Archbishop. However, he probably relied on the proverbial short memory of the reading public. It is noteworthy that he carefully refrained from refreshing the memory of his hearers, for he was still silent as the grave about the previous tilt when he was unhorsed.

In the Globe of Nov. 2nd Mr. Hocken is thus reported:

"Reviewing the history of the establishment of Separate schools, the speaker declared that Separate schools in Ontario were secured in the first instance in 1863 when the Quebec members of the then Parliament failed to adhere to an undertaking entered into between Upper and Lower Canada. The undertaking was, he said, that no matter affecting either of the Provinces should become law unless assented to by a majority of the representatives of the Province affected. The Ontario representatives of that day did not cast a majority of their votes for the establishment of Separate schools in Ontario, yet it carried by votes of Quebec representatives."

Some one having defined a crab as a small, red fish that walks backwards, a French scientist remarked that a crab is not necessarily small, it is not red, it is not a fish, and it does not walk "backwards," otherwise the definition was all right.

So with Mr. Hocken's "history." Separate schools were not secured in the first instance in 1863; there was never any undertaking entered into between Upper and Lower Canada such as Mr. Hocken

describes; there was consequently no failure to adhere to such an undertaking on the part of Lower Canadian members; and the implication that Separate Schools were foisted on Ontario by Quebec is historically untrue and politically malicious; we had almost said malicious, but we do not know how far Mr. Hocken's distortions of history may be honestly and ignorantly held as true.

Dr. Hodgins in his History of Separate Schools in Upper Canada points out that the introduction in 1841 of the principle of Separate Schools into our School System "was owing principally, as pointed out, to the well-intentioned, but misdirected zeal of those who sought to influence the newly elected and mixed Legislature of the time, to make the Bible a class-book in the Common Schools."

The Hon. William Morris, speaking in the Legislative Council on the Common School Bill of 1841, held strongly that the Protestant version of the Scriptures must be a part of the Common School curriculum even if "the children of both religious persuasions must be educated apart; for Protestants never can yield to that point, and, therefore, if it is insisted upon that the Scriptures shall not be a class-book in Schools, we must part in peace, and conduct the education of our respective Bodies according to our sense of what is right."

The Hon. Peter B. DeBlacquire, also a Protestant, on the other hand saw the injustice and acknowledged the utter impossibility of the acceptance of such schools by Catholics. He declared that,—

"To attempt the introduction of the Holy Scriptures, as received by Protestants, as a class book in the Common Schools, when Roman Catholics were to be educated in the same School, was worse than useless; it was oppressive; it was dangerous; and it must arrest all progress in education."

Dr. Hodgins writes: "It is a matter of fact, that up to 1841, no Religious Body, or other persons, mooted, much less advocated, the necessity, or desirability, of Separate Schools, as part of a general system of education."

So the question of Separate Schools was literally forced on Catholics by Protestants who were determined to make the Common School system distinctively Protestant. That is its origin, and the date was 1841 not 1863.

It is hard to believe that Mr. Hocken is not dishonest and malicious in saying that there was an undertaking between Upper and Lower Canada with regard to what was known as the "double majority." This was a contention sometimes made that the Government should have the confidence and support of a majority in both sections of the Province of Canada in any government measure.

John A. Macdonald did not admit the principle; he expressly disclaimed it in a speech in the Assembly, May 26th, 1856, years before, according to Mr. Hocken, Separate Schools were foisted on us by "the failure in 1863 of the Quebec members to adhere to the undertaking entered into between Upper and Lower Canada."

George Brown rejected the contention as fatal to his cherished principle of Representation by Population.

In 1858 Mr. J. E. Thibault, Member for Portneuf, introduced a motion declaring,

"That in the opinion of this House any attempt at legislation which would affect one section of the province in opposition to the votes of the majority of the representatives of that section would produce consequences which would be detrimental to the welfare of the province and give rise to great injustice."

This motion was opposed by the Government of which John A. Macdonald was the Prime Minister. After a protracted debate the resolution was defeated by a vote of two to one, Messrs. Brown, Dorion, Mowat and other members of the Opposition voting with the Ministry against it.

This, be it remembered, was in 1858, five years before the shameful breach of faith charged by Mr. Hocken—the failure on the part of Quebec members "to adhere to the undertaking entered into between Upper and Lower Canada!"

Canadians know little of Canadian history, more's the pity; but there must have been some members of the Toronto Canadian Club

who knew that Mr. Hocken's distortion of history was malignant, or, that Mr. Hocken was colloquially ignorant of the subject he discussed before them.

Here we may very appropriately give a quotation from a speech by Sir John A. Macdonald, delivered, by the way, about eight years before the time that Mr. Hocken says, "Separate Schools were secured in the first instance" through the perfidy of Quebec members.

It is taken from Sir Joseph Pope's Life of Sir John A. Macdonald and according to his biographer "presents his views on the subject [of Separate Schools] very clearly."

"I have called the attention of the people to the fact that the 19th clause of the Common School Act became law long before I was in the Government at all; so that the merit of it, or the blame of it, is not with me, but rests entirely with the Baldwin-La Fontaine Administration, as it was brought in under the auspices of Mr. Baldwin particularly, that pure and honest man of whom I always love to speak, though we were opposed in politics. And if it be asked why we do not repeal it, I answer, in the first place, that it is one thing to give a right or a franchise, and another thing to deprive people of it; and in the second place, we have the indisputable evidence of a disinterested witness—a man who cannot be suspected of any leaning towards Popery—I mean Rev. Dr. Ryerson, a Protestant clergyman himself, at the head of the common school system—a person whose whole energies have been expended in the cause of education—who states deliberately to the people of Canada, that the Separate School clause does not retard the progress or the increase of common schools; but that, on the contrary, it 'widens the basis of the common school system.' If I thought that it injured that system, I must say that I would vote for its repeal tomorrow. You must remember, also, that Lower Canada is decidedly a Roman Catholic country—that the Protestant population of Lower Canada is a small minority, and if Protestant schools were not allowed there, our Protestant brethren in Lower Canada would be obliged to send their children to be educated by Roman Catholic teachers. Now, I don't know how many Protestants or how many Roman Catholics I may be addressing, but I say that as a Protestant, I should not be willing to send my son to a Roman Catholic school, while I think a Roman Catholic should not be compelled to send his to a Protestant one. In Lower Canada the teachers are generally the Roman Catholic clergy, and, of course, it is their duty to teach what they consider truth, and to guard their pupils against error. But the system in vogue there is more liberal than even ours, in that it not only permits the establishment of Protestant schools for Protestant children, but allows the whole municipal machinery to be employed to collect the rates to maintain them. In discussing this subject, I have always found that when it is fairly laid before the people, they always, by their applause, signify their approbation of the consistent course of the Government in regard to it."

The lucid presentation of facts, the statesmanlike grasp of essential conditions in this speech by the most outstanding figure amongst the Fathers of Confederation, the tone as well as the matter we commend to the latest exponent of the history of Separate Schools.

We have felt it necessary to go into this subject at some length, for the malevolence of the paragraph that we have quoted above from Mr. Hocken's "history" is patent,—or the ignorance it betrays is, in the circumstances, incredible. We shall next week deal with other statements in Mr. Hocken's address.

LADY LAURIER

Fifty-three years ago Zoe Lafontaine married Wilfrid Laurier and for half a century was a help meet unto the man whose name will ever illumine important pages in Canada's history.

And that is a fairly complete biography of a valiant woman. For Lady Laurier was the valiant woman of the Scriptures in whom the heart of her husband trusted. And to her he often paid grateful and glowing tribute as "a good soldier," a good woman and a good wife.

Though not a public woman in the modern sense of the term, Lady Laurier participated in many activities of women's organizations irrespective of creed or race, while she was keenly interested in the Federation des Femmes Canadiennes Francaise and the Catholic Women's League. It was only the day after attending a luncheon of the latter that she was taken down with what proved to be her last illness.

But it was by the charm of her gracious personality that she exercised the greatest influence in dispelling prejudice and promoting good will. Her influence over the career of her distinguished husband though immeasurably great can never be fully told.

The concluding words of MacKenzie King's tribute are peculiarly appropriate in their simplicity, dignity and truth:

"Reunited in death, as they were united in life, the names and the memories of Sir Wilfrid and Lady Laurier will ever be cherished throughout our Dominion as a national possession, and greatly revered wherever the history of our country is read."

THE CHURCH AND DISARMAMENT

On November 11, the third anniversary of Armistice Day, the Conference on the Limitation of Armament will open in Washington.

Every Catholic, every Christian, should earnestly pray that God by His Holy Spirit may guide the deliberations of the delegates, for on their decisions depends the mending or ending of our present civilization.

On April 29 Congressman W. Bourke Cockran addressed the House of Representatives on a joint resolution on the subject of disarmament. This resolution House Joint Resolution 84 which Mr. Cockran asserted exactly expressed his views, declares that "the whole industrial fabric from London to Tokyo is in imminent peril of entire collapse," and that "it is now clear that the world must disarm and disarm immediately, or the world must perish inevitably." Congressman Cockran is a Democrat. Congressman Frank W. Mondell, Republican leader in the house, speaking a fortnight later, said: "Unless disarmament is agreed to, the next conflict might easily cause a large part of the world to revert to barbarism." In the Senate on May 24 Senator Oscar W. Underwood, of Alabama (since named as one of the representatives of the United States at the Conference), declared: "If this burden of military preparation must continue for two generations, then, in my judgment . . . it will destroy the present civilization of the world." A committee of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, headed by the president of this great business organization, was sent to Europe to study conditions and report to the membership. In September it presented a printed report of twenty-eight pages which concludes: "Any student of world affairs cannot escape the conclusion that each of the nations, including the United States, cannot continue to expend so large a part of its entire revenues, derived from taxation which is now almost unbearable, in preparation for future war, if the present civilization is to continue." Last month the American Federation of Labor also issued a statement in which that body declared: "The limitation of armaments is a good thing. It will save the great nations of the world from threatened financial collapse."

In foreign countries the gravity of the situation is disclosed in most definite terms by recognized leaders. Viscount Grey, accepting the freedom of Glasgow, says: "I am convinced if we have another war in the next twenty years it will destroy civilization in Europe." Viscount Harcourt asserts that "the limitation and reduction of armaments is essential to the moral and financial solvency of the world and civilization." Former Premier Luzzatti, of Italy, finds the present world situation "more dangerous and frightful than in pre-war times." Premier Briand of France, announces in the French Senate that France must seek every means to limit armament "in order to diminish the frightful charges that weigh upon the people." Baron Hayashi, the Japanese ambassador to Great Britain, announces that competition in armament is "not merely foolish, but tragic." That labor in other countries coincides with the views of labor in America

is shown in a statement made by J. H. Thomas, general secretary of the National Union of Railway Men of Great Britain, who says: "A race for more armaments must lead to one of two things—bankruptcy or an explosion."

Reason for the unanimity of portentous predictions is not difficult to find. Senator Underwood did not have to look far to discover it when he was addressing the Senate on disarmament.

"I do not know," he said, "who placed on the wall the diagram which is before us, but I do know that the figures it contains are substantially correct, and there the burden of war faces the Senate of the United States."

These were figures showing the percentage of disbursements annually by the United States to be as follows:

For legislative, executive, and judicial branches of the Government, 3.19 per cent.

For public works, including rivers and harbors, the Panama Canal, and public buildings, 2.91 per cent.

For public health and education, 1.01 per cent.

For past wars and plans for future wars, 92.83 per cent.

But the United States is not alone in this flouting of common sense, this defiance of the natural as well as the spiritual law that what things men sow those also shall they reap. If this country is spending on armaments and maintenance cost and salaries for the Army and Navy in 1921 almost six times what it was spending in 1912, France is spending more than six times, Great Britain more than three and a half times, and Japan more than three times as much as they spent before the War.

That way madness lies.

One of the hopeful signs for the outcome of the Conference is that leaders in all the nations are approaching more nearly the Catholic concept of civilization and discussing conditions more and more frequently in the light of eternal justice, which is the ideal of the Church, and less frequently in terms of political expediency.

By a peculiar perversity the rulers of the nations have long assumed that the teachings of Our Lord and the suggestions of His Vicar on earth are not practical.

When, in August, 1917, Benedict XV. suggested the substitution of moral right for the material force of arms, he said: "Out of this shall arise a just agreement for a simultaneous and reciprocal diminution of armaments, according to rules and guarantees to be laid down hereafter, without impairing, however, the force needed for the maintenance of public order in each State."

Today men from the leading nations are gathering to discuss just such an agreement. It has taken four years, during which the burden of taxation for armaments has pressed heavily on the backs of those least able to support it, for the world to realize the practical value of the suggestion made by the Vicar of Christ.

Benedict XV. sought to remedy a condition; Leo XIII. sought to avert that condition in words which were prophetic to the very letter. In his Encyclical Letter of June 20, 1894, twenty years before the outbreak of the Great War, he said:

"We behold the condition of Europe. For many years past peace has been rather an appearance than a reality. Possessed with mutual suspicions, almost all the nations are vying with one another in equipping themselves with military armaments. Inexperienced youths are removed from parental direction and control, to be thrown amid the dangers of the soldier's life; robust young men are taken from agriculture, or ennobling studies, or trade, or the arts, to be put under arms. Hence the treasures of States are exhausted by the enormous expenditure, the national resources are frittered away, and private fortunes impaired; and this, as it were, armed peace, which now prevails, cannot last much longer. Can this be the normal condition of human society? Yet we cannot escape from this situation, and obtain true peace, except by the aid of Jesus Christ."

The world tried other means of escape; the increase of armaments continued and ten million lives and untold billions of dollars were expended in the delusion that a reduction of armament was not practical. After more than a

quarter of a century such a reduction is regarded by all thinking men in the world as the only practical solution of the problems of the nations.

THE INITIATIVE; THE REFERENDUM; THE RECALL

By THE OBSERVER
1. THE INITIATIVE

The labor and farmers' parties in Canada are all committed, directly or indirectly, to the three far-reaching and sweeping innovations above-mentioned; the initiative, the referendum, and the recall. The Canadian Council of Agriculture has adopted the principle of these three changes in the Canadian Constitution; and subsidiary councils and conventions in the various provinces, consider the platform laid down by that Council as forming a general policy for the farmers' political movement all over Canada.

The Labor Party, or parties, are also committed to these changes; and in some cases, labor candidates are nominated on joint tickets with nominees of the farmers' conventions.

The present general federal election is the first in which a federal party proposed radical and sweeping changes in the Constitution of Canada. Heretofore, political parties have agreed on one thing; namely, that our Constitution was a good one; sound in principle; and based upon many centuries of constitutional experience and development. Now, for the first time, the Constitution itself is challenged. In this election, we are not only going to elect members of Parliament; we are going to decide whether the whole system and nature of our parliamentary institutions are to be changed.

I am going to illustrate this, by means of a brief account of these three proposals; and first, of the Initiative.

The Initiative is either direct or indirect. In the direct Initiative, a certain per centage of the electors can petition for a certain law; and that law must then be submitted to the people at a poll. For instance, a taxation act; the customs tariff act, for instance. If we had the direct Initiative system, with, say, a 10% petition, then, a petition signed by 10% of the electors would call for a poll at any time for a reduction of 50% all round in the tariff; or for a repeal of the whole tariff, or for free trade. The petition being duly signed and presented, Parliament, under the direct initiative would have nothing to say; the legislation petitioned for would have to be presented to the people at a poll held for the purpose; a referendum.

The only difference between the direct and the indirect Initiative is, that under the indirect system, Parliament, on receiving the petition, could enact the legislation asked for, and no poll would be held. But if Parliament does not pass it, the poll must be held.

Thus, under either the direct or indirect Initiative, the main point is, that laws are to be passed, or repealed, at the polls; their value or worthlessness, their wisdom or their folly, their justice or their injustice, judged by the masses of the people, as they drop their ballots; and their votes make laws or repeal laws.

I do not understand how such a change in the Constitution can commend itself to so solid and calm a people as the Canadian farmers. I do understand why radical, fire-eating, capitalist-hating, Socialists are wildly in favor of the Initiative. They dream of legislative schemes which are not likely to be passed by any parliament; so they want to write their schemes into bills; work up enough interest to get a 10% petition; and then have a referendum to see whether the people will vote for or against the Revised Statutes or some part thereof.

Now we are asked to believe that all British and Canadian statesmen up to this time have been fools; and that Parliament is an absurd institution; that the proper place to make important laws is at the polls; and that the rank and file of the electors are just the right persons to decide whether a chapter shall be cut out of the Criminal Code, or a schedule removed from the Customs Act.

Anyone who wants to believe that is, of course, free to do so. For my part, I find it impossible. I can imagine how deeply the great fundamental laws of Canada would be pondered, and how much wisely they

would be judged, around the doors of some leaky shed where ballots were being dropped in a box; while scores of people waited in snow or rain for their turn.

If we are going to lose our sense of values, of comparisons, of proportion let us at least try to keep our sense of humor. At the same time, this is not by any means a joke. The Farmers, and Labor Parties hold to the Initiative as a method of making and repealing laws. They propose this very radical change in the Constitution of Canada. They propose this paralysis of Parliament.

They propose more than that, too: The Recall. That is matter for another article.

NOTES AND COMMENTS

THE CANADIAN Club of Toronto invited Archbishop McNeil to discuss the Separate School question before them, which he did with his accustomed clarity and moderation. It was of course the prerogative of the Club to hear both sides of the question, but it cannot be complimented on its selection of an advocate for the other side. We go further, and say that the choice of the editor of the Orange Sentinel can not be easily understood unless Mr. Hocken is really representative of whatever opposition there is to needed amending legislation with regard to Separate Schools.

THE KINGSTON despatch which appeared in all the daily papers a week ago to the effect that the Penitentiary there was never so crowded will not have afforded much consolation to those who would have the world believe that Prohibition is the one and only solvent of crime. Was there, indeed, ever a time in the history of Canada when crimes of the graver sort were so rife as now? Canada's experience in this respect is duplicated by that of the United States. When will men learn that the seat of all crime is in the heart and will, and that to overcome this tendency in the race legislative enactments will not suffice? The true remedy, as the Catholic Church has never ceased to proclaim, lies elsewhere.

AND to illustrate the feeble grasp the sects are coming more and more to have of the fundamentals of Christianity, a Methodist minister steps into a pulpit and tells an audience of men seeking light on the grave social problems of the time that he "didn't care too figs for the Church's doctrines and philosophies." That is, that conduct is independent of belief, and that no matter with what earnestness and solemnity the Founder of Christianity proclaimed certain given truths it doesn't matter "two figs" to the shallow theorists of the hour. Josh Billings once said that "politeness is dreadful simple if you take the ceremony out of it, but in sitting out the ceremony, you often sit out the politeness"—a saying which might be applied very aptly to the give-and-take sort of attitude of the great body of non-Catholics to religious truth now-a-days. They do not seem to realize that in rejecting dogma they are making of religion an empty sham.

THE CANADIAN CHURCHMAN, the organ of Canadian Anglicanism is much exercised over the Baptist attitude towards "church union." The Baptists, it seems, claim to be the only authorized custodians of the Gospel, and will have no dealings with the proscribed Samaritans of other denominations. "We have something that belongs peculiarly to the Baptist church, which no one can persuade us to give up, and as we can persuade no other communion to accept it, therefore we will refrain from even discussing the subject of union," is the Churchman's paraphrase of the Baptist stand-pat policy, and it makes the comment that "no matter what is the mind of Christ the Baptist church is going to plough its own furrow, and Christianity means Baptist or nothing," the prelude to the fatuous remark that "the Church of Rome takes the same position." The fact that the "Church of Rome" comes down through the ages as Christ's own appointed representative cannot be supposed to weigh with our Anglican contemporary, but common sense should suggest to his editorial brain that whereas the Catholic Church has existed from the beginning and is confined to no country, the Baptist organization is but a sect of yesterday.