

Northwest Review

Senate Reading Run 5

"AD MAJOREM DEI GLORIAM"

THE ONLY JOURNAL DEVOTED TO THE INTEREST OF ENGLISH SPEAKING CATHOLICS WEST OF TORONTO.

VOL. 10, NO. 40.

WINNIPEG, MANITOBA, WEDNESDAY, APRIL 17, 1895.

\$2.00 per Year Single Copies 5 cents

Mr. F.W. Russell Replies

TO "UNITED CANADA'S" ONE-HORSE FRAUD.

Catholic Truth Quietly Points Out the Error About Government Employees, About Dan. Smith, About Splits Among Catholics, About the "Corporals" Oath.

To the Editor of United Canada. Dear Sir,—Permit me in a few words to show you how little reliance you should place on your present sources of information in this country, and to point out how your Winnipeg correspondents have led you astray as shown in the article which appeared in your issue of the 30th ult., under the heading of "Catholic Truth." I take it for granted that the article must have been based on information furnished you by some one in this city, for it is obvious that personally you know nothing about either the Truth Society or any other of the points you deal with. It you will allow me I will endeavor with the fewest possible words and in a most kindly spirit to show you and your readers where you are wrong in the stand you appear to have taken in the present phase of the school difficulty in this Province, especially your attitude regarding the Catholic Truth society here. You commence with an insinuation that the Truth Society is not considered "of any importance in Winnipeg where its exact status is so well known." This is error No. 1 into which you have been led by your correspondent, but as one man's assertion (especially if he gives his name) is as good as that of another (who in this case adopts the secrecy of a non-de-plume), I will content myself with present and giving that statement a direct denial, and saying that the Truth Society is looked upon by those best able to judge as one of the most important of the lay societies connected with the church in this city.

You say "the average attendance, a half-dozen boys, including two Government employees." This is an absurdity on the face of it; for how could meetings composed of boys include two Government employees whom you go on to describe as "Tory political tools first and Catholics afterwards"; one of whom, you add, was "selected as the 'John Doe' of the school case?" There is evidently some loose in the construction of your sentence, and I may dispose of it at once by the simple statement that the membership of the Truth society does not contain "two Government employees." Since the society has been in existence there have been but two Government employees amongst its members, viz.: Dr. J. K. Barrett, Inspector of Inland Revenue, and Mr. A. McGillis, of the Post Office department. The latter is not now a member, and has not been for some months; your remarks, therefore, could not apply to him; and as to Dr. Barrett, I may say that although he is a member and gives his financial support to the society, as he always does to everything tending to the promotion of Catholic interests in this country, he is not much to the regret of the other members—a regular attendant at the meetings; and, as a matter of fact, he had not anything to do with the passing of the resolution you complain of. It is not my desire to answer your uncalculated references to him as the "John Doe" of the school case, and it is not necessary to reply to your charge that he is a "Tory political tool and a Catholic afterwards." I very much regret you have made such an ungenerous statement, and in charity I am willing to believe you have been misled by false information. I will only add that the charge is totally unfounded, and that you cannot name a reputable Catholic in this country who would support it.

You say "Every mail for days past has brought us letters from foremost Catholics of Winnipeg denouncing the so-called Truth society as petty tyrants and falsifiers." I am willing to take your word that you have received some such letters; but I may make this statement, that if the authors of those letters have represented themselves to you as "foremost Catholics," they have most grievously imposed on your credulity. I challenge you to name even the best sample, and if you will name the whole lot I think I can easily show you that not one of them is entitled to the designation of "foremost Catholic." Anyway, I fancy the statement that you have received such letters "for days past" must be taken with a grain of salt; for I am convinced that the number who would write to you in such terms is so limited that the supply could not be kept up for many days—not more than two or three at the outside, and then you would not get more than one letter a day.

You go on: "Let us call to the witness stand an honest member of the Catholic Truth Society of Winnipeg," and then you quote his letter. Again I challenge you to give the name of your correspondent, and I am certain I could then show you he is once more misrepresenting himself to you, and that he is not a member of the society.

I will only notice his letter by referring to the closing remarks, in which he says "The society is managed by your friends Barrett and Smith." I have already shown you how much Dr. Barrett interferes with the management of the society, and surely it will convince you of the extent to which you may rely on your correspondent's veracity when I assure you publicly, and no one can deny it, that Mr. D. Smith, the superintendent of Dominion Public Works, to

whom he refers, is not and never has been a member of the Truth society. I am glad to read your assertion that "United Canada yields to no man or society in its loyalty and adherence to Catholic schools," for we poor Catholics of Manitoba need all the hearty and honest support we can get in this our present difficulty. It is unfortunate however, that your stand lately has led many to think otherwise as shown in yesterday's Winnipeg Free Press, which is strongly opposing us in our struggle, and which quotes at great length from your article to show that at least the Catholics of Canada are not a unit on the subject of Catholic education, and that one Catholic paper of the Dominion has the manliness to come out boldly in favor of the public schools.

You reprint your interview with Mr. O'Donohue, and thus again do you repeat the action of which the Truth Society complained, viz.: Giving his statements every publicity whilst suppressing all notice of the resolutions passed by this mass meeting of the Catholics of this city denouncing him and clearly showing that he is not the representative Catholic or entitled to the confidence of our co-religionists of eastern Canada. It is true you may have done this because of the information conveyed to you by your Winnipeg correspondent that "the Catholics of Manitoba are a mere handful of men in one parish in this city." You may however be induced to do otherwise when I assure you that the two mass meetings at which resolutions repudiating Mr. O'Donohue have been passed were thoroughly representative of the Catholics of all degrees and nationalities in the city of Winnipeg; in fact if there are any Catholics here who do not concur in both the letter and spirit of those resolutions they have not yet declared themselves. I will only refer to the statements in this interview to say there is no "bossing" as he calls it in Catholic school matters here. The whole people, and we comprise, not only Irish and French but many other nationalities, are practically a unit working together harmoniously and with the very best spirit conceivable. It is an absolute falsehood to say there is any "bossing" on the part of the French, and it is certainly not very flattering to the Irish people of this city to have an Irish paper as United Canada claims to be representing them as the servants or slaves of any other nationality. I will add that his statements regarding the objects of the deputation that waited on the late Archbishop Tache regarding Father Maloney are absolutely false, and to show you that I know whereof I speak on this matter I may tell you that I was Chairman of the meeting at which the deputation was appointed and I was one of the body which waited on the Archbishop. Our action had nothing whatever to do with the school question, neither did it concern nationalities, and as a matter of fact every member of that deputation afterwards signed a letter to the Archbishop thanking him for the kindness with which he received us and expressing ourselves as well satisfied with the explanation he gave us. Mr. O'Donohue signed the letter with the rest of us; this will show you how much reliance you can place on him.

You state that the "So-called office of United Canada consists in publishing the above impartial and accurate account of Mr. O'Donohue's examination and the statements obtained in his interview." I think if you will read the resolutions of the Truth society again you will find that what they complained of was that, whilst you gave undue prominence to him, you seemed to wilfully suppress everything which would show his real standing in the community. I do not see how a society established for the protection of Catholic Truth could have taken any other action than they did; but this I may say, the society has no desire in any way to attack or injure United Canada; the members wish well to every paper published in the interests of our holy religion, and if, now the truth has been exposed, you take a more correct stand on this unfortunate matter, no one will rejoice more than will the members of the Catholic Truth Society of Winnipeg.

You show later on in your article that you have been misinformed regarding the actual weight to be attached to Mr. O'Donohue's statements, when you say "He has pledged his oath to their accuracy." I would point out to you that what he did before the Cabinet was to make a simple statement; he was not on oath, and I may add that if he had been on oath he would probably have thought twice before giving evidence commencing with such an assertion as: "I am a member of the Public School board. I am a good Catholic and a regular communicant." You may rely upon it, Mr. O'Donohue did not, in the Appeal case, take an oath before giving that "evidence."

I now come to the questions with which your article practically concludes. It was my intention to answer them, as I easily could do I am sure to the satisfaction of yourself and your readers, but I find that the Rev. Father McCarthy has to-day a letter in the public press which puts the matter so much better than I could do, and with such weight, that I attach his communication.

[See Father McCarthy's letter in our last issue.] Now in conclusion allow me to say: the Catholic Truth Society members have no desire to quarrel with United Canada. They have only one object in view—the spread and protection to the best of their ability of Catholic Truth. They felt in duty bound to correct the false impressions they believed your report was calculated to make in the minds of your readers, but they are now, willing to believe that you acted on false information, and although this letter is long I ask you to publish it as one proof that you have acted bona fide. Yours truly, F. W. RUSSELL. Winnipeg, Man., 5th April, 1895.

Father Cherrier Replies

TO THE MAN THAT WROTE MR. O'DONOHUE'S LETTER.

Justification of Oblate Fathers, Father Ritchot and the Action of Catholic Section of Board of Education in Saving Money According to Law.

To the Editor of the Free Press. Sir,—A cursory perusal of Mr. O'Donohue's attempt to answer the Rev. Father McCarthy's letter, which appeared in the Free Press issue of the 8th instant, is more than sufficient to convince any honest reader that the gentleman, if he had anything at all to do with his so-called reply, was still laboring under some nightmare, call it by which name you like, when he wrote it. Well it is Sir that you take good care not to hold yourself responsible for such opinions as expressed by Mr. O'Donohue, for the public may endure from him such utterances as it would be a disgrace to any decent paper to uphold. Such is the case in the present instance; and permit me, Sir, to substantiate my assertion by calling the attention of your readers to some of Mr. O'Donohue's pitiable quibbles.

Mr. O'Donohue says "Every word that United Canada has said about the Manitoba schools and school fund is as true as the gospel which Father McCarthy preaches." This, Sir, is either a terrible oath in the mouth of Mr. O'Donohue, or it must be accepted as a remark reflecting very disrespectfully on Rev. Father McCarthy as a priest. But it cannot be taken in the latter sense, for I have Mr. O'Donohue's own admissions that Father McCarthy is a zealous and pious priest, for whom he (Mr. O'Donohue) always had a great respect; therefore, it must be granted that the utterance is truly a solemn oath to make us believe that Mr. O'Donohue's testimony is based upon truth. On the other hand, Sir, whenever there is a question of facts, it is clear that two or three of these facts well proven are worth all the assertions made without evidence by any man, even though he should call heaven and earth to witness. And I therefore deeply regret for Mr. O'Donohue's own sake, that he has failed, so far, to substantiate any of his charges.

These questions in the United Canada have been very clearly answered by the Rev. Father McCarthy, and in the very terms which should best suit Mr. O'Donohue's methods. "Is it true that a rental was charged for one of the schools, although the lands were free grants, and the school built with the money of Catholic laymen?" "It is not true," says the Rev. Father, after having stated that the school in question as well as the Holy Angels school, were built with money—\$4,750—borrowed by the fathers of St. Mary's; the school trustees having agreed to pay, call it rent if you like, \$200 yearly, for the use of such schools, by the bye, a sum which hardly means an interest of 5 per cent. Is this not a satisfactory answer? It may be, it would be sufficient information to satisfy any gentleman possessed of common sense, but Mr. O'Donohue has a particular craving for any information re the management of the Oblate Father's financial affairs—he is such a good conscientious Catholic! In his fear that the dear fathers should have misappropriated the people's money to build schools for the people's children, he anxiously demands that Rev. Father McCarthy should explain where the loan came from. In plain English this is a piece of unqualified insolence, further surpassed by Mr. O'Donohue's further insolence in asking "how it was that Father Ritchot had been able to lend several thousand dollars to the municipality of St. Norbert." This is a recent discovery, which seems to be deeply interesting to Mr. O'Donohue, but why did he not go a little further in the field of discoveries? For he might easily have come to the knowledge that Father Ritchot upon coming to Manitoba had more of personal wealth than Mr. O'Donohue, from all appearance, would ever suspect such a Nazarene to be possessed of. As to the loan of \$4750 obtained by the Oblate Fathers, I am authorized to inform Mr. O'Donohue that it was obtained partly from a religious community in Quebec and partly from the late Bishop Faraud. Will the gentleman be satisfied with this plain statement? Now let me touch upon another item of stewardship. Mr. O'Donohue wants an account for the \$14,000, more accurately \$13,879.47, "that was boarded up"—forgive me for repeating the words—by the authority of His Grace the late Archbishop Tache, and which had to be paid over to the government when the present school act came in force." This accumulation was, as Mr. O'Donohue understands it, in direct violation of the school act. Gross ignorance and base impudence! I regret to have to use the expression, but it is not any too strong, under the circumstances. For had Mr. O'Donohue had the least anxiety for the laments Archbishop of St. Boniface, he would certainly, before making such a manual of the late school law, and he would have learned therein that the money voted by the legislature for school purposes, each section of the board was authorized by the law to make a reserve of ten per cent of such grant to meet unforeseen expenses; he would have learned that it was the duty—a duty which was performed to the very letter of the law—of the superint-

tendent of each section to have such money deposited in a bank. He could in like manner, by having recourse to proper authority, have obtained the information that the \$14,000 in question were not paid over to the government when the present school act came in force, but long before, i.e., 23rd July, 1880. Moreover I am in a position to assure Mr. O'Donohue, that the right of the Catholic section of the board to such \$14,000 was perfectly recognized by the government itself, who demanded the money at the time, as a simple matter of administration, giving us the solemn assurance that it would merely be held in trust for the benefit of the Catholic schools of the province. Mr. O'Donohue may not know this; he has so much more to learn regarding school matters—just as he may also be ignorant of fact that the "hoarding up" practice of the Catholic section was for a long time also practiced by the Protestant section of the board. Let him read for his instruction what is written in plain figures in the report of the superintendent of education for the Protestant schools of Manitoba for the year ending Jan. 31, 1885. At page seven it is written: "At the commencement of the school year of 1884 (February 1st) the balance of the fund of 1883 remaining unexpended was \$9,631.41." In 1884 the expenditure was in excess of the grant so that the balance at the end of 1884 was reduced to \$6,681.02. In 1887 it had come down to \$4,680.29. It might not be, I pray, because the Catholic section continued in its saving policy whilst the Protestant section, reducing year after year the balance at their credit which in 1883 amounted to \$9,631.41; might it not be for such a reason that Mr. O'Donohue comes to-day a reason that Mr. O'Donohue comes to-day a reason to stain the memory of one of the noblest figures in Canada, with a crime of which the government, to which he accorded his hearty support, is the true and only guilty party?

One word more, Sir, and then I have done. Referring to me, Mr. O'Donohue will have it that I know better than my utterances on school exhibitions would seem to imply. There is one thing above all that I know, and would wish Mr. O'Donohue to know also, viz.: That in my sermon I never made any reference to exhibits at the World's Fair by the Catholic schools of Manitoba. When speaking of school exhibits at Chicago, I only made reference to the schools of Quebec. It was in 1885, and to the International exhibition held in London, England, that the Manitoba exhibits of which I spoke were sent. And I am in a position to prove to Mr. O'Donohue, whenever politely invited to do so, that such exhibits were not the work of colleges and academies and higher institutions of learning only, but even work furnished by some of the schools along the Red River, those schools at which he sneers with contempt, but in which there are many children of ten and twelve years who could teach him, along with the rudiments of a sound Catholic doctrine, the elements of that primary education which he himself seems to lack to such a lamentable extent.

A. A. CHERRIER, P. P. Winnipeg, April 16th, 1895.

Catholic Art Publications.

The Catholic Art Publishing Association of Philadelphia are doing a good work in producing art publications that are not only most creditable to the firm, but are issued at such prices as to be within the reach of all who may care to possess them. Their latest production is "The Holy Rosary Illustrated" being a book containing the method of saying the Rosary, with the mysteries, by St. Alphonsus Liguori, with illustrations from world-famous paintings by most eminent artists. The book is beautifully brought out and has elicited warm encomiums from many of the Bishops of the United States and this country. The merit of the illustrations well entitle them to such praise. The spirit and devotional feeling of the original paintings are admirably brought out and thus through the eye the devotion appeal to the best emotions of the soul with irresistible force. The book is also finely embellished otherwise, the pages being splendidly foliated and the binding a model of good taste. As the Bishops say "it should find a welcome in every Catholic home," and in order to bring it before the Catholics of this country, the publishers have requested Mr. F. W. Russell, who has obtained a copy, to introduce it here. He will be glad to give any of our readers further information regarding the book, and to obtain copies on receipt of the price, two dollars.

Toadying to Protestants.

Our "liberal" Catholics might wish to know what Cardinal Newman thought of them. "Here," he says, "is another grave matter against you, that you are so well with the Protestants about you. I do not mean to say that you are not bound to cultivate peace with all men, and to do them all the offices of charity in your power. Of course you are, and if they respect, esteem and love you, it redounds to your praise and will gain you a reward; but I mean more than this—I mean that they do not respect you, but they like you, because they think of you as of themselves; they see no difference between themselves and you. This is the very reason they so often take political rights. We gain their support by giving them a false impression in our persons of what the Catholic Church is, and what Catholics are bound to believe, and to do; and in this not the case often, but the world takes up your interest because you share its sins."

Mr. J. S. Ewart Replies

TO THE VERSATILE AND VARIOUS DR. BRYCE.

Seven More Bad Facts—Two Quotations From the Professor in 1877, Which Force Him in 1895 to Turn Himself Inside Out.

To the Editor of The Nor-West. Sir,—My former letter was written to prove that Dr. Bryce's sermon was based upon bad facts. I enumerated twelve of them, and can give more if necessary. Dr. Bryce has since then published a letter—not for the purpose of maintaining his facts (for there is only one of them that he pretended to uphold) but merely so far as one can judge, (1) To ascertain what "jargoled wrongheadedness" is, and (2) to prove that there are plenty more bad facts where the others came from. The professor writes, "Mr. Ewart says he is not quite satisfied with the remedial order." Inasmuch as I did not say so, and the professor had my letter before him when he wrote it, I commend to him this statement as a good illustration of jargoled wrongheadedness. (Bad fact No. 13.) He continues: "It is beside the mark to say that the order does not mean what it says." This is an excellent example of J. W. for I did not say so. (B. F. No. 14.)

The professor has a new theory as to bill of rights No. 3. In January, 1890, he said that "Riel and his provisional government, or to have allowed to have substituted, or to have seemed to have substituted, a quite a fictitious bill of rights. This (for Riel) and his government having drawn it (he wished), could substitute another if they wished, so the professor in his sermon altered the charge, and said that "a prominent gentleman in Ottawa" informed me that he knew the real bill of rights was changed in Ottawa, unknown to the English-speaking people of Red River. In my letter I pointed out that this was impossible for I had not three delegates were English and would not have sanctioned any such change. Now, the professor commits that there was no change at all, but that "the real bill of rights" was the one used! I am sorry for "the prominent gentleman at Ottawa." The professor (if not subject to J. W.) would have stood by him for more than six days! (B. F. No. 15, to be settled between the "prominent gentleman" and the professor.)

The doctor further makes me say "that all charges about filling the school census with wrong names had no foundation." I said nothing of the sort. (B. F. No. 16.) The professor in his sermon repeated an old slander, and did not tell his audience that the truth of it had been tested in court. That is what I said.

The professor says: "Defective education. Mr. Ewart does not deny this." I did deny it. (B. F. No. 17.) He continues: "He simply tells me that I should sympathize with it." I did not say so. (B. F. No. 18.) The professor says: "Surely Mr. Ewart ought to know that Sir George Cartier had almost all to do with the Manitoba act." There is the same reckless J. W. again. Mr. Pope, in his "Life of Sir John Macdonald" (II., 249), referring to Sir John and the Manitoba act, says: "My object is merely to show what were the views of him who had by far the greatest share in the framing of this piece of legislation as to its scope and effect." Stafford Northcote the bill, having Sir Cartier introduced the bill, having Sir Cartier and the speakers with great skill... and gave very ingenious turns to his difficult points." (Ib., 64.) It was only after Sir John's illness that "Sir George" and took up the Manitoba bill, which had dropped from the hands of his chief." (Ib., 79; B. F. No. 19.)

I said at Ottawa as to the agitation for the abolition of separate schools in 1876: "Prof. Bryce wrote a pamphlet... but that is all that was done." The professor asks me "as a man" to admit that I was wrong. In his sermon the professor said: "The columns of the Free Press and other papers were filled with the discussion." Referring to this in his letter he says "I cited whole columns in the Free Press and other papers, embracing twenty or thirty columns." Notice the change. In his letter at the most thirty columns spread over at the least three newspapers and twelve months; that is five-sixths of a column per month to each paper; but in the sermon "the columns of the F. P. and other papers were filled with the discussion." "As a man" then I admit that there was an agitation in the newspapers—but on one condition I say so, namely, that the professor will get some one (not noted for J. W.) to agree with me. I admit, too, (upon the same condition) the agitation in the Protestant school section where a resolution was passed, which was withheld from the press and finally allowed to drop. But I cannot (much as I wish) admit Mr. Davis' wrath, for it was not at that time, nor upon that subject. And I really cannot admit Archbishop Tache's pamphlets as part of the agitation for the abolition of separate schools.

As part of my criticism I quoted, with passages from the professor's book. He explains in his letter what he meant to say, and then appeals to his readers: "Was there ever a greater attempt made to distort a man's words? Whenever

the professor wants to explain J. W. to you let him say: "If I were to quote your exact words, and you were to quote that I distorted them, that would be untrue no doubt, but it would be worse than a crime, it would be a blunder—it would in fact be J. W." An unusual complication of perversity and ingenuity, wrongheadedness and ability, recklessness and industry, distortion and capacity, desinenousness and rhetoric demands the use of an unusual term to describe it. If anyone can suggest anything better than "jargoled wrongheadedness," I shall adopt it with pleasure. JOHN S. EWART.

Winnipeg, April 9. P. S.—Tomorrow I shall give further extracts from Prof. Bryce. I keep them separate from this letter for fear of another charge of distortion.

Two Extracts From the Professor's Pamphlet of 1877.

To the Editor of the Nor-West. Sir,—I send you two extracts from Dr. Bryce's pamphlet of 1877. They may help us to understand [1] whether, under the old system, any "special rights" were "given to either Catholics or Protestants"; [2] whether "all moneys" were "equitably distributed"; and [3] whether, as I have contended, the old Catholic schools could properly be called "national." The professor, in answering Archbishop Tache, says: "In his introduction, in stating apparently quite incidentally the state of educational question, the writer endeavours to show that separate or dissident schools are in existence in this province, and on this point is plainly wrong. And well may he be, for a careful reading of the educational acts of the province—called a system, will fail to discover two absolutely distinct classes of schools in the province. The very words separate and dissident have been removed [Cap. 27, clause 28, 38 Vic.]; not only so, but the phrase "regular districts" is repealed, and the idea of removed, and all made co-ordinate. The Board of Education is to coordinate every quarter; and is charged with the duty of seeing that new school law for towns and organization of the common schools. The government of the common schools system of schools, and is divided according to the population of children. No special rights are given to either Catholics or Protestants; all moneys are equitably distributed; even the taxes of corporate bodies being divided according to school population. But it may be objected, are there not two sections of the board having control over different schools. True, but if the act be carefully read, it will be seen that these sections are really, in fact are called committees of the board, and that the board is given the jurisdiction of referring all matters that it does not retain to itself to adjudication of the two sections. These two sections then go on with the things referred to them by the board."

"The separate school supporters in Ontario are viewed in the light of being exempt from the general law which establishes a national system of education. In Manitoba the Roman Catholic schools are as much national as the Protestant. They are in no sense separate schools as mentioned. They are to all intents and purposes by law what a number of the schools of Halifax, Nova Scotia, were by custom under the late Archbishop Conolly, Roman Catholic as to pupils, Roman Catholic as to the nomination of teachers, and consequently Roman Catholic as to the teachers employed, and yet these were never claimed as in any sense separate schools. The whole by the committee of the board into two bodies of separate school districts, so that both sets of schools being on the same footing there is no separate school established either in fact or in name, the French and Roman Catholic being so nearly synonymous it was considered desirable to establish side by side Roman Catholic and Protestant schools under one jurisdiction, just as the city ward schools side by side on account of are in other words simply the result of a differentiation as to administration, while forming part of one organic whole." JOHN S. EWART.

The second number of the official journal, The Canadian, is to hand, and with the announcement that this is the assessment, which they must pay the 3rd of May. Branch treasurers must remit the assessment to the Grand Sec. Branch No. 97 of Quebec city headed the initiations for the month of February, viz., 8; the total number of initiatory branches were organized during February, and seven more are about to be formed, two of them being in the Northwest Territories, viz., at Battleford and Prince Albert.

People appear to think that, while good manners should be strenuously exacted from children, precept in this connection may stand instead of example, and that orders may be given them and remarks made upon them as if they were devoid of natural feelings and perceptions. As a matter of fact, if, when people wish children to do something for them, they would address an equal, if they would thank them for little services rendered, speak to them gently, answer their reasonable questions civilly, and avoid unnecessary comments upon their appearance, they would behave far less trouble in teaching them to behave with like consideration for others.