

Catholic Record.

MONDAY, SATURDAY, DEC 11, 1886.

REPUBLICAN POLICY.

L'Etendard reproduces from M. G. de la Tour a remarkable article on French Republican policy: What policy have you for two years followed, you pretended liberals of the republican majority? A Jacobinical policy which tends to hand over France to the anarchists, your implacable foe. This will be your punishment, an inevitable punishment, if the conservatives do not relieve you from the consequences of your error. You attack the men and the creeds and the institutions which preserve France from anarchy and you support the factions that have chosen the blood-stained banner of pillage and devastation. Overbearing towards the right, you bow humbly to the extreme left, you seek its alliance, saying, unite with us against God and the believers in God! All rights proceed from the God whom you allow to be blasphemed in Parliament, all true liberties proceed from these rights, and apart from these there is naught but a waste of the country's resources by an abuse of numerical strength. Therefore it is that your policy is all the more tyrannical as it becomes more pronouncedly atheist. The radicals affirm that the world has too long walked on its feet and now pretend to force it to walk on its head. They fully understand, however, just what they want, the overturning of society, the forced equalization of education and of fortunes, the confiscation of my and my neighboring property, and this is why they attack religion, which is, of course, opposed to the accomplishment of their designs. You see in the Christian faith but an obstacle to your omnipotence, and you therefore seek to do what you can to weaken and to destroy the nation. The radicals fight us with open eyes, but you blindly assail the Christian who with this faith protects your families, your properties and the public peace. You attack Christianity, our social future on earth and under the earth, by open trenches, and subterranean approaches, advancing little by little until the opportune moment comes for the explosion and the assault. You have thus been preparing for seven years the decisive attack on religious instruction. You finally succeed in your purpose by means of the Goblet act, whereby the public schools and the souls of the people's children are handed over to you. The religious will be everywhere replaced by a lay teacher, who will cost more and teach less, but who will act as your electoral agent—the enemy at once of the presbytery and the Castle, and bring up a generation of free-thinkers. The good and devoted man will be driven from the school to which he wished to devote his life. In the poor country municipalities it will not be possible to establish private schools, which in any and every case must be subject to your functionaries and your councils. Your victory over the consciences of the poorer classes is complete, you have seized on the education of their children. The majority of the municipalities would, had they been consulted, have protested against your proscriptions and against the exorbitant taxation you inflict on them, for in our country places the religion is yet practiced which you wish to destroy; in an immense number of communes there is not a single atheist—but you admit the rights of none but free-thinkers. Soon too, perchance, you will expect the chaplains of your lycées, and have the history of religion taught in this as it is in your superior courses of Paris, where Mahomet and Confucius are compared to Jesus Christ. May you not charge M. Renan with the organization of this "emanicipation" of thought and of morals? Your chief and capital purpose is to teach successive generations that there is no God—no eternal justice to recompense the faithful believer who lives in rectitude and sincerity. In taking away from man the hope of another life, do you, on the other hand, ameliorate his terrestrial existence? Do you make the nation prosperous and the people materially happy? Oh, no, indeed! In the country to day we find naught but discouragement and desolation. You persist in protecting the foreign producers against the French farmer, whose heavy and unceasing labor can not any longer guarantee the support of his family. In the city factories, you have not been able to do aught but excite combinations and strikes among the workmen, as fatal to themselves as to our industry. Our national industries are declining and the stranger is fast getting hold of our markets. In many of our hospitals the sick workman no longer receives the kindly attention of the religious, no word of consolation any longer soothes his sufferings, for the costly mercenary that you now employ feel towards the sick, unbecomingly and disgust. It is faith that begets charity and creates those works of benevolence, those almsgiving establishments whose purpose is to contradict and whose resources

you waste. The unbeliever is incapable of humanity. St. Vincent of Paul alone founded more institutions of charity than all the lodges of Freemasons combined. The sufferings of the people concern you little and you take little notice of their wishes. Do you respect these wishes at the polls? Do you leave the electors free in their choice? Do you abide by the results of universal suffrage? No, but you declare inadmissible candidatures opposed to your policy. You invalidate a hundred elections for one flimsy cause or another. If a priest supports a candidate you at once come to the conclusion that all priests have done likewise, and thereupon nullify the election of a man against whom you had sent forth an army of officials and political tricksters. Your predecessors, the Jacobins, practiced still better their style of radical freedom of election. They removed by deportation or by the scaffold obnoxious candidates and the journalists that supported them. It is by the oppression of conscience and the restriction of liberty for good that you pretend to consolidate your power and strengthen the republic. For your officials there is no longer either security or dignity. You have destroyed the independence of the judiciary and created an exceptional jurisdiction subservient to your passions. These passions declare themselves in the choice of your diplomatic agents; it is to persecuting atheists that you confide the protection of French and Catholic interests in the extreme east. You assail in France in their constitution, in their recruiting and their support, these missionaries who every where bring to our country the most precious assistance. Fiscal oppression completes your administrative failures; you destroy private fortunes, and ruin the resources of the country. You should have lightened the burdens inflicted by a war whose evils you cruelly aggravated, and these charges you have foolishly augmented until to day you know not how to measure the accumulated deficits you have so long endeavored to conceal. Your financial management has already cost France six milliards (6,000,000,000 fr.), and still you threaten the country with an intolerable increase of taxes. This policy is leading you infallibly to radical government. Take ye care—for we are not alone in uttering this warning. "We are very close to the Commune," said Jules Simon, one of your former chiefs, whose advice you should have taken. If the commune does come, you will bleed under the lash of the radicals, your accomplices in the oppressions of which you are guilty. You will then see how much good there was among the clericals. Bad as is your government the latter would gladly find something in its course to applaud and support. Your blind folly robs them of every hope in this direction. Nothing but a Catholic and Conservative reaction can prevent your policy from working its inevitable end, the destruction of our country.

COERCION AGAIN.

In a remarkable article entitled: "What Michael Davitt says," the Boston Pilot of the 4th inst. publishes some of the opinions of that trusted, true, and honored patriot, collected from interviews, some of which have never been given the public before. Mr. Davitt, according to the Pilot, amongst other things, says: "That the prosecution of William O'Brien and John Dillon by the Tories would be good news for the Nationalists, as it would crystallize popular indignation against the suppression of legal education; and the Government could not have selected two more popular men to fix the nation's attention. He says that the extraordinary welcome he received in the leading cities of Canada, from French as well as Irish, was one of the significant features of his present tour. He says Gladstone's work for Ireland had been so thoroughly done that even the death of this great statesman could not impede the progress of the movement. He says Lord Rosebery is the man who will step to the front in England as a great Liberal leader when Mr. Gladstone retires. Rosebery, though a lay, is at least a sound man of the people, who would be glad to see the House of Lords abolished. He says that the Irish land question can never be settled satisfactorily until it is settled by the Irish Parliament. He says the purchase of land by tenants at the twenty years' purchase rate, is folly on the farmers' part and robbery on the landlords'. He says he will break all engagements in America and return at once to Ireland if the National League is suppressed. He does not think, however, that it will be suppressed. He says that coercion must fail in Ireland as it failed before; and that its only effect will be to strengthen rather than retard the cause. There is no man of observation in the old or new world who does not perceive that coercion must be a failure, but the government, largely influenced by the needy and grasping landlord, himself hard pressed by the Jew money lenders, upon whose usurious loans he buys himself the pleasures and pastimes that have made the Irish aristocracy odious to the world, is likely to be driven into another trial of coercion. The people

of Ireland now see that the landlords are completely at their mercy and will not be forced into paying them exorbitant rents. The very threats of the official press have stimulated the "no rent but a just rent" movement, and the landlords will get nothing if they refuse to take what is fair. Despatches from London announce the agrarian war of 1886, the most formidable ever known, and that if the government is so ill-advised as to prove by its action that it intends to fight the National League, the end of the struggle will be the irremediable ruin of the landlords. The Liberal party in England is a unit in its opposition to coercion, which will be fought to the very bitter end in the coming session of Parliament. With a divided Cabinet and a weak disconnected feeling in Parliament, the Salisbury Churchill combination does not give promise of a long life. Any attempt at coercion will bring about a ministerial crisis and force the early recall of Mr. Gladstone to power. Coercion will assuredly hasten and not retard Home Rule.

THE SCHOOL QUESTION.

We begin this week the publication of the letters to the Right Rev. Dr. Cleary, Bishop of Kingston, on the school question. This question—over an important one—has assumed a new measure of actuality, by the assaults of the Mail on the Catholics generally and on the constitution of the country. The letters, begun this week, will cover a period of six or eight weeks, and will, we think, fully cover the ground held in view by their writer, viz., the demonstration of the inferior position held in the matter of education by the Catholics of Ontario as compared with the minorities in other Provinces.

MR. WILLIAM O'BRIEN.

There are few men who hold a larger or more affectionate hold on the Irish heart than Mr. O'Brien, late member for Malton and still more recently for South Tyrone. Mr. O'Brien's parliamentary career was brief, but extensively serviceable to his country. His speech on Mr. Gladstone's Home Rule Bill would alone entitle him to everlasting gratitude. His name has been mentioned in connection with the representation of South Sligo. Mr. O'Brien has written to the Freeman's Journal explaining his intention not to enter Parliament at present: Dublin, Nov. 11. DEAR SIR—One of the many agencies has circulated a report (an erroneous one, as appears from your admirable report) that Mr. St. James announced at Banninburn on Tuesday that I would be a candidate for the representation of South Sligo. As the rumour has brought upon me a large number of communications, to which it is beyond my power to reply, will you kindly afford me space to say that I do not intend to enter Parliament at present, either for South Sligo or for any other division. Yours sincerely, WILLIAM O'BRIEN. In the grave crisis with which Ireland is now threatened, Mr. O'Brien will no doubt be enabled to render Ireland greater services out of than he could in Parliament. Upon him will fall the brunt of the heavy fighting in the struggle against landlord tyranny. His past triumphs over the Castle warrant us in the belief that he cannot fail, however great and severe the task of his physical energy, and great and severe that task will certainly be in the fight against Ireland's worst foes—the landlords.

A JUST AND GENEROUS VIEW.

We have lately heard so much of French aggression and French domination that one would almost perforce have to believe that the people of Quebec were all in arms ready for a wholesale massacre of their British fellow-citizens. The massacre of St. Bartholomew and the Edict of Nantes have been again trotted out to do duty in the setting of the English majority in this Dominion against the French minority. Is it not then pleasing in view of the Francophobic agitation, to read in La Justice, of Quebec, referring to the Mayorality of Montreal, the following: "Our confere (the Star) pretends that the French Canadians have become so intolerant that they have made up their minds not to have an English-speaking Mayor in Montreal. We do not wish to meddle in this matter which does not concern us, but if we were in the place of our countrymen of Montreal we would, this year, select a Mayor from among the English-speaking citizens. It is now some years since they have had an English Mayor, and by doing this the French-Canadian of Montreal would be giving a splendid example of tolerance and generosity, two virtues which are part of our national traditions in this Province. They would smother at a single blow the cry raised by fanatics who imagine that the French Canadians are decided in doing away with all their compatriots of other nationalities. We would not like to hear our confere of Montreal telling us that this is none of our business. Montreal is the great commercial metropolis of the country. French Canadians all over the country have their eyes incessantly turned towards it. They would be happy to see it choose an English-speaking Mayor worthy of being its First Magistrate. By doing this our compatriots would be showing the whole Dominion that they are not become so exclusive and intolerant as it is attempted in certain quarters to make people believe that they are." In times gone by, and not long since gone by, the Mayorality of Montreal was held almost exclusively by English-speaking gentlemen, and the lion's share of the civic patronage went to the English and Protestant population. In Toronto, on the other hand, so CATHOLIC has ever yet been elected mayor of the city, notwithstanding that there are many Catholic gentlemen in the capital of Ontario well fitted for the position. Their religion is, however, an insuperable bar to their promotion to this office. It will never be said in Lower Canada that a Protestant is excluded from any office simply because he is a Protestant.

it is attempted in certain quarters to make people believe that they are." In times gone by, and not long since gone by, the Mayorality of Montreal was held almost exclusively by English-speaking gentlemen, and the lion's share of the civic patronage went to the English and Protestant population. In Toronto, on the other hand, so CATHOLIC has ever yet been elected mayor of the city, notwithstanding that there are many Catholic gentlemen in the capital of Ontario well fitted for the position. Their religion is, however, an insuperable bar to their promotion to this office. It will never be said in Lower Canada that a Protestant is excluded from any office simply because he is a Protestant.

ARE THE CATHOLICS OF ONTARIO UNFAVORED IN THE MATTER OF EDUCATION?

To the Right Rev. James Vincent Cleary, S. T. D., Bishop of Kingston, etc., etc., etc.

MY LORD BISHOP.—It is, indeed, I think, fitting that to you, as Bishop of Kingston,—the second see in antiquity—in this Dominion, and the mother See of Ontario, whose first Bishop, the illustrious Alexander Macdonnell, laid the foundations of a Catholic school system in this Province, should be addressed the observations prompted by close study of the matter, warranted by some years of observation, and rendered specially opportune by the present circumstances of the Catholic minority in Ontario, in relation to the question of Catholic education in this Premier Province of Canada.

There is, also, another reason why to Your Lordship these letters should be addressed. You were, my Lord, for many years prominently connected with Catholic education in a country which the majority of the Catholics of Ontario look on as their motherland—a land wherein every enactment devised by hostility to its race and religion in this very matter of education, has met with the careless opposition of the Bishops of Ireland. It was Your Lordship's privilege to devote many of the best years of an active life, and all the faculties of a well-stored and far-reaching mind, to the cause of religious education in Ireland. Of the battle waged by the Irish episcopate and clergy, already crowned with a success which gives promise of an early and complete triumph, you might, my Lord, say—*par magna fuit*. The pastoral letter of the Irish Bishops of Oct. 27, 1871, a document of enduring power, and imperishable renown, renews the claims, reiterates the declarations, emphasizes the condemnations of the Irish Bishops in 1824. Note the following remarkable words: "Considering, that in the Roman Catholic Church the literary and religious instruction of youth are universally combined, and that no system of education which separates them can be acceptable to the members of her communion. . . . That any system of education incompatible with the discipline of the Catholic Church, or superintended exclusively by persons professing a religion different from that of the vast majority of the poor of Ireland, cannot possibly be acceptable to the latter. That schools, whereof the master professes a religion different from that of his pupils, or from which such religious instruction as the Catholic Church prescribes for youth is excluded, or in which books and tracts not sanctioned by it are read or commented on, cannot be resorted to by the children of Roman Catholics, etc."

The same pastoral likewise repeats the condemnations, confirms the warnings and endorses the demands of the Fathers of the National Synod of Thurles in 1850, feeling assured, as they declare to their faithful people, "That a system of education, the dangers of which have been publicly and solemnly pointed out by the Church, which is the pillar and ground of truth, a system against the dangers of which the history of modern Europe bears witness, will meet with your marked rebprobation; that you will not yield it encouragement or patronage of any kind, but that you will save your children from its influence. The solemn warning which we address to you against the dangers of those collegiate institutions extends, of course, to every similar establishment known to be replete with danger to the faith and morals of your children—to every school in which the doctrines and practices of your Church are impugned, and the legitimate authority of your pastors set at naught."

Not content with reaffirming the declarations of their venerable predecessors, the Irish Bishops in 1871 thus distinctly, unequivocally and unanswerably place themselves on record. "Catholic parents cannot approve of an education which fits their children only for this life, and ignores that life in which the soul is to live for ever. As faith is the foundation of all our hopes for eternity, and as faith without good works is dead, you cannot choose for your children education which would endanger their faith and morals, and consequently imperil their eternal welfare. "The Bishops close with distinct demands of government, regarding severely, primary, intermediate and higher education. With no small measure of success, I repeat, have the Bishops of Ireland met in their heroic battle for educational

rights. This success gives promise of an early and, we would fain hope, lasting and complete triumph. Constitutional changes in Ireland's relation to Britain, in which you, my Lord, have taken and still take such a lively and practical interest, are at hand—changes that will give to Irishmen the government of Ireland, and to Irish parents the education of Irish children. The struggle for educational freedom here in Ontario does not date from the early period in which the episcopate of Ireland first raised its united voice in solemn protestation against indignity, inequality, injustice. But it does go back to a period comparatively remote in our history: Previous to the legislative union, in 1841, of the Provinces of Upper and Lower Canada, a system of denominational schools, rude and primitive, if you will, but all the same denominational, prevailed in Upper Canada. An official publication of the Department of Education refers to some interesting information concerning the educational progress of the Province of Ontario, which, as it says, at first of slow growth.

In 1798 an unsuccessful attempt was made to endow out of the public lands, granted for that purpose by George III., to the extent of 800,000 acres, a grammar school in each of the four districts into which the Province was then divided, and a central University at York (now Toronto). But the sale of these lands was so slow, and the price per acre obtained for them was so small, that the revenue derived from this source barely defrayed the cost of management, consequently the grammar school scheme was abandoned, as well as that respecting the college.

In 1807 the first legislative enactment was passed, establishing a classical and mathematical school in each of the eight districts into which Upper Canada was then divided. A grant out of the public revenue of £80 sterling (\$400) a year was made to each of these schools. In 1816—nine years after the establishment of the grammar schools—the Legislature of Upper Canada passed the first common, or elementary, school law for that Province. It appropriated \$24,000, or nearly £5,000 sterling, per annum, for the support of the schools to be established; and provided for the management of these schools by trustees elected by the inhabitants in the localities concerned.

In 1822 a Board of Education for Upper Canada was established under the presidency of Ven. Archbishop Strachan, then residing in York (Toronto). It had under its supervision the district grammar schools, and had also the management of the University and grammar school lands. In 1824 a Board of Education was established by His Majesty George III. in 1793. In 1824 a small grant was made to aid in the introduction of common and Sunday-school libraries into the less sparsely settled portions of the country. It was not, however, until 1835 that any systematic or vigorous effort was made by the public men of the time to establish a system of education.

In 1836 a Commission was appointed, consisting of Dr. Thomas Duncombe, M. P. P., Dr. Thomas D. Morrison, and Dr. Bruce to obtain evidence and to prepare a report on a system of education for the Province. An elaborate report on the subject was prepared by Dr. Duncombe, and also on the state of education in the various parts of the United States of America which he had visited. He also prepared a comprehensive draft of a Bill to promote public elementary education, which was printed with the report. It was introduced into the House of Assembly and passed, but failed to pass the Legislative Council. The political crisis which so quickly followed and culminated in the outbreak or rebellion, of 1837, overlaid in confusion all legislation, and prevented further attention being given to the subject for the time.

Immediately after the union of the two Canadas, that is, in 1841, a Bill was introduced by Solicitor-General Day (subsequently Hon. Mr. Justice Day) into the United Parliament and passed, establishing common schools in each of the two Provinces, and authorizing the establishment of "Roman Catholic Separate Schools" in Upper Canada (in cases where the teacher of the public school was a Protestant and vice versa); and "Dissentient Schools" in Lower Canada (in cases where the teacher of the public school was a Roman Catholic and vice versa).

In 1842 it was considered desirable to supersede this Act by one more applicable to the circumstances and wants of each Province. A School Bill for each Province was accordingly passed by the Legislature, the "Separate Schools" and "Dissentient" school provisions were, however, retained in each case. In 1844, Rev. Egerton Ryerson was appointed to the office of Chief Superintendent of Education for Upper Canada, and laid the foundation of the system that has since prevailed in this Province—a system not indeed without its merits, but not calculated to do adequate justice to the claims and the conscientious scruples of the Catholic minority. But the manifest intention of our legislators, despite the efforts of Dr. Ryerson, was to place the Catholic and Protestant communities in Upper and Lower Canada in a position of equality. This will be apparent from a perusal of the report of a discussion in the legislative Assembly of old Canada on July 5th, 1850, when a school law was under discussion. The Catholics of Upper Canada did not, indeed, obtain, and have not since, obtained the privileges enjoyed by the Protestants of Lower Canada, but the principle was affirmed in every legislative measure relating to education passed by the Parliament of old Canada. The report of the discussion just referred to reads as follows: Mr. Hincks said the Government did not desire to place the Roman Catholics in the position which had been contended for by some members of the House. He proposed an amendment to the 19th clause to the effect—"That it shall be the duty of any Municipal Council to grant separate

Schools on the petition of 12 or more colored persons, or Roman Catholics; that none but colored persons shall vote in the election of Trustees for their Schools; and that Roman Catholics shall possess the same privilege."

Mr. W. H. Boulton admitted the integrity of the hon. Inspector General. He had understood that the administration determined to stand or fall by this clause. He was, however, gratified to find, that the remonstrances made by the Roman Catholics of Lower Canada against it had been properly respected; and as that concession had been made, he hoped that a little more would be granted. The dissenting denominations of Lower Canada were entitled to claim their portion of the School Funds, for the erection of a school in which they were entitled to employ a teacher of any religious persuasion they might choose, and he desired to extend the same privilege to Roman Catholics. The intention of his amendment was merely to establish the Protestant and Roman Catholic communities of Upper Canada on the same footing as those of the same persuasion in the Lower Provinces.

Hon. Mr. Cameron (Cornwall) was prepared to show, that the amendment to the 19th clause proposed by the hon. Inspector General, could not work in harmony with the remaining sections of the bill. It was right to privilege the Roman Catholics alone to teach their schools, according to their own religious tenets, it was likewise just that the same should be extended to the several English, Scotch, and other churches, instead of confining them under the general denomination of Protestants. He then proposed an amendment to the effect, that any sect of Protestants should have the right of establishing a separate school on application of twelve heads of families, and that they should receive an appropriation from the School Fund in proportion to the number of their sect to the rest of the population in the school division.

Hon. Mr. Hincks did not anticipate any of those difficulties apprehended by the hon. member for Cornwall, with regard to the general working of the other clauses of the bill. The object of the hon. member for Cornwall was, desiring a separate establishment, was, because the reading of the Protestant version of the Bible in Schools was objectionable to them, whilst it was thought that some of the other religious persuasions differed on the same subject. Wherever the Bible was used as an ordinary school book, its objection would prevail. He preferred the 19th clause as it originally stood; but in consequence of many desiring some alteration of it, he had introduced the amendment.

Hon. Mr. Baldwin was not prepared to say whether the objections raised by the hon. member for Cornwall, as the general working of the Bill, would or would not be founded in fact. With respect to the objection of religion with secular education, he was convinced of its utter impracticability; if it were at all practicable he would readily agree with the views of the hon. member for Cornwall. But in a new country such as Canada, it could never operate beneficially. Even in the Mother Country this principle was found impracticable; and if among a population where the views of the greater number were identical, such an impediment existed, it would be folly to propose the system to work in the midst of the numerous sects and religious denominations which are settled here. It was, therefore, entirely on the ground of impracticability, that he opposed the proposal.

Hon. J. H. Cameron maintained that his views, with respect to religion and secular education, could be carried out. Mr. Ross would not vote for anything in the shape of an odious distinction. He opposed the 19th clause as well as the amendment.

The Hon. Mr. Cameron's amendment was put and lost, there being only 5 votes in its favor. Catholics there are to be found who find occasion and reason to complain of the deficiencies of our schools in this Province, but instead of laying the blame for these deficiencies, the existence of which in certain cases we are obliged to acknowledge, where it is right to propose the one-sided school system of Ontario—their own countrymen, priests and church as the cause of all the shortcomings of the "Separate Schools." The time has now, we think, come when the Catholics of Ontario must speak out in plain but firm demand for their rights. This we have, the opportune moment for decisive, energetic and united presentation on the part of the Catholics of Ontario of their just claim to have themselves placed on a footing of equality with their non-Catholic fellow-citizens. These latter have by law established a system of education suitable to themselves. "Dissentient" school provisions were, however, retained in each case.

In 1844, Rev. Egerton Ryerson was appointed to the office of Chief Superintendent of Education for Upper Canada, and laid the foundation of the system that has since prevailed in this Province—a system not indeed without its merits, but not calculated to do adequate justice to the claims and the conscientious scruples of the Catholic minority. But the manifest intention of our legislators, despite the efforts of Dr. Ryerson, was to place the Catholic and Protestant communities in Upper and Lower Canada in a position of equality. This will be apparent from a perusal of the report of a discussion in the legislative Assembly of old Canada on July 5th, 1850, when a school law was under discussion. The Catholics of Upper Canada did not, indeed, obtain, and have not since, obtained the privileges enjoyed by the Protestants of Lower Canada, but the principle was affirmed in every legislative measure relating to education passed by the Parliament of old Canada. The report of the discussion just referred to reads as follows: Mr. Hincks said the Government did not desire to place the Roman Catholics in the position which had been contended for by some members of the House. He proposed an amendment to the 19th clause to the effect—"That it shall be the duty of any Municipal Council to grant separate

schools on the petition of 12 or more colored persons, or Roman Catholics; that none but colored persons shall vote in the election of Trustees for their Schools; and that Roman Catholics shall possess the same privilege."

whose parent or guardian object to them: If the teacher hears any pupil recite catechism it must be by private arrangement between the teacher and the parent or guardian of such pupils, and must not interfere with the regular exercises of the school.

In his speech on Confederation Hon. George Brown declared the principle of the common schools of Upper Canada necessary to religious education in the school themselves. He said: (Feb. 8, 1865) "I have always opposed and continue to oppose the system of sectarian education, so far as the public chest is concerned. I have never been able to see why all the people of the province, should not send their children to the same common schools, to receive the ordinary branches of instruction. I regard the parent and the pastor as the best religious instructors, and so long as the religious faith of the children is the basis of their education, I am not disposed to see the clergy to give religious instruction to the children of their flocks, I cannot conceive any sound objection to mixed schools."

So much for the theory. Now as for the practice of Public Schools in relation to religious instruction, they are decidedly Protestant. Wherever the Trustees of any section or municipality decide in favor of the introduction of the reading of Scripture and recitation of prayer, in so far as Catholics are concerned, the reading of Scripture and recitation of prayer ordained by any authority of a religious worship in which they cannot participate without a violation of conscience. Protestants themselves have not failed from time to time to call for the holding in the Public Schools of religious exercises peculiar to and acceptable to themselves. It is the duty of the Trustees of a religious training for their children, and no Catholic objects to Protestant parents exercising all the influence they can to secure the imparting to their children of such training. What Catholics do not want to do is to see their children sent to a school where they are to receive religious training in schools acceptable to themselves, but to assist at scriptural readings and prayers not approved by their Church. It is all well to say that any one who knows the public schools, and that such objections must admit that few parents or guardians can desire to take such a course. Now, no man, in such a matter as the education of his children, should be by law forced to meet, or undergo, any unnecessary hardships. That Catholics attending public schools, and placed at a distance from their own, should be obliged to attend the same, we need not point to the fact that in a Memorandum of the Minister of Education of Ontario, dated April 2, 1878, the following is found: FURTHER MEMORANDUM ON THE SUBJECT OF RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

A Deputation from the Synod of the Presbytery of Hamilton and London, consisting of the Rev. John Lang, M. A., Moderator, and the Rev. W. Cockraie, D. D., Clerk, have submitted for my consideration the following questions, viz:— 1. May the local Trustees, who are authorized to use the Bible in whole or in part as a text book, giving such instruction as is needed for the proper understanding of what is read? 2. Is there anything in the Regulations and Programme at present in force to prevent the reading of the Holy Scriptures as part of the regular course of instruction, and work of the School, when the Trustees desire this to be done? I explained verbally to the Deputation my views of the Laws and Regulations upon these important points, and produced to them officially in writing in order that they might be generally understood.

The Law on the subject of Religious Instruction in Public Schools will be found in the ninth and tenth sections of the Public School Act (Revised Statutes Cap. 294). The ninth section reads as follows:—"No person shall require any pupil in any Public School to read or study in or from any religious book, or to join in any exercise of devotion or religion, objected to by his or her parent or guardian." The tenth section provides that "pupils shall be allowed to receive such religious instruction as their parents and guardians desire according to any General Regulations provided for the organization, government and discipline of Public Schools." By section 3, of the Education Department (Revised Statutes, Cap. 203) the Education Department is empowered to make Regulations from time to time for the organization, government and discipline of the Public Schools, and the like of Public Instruction, under the Act of 1874. The general Regulations for the government of Public Schools now in force are those prescribed by such Council in 1874, and comprise the following Regulations on the subject of Religious Exercises and Religious Instruction: "II. Religious and Moral Instruction in the Public Schools."

"1. As Christianity is recognized by common consent throughout this Province, as an essential element of Education, it ought to pervade all the Regulations for elementary instruction. The Consolidated Public School Act, section 102, provides that no person shall require any pupil in or from any religious book or to join in any exercise of devotion or religion, objected to by his or her parent or guardian. Pupils shall be allowed to receive and religious instruction as their parents or guardians desire according to any general regulation provided for the organization, government and discipline of Public Schools."

"2. In the section of the Act thus quoted the principle of religious instruction in the School is recognized, and the restriction is made that it is to be given according to the desire of each parent and guardian and the exclusive right of each parent and guardian on the subject is secured."

"3. The Public School being a day and not a boarding school, rules arising from domestic relations, rules arising not required, and as the pupils are under the care of their parents and guardians,