

The Catholic Record

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.
United States and Europe—\$2.50.
Publisher & Proprietor, Thomas Coffey, L.L.D.
Editor (Rev. James T. Foley, R.A.)
Associate Editor—H. F. Mackintosh.
Manager—Robert M. Burns.
Address: Business letters to the Manager.
Classified Advertising 15 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.
Obituary 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 Archbishops Falcioni and
Faretelli, late Apostolic Delegates to Canada,
the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa,
and St. Boniface, the Bishops of London,
Hamilton, Peterborough, and Oshawa,
N. Y., and the clergy throughout the
Dominion.
In St. John, N. B., single copies may be
purchased from Mrs. M. A. McGuire, 249 Main
St. and John J. Dwyer.
In Sydney, N. S. W., single copies may be
purchased at Murphy's Bookstore.
In Montreal single copies may be purchased
from J. Milloy, 211 St. Catherine St. West.
In Ottawa, single copies may be purchased
from J. W. O'Brien, 141 Nicholas St.
The following agents are authorized to
receive subscriptions and orders for The
Catholic Record:
General Agents—M. J. Hagan, Stephen V.
James, George J. Mulvey, Clarence A.
McIntyre, Resident Agents—Miss
Saunders, Sydney; E. R. Costello, 75 Pender
St. West, Vancouver, B. C.; H. Chamberlin,
Ottawa West; Mrs. Geo. E. Smith, 230 Main
St., Montreal; Mrs. J. Edward McKelvie, 224
Martin Ave., Elmwood, Winnipeg, Man.;
John P. O'Farrell, 38 Aberdeen St., Quebec
City.

LONDON, SATURDAY, JUNE 3, 1922

ABOUT POLITICS

The Dominion census gives a long list of religious denominations in Canada. If a survey of these bodies were undertaken by independent investigators for the purpose of ascertaining how far they interfere in politics as organized bodies, it would be found that the Catholic Church interferes least of all. As individuals, Catholics are like other citizens; but the Church as such does not meddle with Dominion politics at all. We are not asking whether this is right or wrong, wise or unwise. We are referring only to what takes place in fact. If the Catholic Church had influenced the formation of the present Dominion Cabinet, the Department of Immigration would have been placed in charge of a Catholic. On the contrary, from the personnel of the Cabinet it is evident that Catholics sought portfolios which suited them as politicians. The truth is that the Church in Canada has not the machinery for united action in such matters. There is no central bureau. There are no meetings of all the Bishops. There is no correspondence on the subject. There is no fund to draw on for the cost of united action.

On the other hand, it is assumed generally by Protestants that the Catholic Church is continually using her influence for political effect. Thus, when the Anglican Bishop of Huron sought to account for the fact that the Catholics have Separate schools in Ontario, in his address to the London Synod a few weeks ago, he did not even think it worth while to inquire into the facts. He simply assumed that the Catholics "got Separate schools by playing party politics successfully." This statement is not merely false; it is cruelly false. Separate schools were imposed upon Catholics by the action of Protestant ministers in 1841, and especially by the action of Anglican ministers. Dr. J. George Hodgins, who wrote a History of Separate schools in Ontario, was, we believe, an Anglican. At any rate he was a Protestant, and his official position as colleague of Dr. Ryerson gave him access to the facts. In his History he asks the question: Who was responsible for the introduction of Separate schools into Ontario? He answers (page 19): "It was owing principally 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 Bible which the numerous petitions and Anglican propaganda in the press sought to place in the Common schools as a text-book is the version authorized by King James, in other words, the Protestant version. The Legislature could not do this, any more than it could impose the Catholic Catechism as a text-book in all the schools. The outcome was that the Legislature divided the Common schools into different branches, allowing the formation of Separate school boards, both Protestant and Catholic, for the benefit of the minority in each place. The Bishop and Clergy of the Church of England in Toronto actually petitioned the Legislature of 1841 to provide "that the education of the children of their own Church may be entrusted to their own pastors, and that an annual grant from the assessments may be awarded for

their instruction." This was asking very much more in the way of separation than was ever obtained or even sought by Catholics.

How account for the fact that an Anglican Bishop, in a formal address to a Synod, passed over the known facts of the case and gave instead a mere supposition of his own? The answer is—prejudice. Nothing but the traditional prejudice of his class led him to substitute fancy for fact.

ABOUT SCHOOL GRANTS

One of the claims made by Separate school supporters is a proportional share of all legislative school grants. From 1863 to 1907 this claim was never questioned. Then the Department of Education made a new set of regulations, dividing the grants on a basis which departed from the basis of proportional school population, with the result that the Separate schools received in grants a smaller aggregate amount than the Act of 1863 gave them. In 1915-16 the Separate school authorities represented to the Government that the Separate schools were entitled to the full proportional share. The Government consulted as legal advisers Messrs. Cartwright & Middleton in 1916, and the advice given to the Government by these lawyers is now published. It is as follows:

"It appears that a question has arisen with regard to the mode of apportioning the special grants for urban, Public and Separate and also the general grant for the rural Public and Separate schools. The facts, as we understand them, are as follows: The practice of the education department is to divide these grants by first making an allotment to the Public and Separate schools according to school attendance as provided in the first part of subsection 2 of section 6 of the department of education act, and then to apportion the said allotment among the Public schools and the Separate schools respectively, according to the regulations which were passed following clauses 'd' and 'e' of subsection 1 of said section 6, which regulation provide for the allowance of certain sums of money to each school according to the class of teacher engaged and the equipment of such school.

"The result of this apportionment is that the sum allotted to the Separate schools is not exhausted and there is a considerable amount, which under subsection 5 of section 6 at the end of the fiscal year lapses and becomes part of the consolidated revenue.

"The Separate schools have now made a claim that they are entitled to the full amount of the allotment made to them under the first part of subsection 2 and that no part of the allotment should be allowed to lapse.

"By an act of the old province of Upper Canada, 26 Victoria, chapter 5, which is entitled 'An act to restore to Roman Catholics in Upper Canada certain rights in respect to Separate schools,' it was provided by section 20, that 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, etc., according to the average number of pupils attending such schools during the twelve next preceding months or during the number of months which 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. This act was passed in the year 1863, four years prior to the passing of the British North America Act. The British North America Act by section 93 provides that in each province the legislature might exclusively make laws in relation to education, but that 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 in the province at the union. It would seem clear that the share of the public grant on the basis specified was a right of the Separate schools, existing at the passing of the British North America Act, and under the provisions of section 93 above quoted from that act it would seem that the legislature should not prejudicially affect such right.

"We are therefore of the opinion that the Roman Catholic Separate schools are entitled to the whole of the allotment made to them under the first part of sub-section 2 of section 6 of the department of education act, and that the same should be divided among them so as not to leave our surplus to lapse into the consolidated revenue fund under sub-section 5 of the same section. We may add that in expressing this opinion we are not to be understood as saying that the grant to any school may not be withheld for cause."

Thus advised, the Government in 1917 resumed the payment of the full proportional share on the basis of school attendance. During the ten years prior to 1917 the Separate schools lost over a hundred thousand dollars of the grants due according to the Act of 1863. The Hearst

Government brought the grants back to the basis of attendance, as the lawyers advised; but refused to refund the amounts which had been lost during the previous ten years. We have to place to the credit of the Hearst Government that it gave us at least partial justice. One wonders what measure of credit can Separate school supporters accord the Drury Government after its demise. So far its credit side is a blank.

One does not need to be a lawyer to see that no Government had the right to deprive the Separate schools of the grants due according to the Act of 1863. The wording of this Act is so plain that no one could distort it into meaning anything different from what Messrs. Cartwright & Middleton found it to mean. Hence, the amounts lost to the Separate schools during the years 1907-17 are clearly due to those schools from the Provincial Treasury. Why have two successive Governments refused to perform this act of plain justice? Because the Governments are afraid of the majority of electors. All the talk about Ontario striving to live up to the pacts of 1863-67 is nothing but talk. Acts speak louder than words. The Government knows that the debt should be paid, but shrinks from paying it in presence of people who are pained at seeing justice done to Catholics.

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

The stand which the synods and conferences of the different Protestant sects are now taking in regard to religious teaching in the schools is somewhat inconsistent with their almost unanimous opposition to Separate schools as demanded by Catholics. They are now advocating a more extensive teaching of religion in the Public schools. Religious bodies in the United States have gone on record, advocating the same thing. The Catholic Church has always maintained that, wherever possible, religious education should accompany secular education.

The Church teaches and has always taught that not only the intellect must be trained but also the will; and the will can only be properly directed by principles of religion. Why then should there be opposition to the Catholics who have put in practice the very resolutions which the various synods and conferences have passed? It seems that the opposition is not so much directed against the fact of Separate schools as against the Catholic Church itself, and the many specious arguments used by the opponents of Separate schools are nothing more than popular appeals to the bigotry of the people to prevent the Catholic Church exercising that influence over her children for which she was divinely appointed.

The activity which the different religious bodies both in Canada and the United States display in urging the necessity of religious training in the Public schools, must have been brought about by the careful study of results which the Public schools have produced under the present system. They admit that under the present system the Public schools have not produced the best type of citizens. The crime wave that is sweeping both countries, the number of delinquents of tender years, have forced them to take notice and ascertain the cause of these and at the same time to suggest a remedy. Judging from the published reports of their meetings, Methodists, Presbyterians, Baptists and Anglicans, all place the cause of these conditions on the lack of religious teaching in the Public schools, and the remedy they suggest is a more extensive teaching of religion.

But just here is the difficulty. What religious instruction will be acceptable to all the Protestant sects, not to mention the Jewish Religion? They may agree on what is not to be taught, but to formulate a positive set of religious principles that would be effective, they would be hopelessly at sea.

In doctrinal matters they differ fundamentally. In the interpretation of the Scriptures not only is each sect a law unto itself but each individual enjoys the same right. Some believe in the Divinity of Christ; others reject this doctrine. Some believe in the necessity of Baptism for salvation; others deny this. All the other Christian doctrines have their advocates and their opponents. Not a single religious belief can be mentioned which is not ardently defended by

some, and most vigorously denied by others.

The fundamentals of Christian belief cannot be taught in the Public schools without offending the convictions of some one. If this is true of the Christian sects, how offensive must such teaching be to the Jews and the Unitarians, whose religious beliefs are irreconcilable with the teaching of the Christian Religion. In any science a start must be made from fundamental principles, if the science is taught properly. Religion is no exception. If religion is to be taught effectively the first principles of religion must be stated. But no two Protestant sects are agreed as to what are the first principles of religion. Principles of religion, therefore, must not be taught in the Public schools.

Since principles of religion cannot be taught in the Public schools, and since there is urgent need of something that will influence the life and conduct of the pupils, influencing them to do good, and restraining them from evil, the advocates of religious training in the Public schools have found a substitute in a certain system of ethics. In their zeal they are now engaged in working out a plan of moral teaching that will be acceptable alike to Jew and Christian and Atheist. It is a rather difficult task as the same difficulties which are evident in the teaching of doctrine are present in the teaching of ethics. There is just as much difference among the Christian sects in regard to ethics as there is in regard to doctrine.

A few weeks ago, in the city of London, there arose a heated controversy over the question whether the students should be allowed to dance at the opening of the new Collegiate Institute. Members of different religious denominations protested against this form of amusement as dangerous to the morals of the students. They appealed to the School Board. Immediately the School Board, which has no right and claims no right to define what is dangerous to morals, became the sole judge in this particular case. The dance was held, and from the newspaper reports an enjoyable time was had by all.

The point here is who is going to determine what ethics should be taught in the school. In the particular case stated above, the School Board determined what the students of the London Collegiate Institute should be taught in regard to dancing. Its decision did not meet with favor among a great number who pay their taxes for the support of the school and whose convictions are strongly opposed to an amusement of this kind for children. Who will determine the morality of indiscriminate frequenting of the "movies" or of the countless other forms of present day amusements? It surely does not fall within the province of the School Boards. It cannot be determined by the different religious bodies as they differ among themselves. It remains that there is no one with authority to determine what must and what must not be done. The children, as heretofore, will be left pretty much to themselves to determine what their conduct will be.

Religion is the only factor that can safeguard the morals of the children. There can be no substitute. The Catholic Church has taken this stand from the beginning. Since it is impossible to have this in the Public schools, she demands schools of her own where her children can be taught both the principles of belief and principles of ethics. Why then find fault with her when she puts in practice what all religious denominations are now demanding but which they are unable to accomplish?

HON. MR. RANEY

In the issue of the Mail and Empire, May 23, it is stated that the Hon. Mr. Raney denies ever making the statement that the present system of Catholic representation on the Board of Education was a rank injustice. The Hon. R. H. Grant, Minister of Education, corroborates the denial of the Attorney-General. A considerable time has elapsed since His Lordship, Right Rev. M. F. Fallon, quoted the Attorney-General as making the above statement. It was never publicly denied, and it seems strange that after all these weeks a denial should come now when the Bishop is away in Europe and unable to help the memory of the Hon. Attorney-General.

In the meantime an explanation of the long silence on the part of the Attorney-General and the Minister of Education is due the public. The statement was a most important one and had greater influence from the fact, as was alleged, that it came from the head of the legal department of the Province. No doubt His Lordship on his return will try to refresh the memories of the Hon. Gentlemen.

THE GENOA CONFERENCE

By THE OBSERVER

A French paper, some time ago, had a cartoon representing John Bull presenting a final ultimatum to Russia with the words: "I ask you for the last time, will you trade with me?"

The despatches from Genoa are full of the word "peace." One might imagine all Europe was at war. What is the "peace" that is so much talked of? It seems to be peace for financiers and traders, and nothing else. But it has only one meaning for the masses of the European peoples, and that is the opposite of war, of which they have had so recent and so bitter an experience.

We have not the chance to read much, in Canada, of the views of other nations on the tangled and complicated situation which is the subject of the Genoa Conference. The gathering of news, the sending of cable despatches, the formation of public opinion on this side of the Atlantic, are in the hands of agencies and correspondents and writers who are not much concerned with what is thought of the European situation in Paris, in Rome, or in Brussels; and are greatly dominated by the diplomats and politicians of England. For instance, one of the principal correspondents of The New York Times spent a good while with Mr. Lloyd George in Wales before going to Genoa. It is not surprising that Mr. George bulks large and the rest of the diplomats small in the despatches from Genoa to the New York Times.

As to such of the Canadian papers as have a special correspondent overseas, it has long been noticeable that their accounts of European affairs are colored to accord with the ideas that happen to prevail amongst the leaders of the English Government at any given time.

There have been, for a long time past, many signs that public opinion in England and over here was being prepared for a rupture between England and France. English diplomacy, for over two years past, has been tending towards friendliness with Germany, and a resumption of trade with Russia on easy terms. The Fall after the Armistice and before the Treaty of Versailles, Mr. Lloyd George went to the country. It is interesting to recall now his campaign watch-words. The Kaiser was to be hanged as high as Haman; and Germany was to pay the last cent. But the Kaiser is living the life of a quiet country gentleman at Doorn; and so far from exacting the last cent from Germany, concession after concession has been made in the terms of reparation; always with England's eager consent; always against France's protest.

Reading English newspaper views I think I have been able to see how Mr. Lloyd George and his political associates have been moved so far away from "the last cent" and the hanging of the Kaiser. The English press reflects the views of English finance and trade; and English finance and trade control English politics and England's diplomatic action.

There are in Canada some people—many people—who look at English politics as something beautiful and ideal. For them, there is no sordid or selfish side to the policies and acts of English statesmen. For them, English statesmen are superlatively of no such sordid things as trade, money, or the chances for the next general election, can weigh in the slightest.

But that is not the history, nor the present condition, of English politics; and it is not the history, nor the present condition of English diplomacy. England has not always fought for the right; nor, when she has fought for it, has it always been for the sake of establishing or protecting the right. Nations fight and scheme for their own safety and for their own prosperity; and beyond these things, they fight little and scheme little. England is planning at Genoa for England first

of all; and ideals are playing only a secondary part.

Soon after the War, English statesmen perceived that her prosperity was not to be served by crushing Germany. The Kaiser's head and "the last cent" were good enough to carry a general election; one general election; an election run amidst the still-existing excitement of the War. But such policies were good only to win that election; they would not do; and they will not do for the next election. For, in the next election, the moneyed interests, the forces which make and unmake English governments, will want to know, not about the Kaiser's head or "the last cent," but about the future of English manufactures and trade.

This fact was clearly perceived in Berlin; and German diplomacy bent itself to the task of persuading English manufacturers, bankers and traders, that the welfare of English business required easy terms to Germany.

"The balance of power in Europe" is still the main subject matter for the thoughts of English politicians; but its nature has changed from what it was when it used to give rise to wars long ago. "The balance of power in Europe" is now financial and commercial, primarily; and is military and naval only in a secondary way.

And so, the safety and welfare of which English papers, influenced by business men, and English politicians, influenced by both, have been thinking, since the War, are financial and commercial safety and welfare, more than any other. England can hardly have considered herself in any danger in a military or naval sense, nor likely to be in any such danger. What she has thought to be in danger is her business; her manufactures and her exports; her investments in other European countries.

France has also been worrying about her business situation; but she has other things, and worse, to worry about. Germany is of the past as a sea-power; but not as a land-power; and that is worrying France far more than her business situation. Besides, France has no such financial interests in re-building Germany as England has. She is not in such dread of a flood of German goods in her foreign markets; because she has fewer foreign markets and fewer exports. She is much more damaged by the War than England, whose soil was not invaded and ravaged. She lost nearly twice as many men in the War. She is much more interested than England is, in the future of Belgium.

So, without giving France credit for any special devotion to ideals and high principles in her dealings with other States, it is reasonably clear, I think, that her attitude towards Germany and Russia is based on more vital necessity, is more nearly inevitable, and is more logical, and fairer than that of England.

Now, the most crucial question that has come up at Genoa is the question of the French and Belgium property which the Soviet Government wishes to retain and to nationalize. France and Belgium say: "Give us our property, or the value of it." Russia says: "No. We are Communists; and your property must come under that regime; but we will give you the management and the use of it." Belgium alone had four hundred million dollars invested in Russia before the War; and was doing a very large per centage of the manufacturing and the public utility work of that country; from 80 per cent. in some lines to 75 per cent. in others.

Mr. Lloyd George says to France, (which has also very heavy investments), and to Belgium: "Let Russia have the property, on the terms she offers you. We must reconstruct Russia and finance her. The 'peace' of trade requires it." France and Belgium are not convinced. England is ready to sacrifice some investments too; not so much as the others, I believe; but she apparently sees her way to make up the loss in new trade with Russia. France and Belgium do not seem to see their way to do that.

This question has only come to an acute phase at Genoa; it is not a new question, and meantime Germany and Russia have made a treaty. It seems that since this treaty was made, Mr. Lloyd George has become more eager still to make Russia a present of the French and

Belgium property. What is the reason? Does he see Germany outbidding him for commercial domination of Russia; of the greatest unexploited natural resources left on earth? Has his softness to Germany come back roundaboutly to embarrass him?

There is the situation at Genoa so far as it can be seen by an average observer on this side of the Atlantic. There is much in it that is obscure; much that is distorted; but some of the main lines emerge from the fog of partisanship and the propaganda.

Mr. George told Mr. Barthan that the Entente was coming to the parting of the ways. On the whole Berlin has a good deal to feel satisfied about, in the diplomatic doings of the last two years; and I suppose Berlin does feel fairly well satisfied.

Nobody seems to be worrying very much in Canada; though the results may cost us blood and money some day.

NOTES AND COMMENTS

AN INTERESTING item comes to us from an Italian contemporary. Just before leaving for home after the events of the coronation, His Eminence, Cardinal Begin, paid a visit to the Salesian Fathers at Valdocco, and in the Borgo S. Paolo, Turin. He also visited the Marist Brothers in the same city and was much impressed by the apostolic and world-wide character of the work being carried on by these two religious orders. The impression was not all on one side, however, as the Fathers and Brothers speak of the "youthful vigor" which characterizes the Canadian prelate, and the ease with which he bears his burden of eighty-five years.

ANOTHER item of interest from across the water is the projected removal of Cardinal Newman's famous foundation, the Oratory School, from Birmingham, to Caversham Park, a large estate recently purchased by the Fathers near Reading. Birmingham and the Oratory School have been so long associated in the Catholic mind that the big city of the Midlands will not seem quite the same place without the latter. It was within three years of his conversion that the future Cardinal set himself down in Birmingham to begin his great work for the re-conversion of England, and fifteen years thereafter that he opened his school. So that after a successful existence of over sixty years, it begins to rank as one of modern England's venerable institutions, antedating, as it does, most of the Catholic schools of today.

WHILE the world at large was debating the possibility of restoring the Cathedral of Rheims, so badly damaged by the Germans during the War, France had already put in hand the work of restoration, and has now carried it through to practical completion. The ceremony of re-dedication, marked as an occasion of public thanksgiving, is indeed, already an event of the past, and the civilized world which mourned the mutilation of the venerable fane, will now join with the French people in their joy over its restoration.

It is re-assuring to be informed, and from independent authorities, that religion in France has really benefited by the War. In spite of other huge and pressing demands, aggravated by the falling down of German reparation promises, the French Government has, we are told, decided to issue bonds to the extent of 200,000,000 francs to re-build 3,000 churches destroyed by the invader. "Carrying the burden of a vast public debt, with little relief from the German reparations upon which they had set so much store," says the Literary Digest, "the French are said to have all that they could do to carry the ordinary expenses of government and provide funds for the restoration of their ruined villages, and for the rebuilding of houses to shelter the homeless," yet it was possible to restore Rheims, and to inaugurate the above-mentioned project of church-reconstruction.

SAYS THE Boston Transcript: "It was not enough to re-build homes and schools. The martyred churches—some 8,000 in number—must be built, however hard-pressed the country was to find funds with which to meet the demands of the ordinary budget. War had laid a