

**The Catholic Record**

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum. United States and Europe—\$2.50. Publisher and Proprietor, Thomas Coffey, L.L. D. Editors (Rev. James T. Foley, B. A. Associate Editor—H. F. MacIntosh. Manager—Robert M. Burns. Address business letters to the Manager. Classified Advertising 15 cents per line. Remittances 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 Catholic Record has been approved and recommended by Archbishop Falgout and Barette, late Apostolic Delegate to Canada, the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa, and St. Boniface, the Bishops of London, Hamilton, Peterborough and Guelphburg, and the clergy throughout the Dominion. In St. John, N. B., single copies may be purchased from Mrs. M. A. McGuire, 240 Main St. and John J. Dwyer. In Sydney, N. S., single copies may be purchased at Murphy's Bookstore. In Montreal single copies may be purchased from J. Milloy, 311 St. Catherine St. West. In Ottawa, Ont., single copies may be purchased from J. W. O'Brien, 14 Nicholas St. The following agents are authorized to receive subscriptions and canvass for the Catholic Record: General Agents—M. J. Hagarty, Stephen Y. James, George J. Archibald, Resident Agents—Miss Brice Saunders, Sydney; E. R. Costello, The Pender St. West, Vancouver, B. C.; H. Chamberlain, Ottawa West; Mrs. Geo. E. Smith, 2383 Manoe St., Montreal; Edward McKee, 321 Martine Ave., Elmwood, Winnipeg, Man.

LONDON, SATURDAY, MARCH 11, 1922

**THE HON. DR. EDWARDS AND SCHOOL GRANTS**

The Hon. Dr. Edwards has been discussing the Separate School question in various parts of the province. Last week he paid London the honor of a visit and addressed the Ministerial Alliance on the subject as well as a "mass meeting." This, in point of attendance, at any rate, must have been disappointing; though the apostle of the Public School Defense League appears to have convinced at least a portion of the Alliance, that in his plea that the ministers hear both sides and make a fair study of the question the Rev. W. R. McIntosh (whom we quoted last week) was advocating a work of supererogation.

In his public address Dr. Edwards said:

"Let me say that I want to present a few facts for your consideration and a few facts for your approval or disapproval. I will refrain from saying anything that will offend any person who is willing to look at the question squarely. . . . Bishop Fallon, in his address at Massey Hall, Toronto, expressed the wish that a large part of his audience might be composed of those who did not agree with him. I have the same wish in connection with this meeting. I would much like to be able to talk to many of the bishop's followers that I might have an opportunity of convincing them of the error of their opinions."

Shortly afterwards he prefaced his remarks about legislative grants with this amazing statement reported—and correctly reported—as follows by the Free Press:

"I cannot understand why Bishop Fallon has not made any reference to the legislative grants in all his discussion of the school question." continued the speaker. "There are two main sources of revenue for the schools, legislative grants and taxation. The question of grants is so pertinent that I want to devote some time to it. Let me again call your attention to the fact that, while the Bishop of London has made many complaints of unfair treatment of the Roman Catholics, he has not made any mention of the grants which the Separate schools now receive from the Legislature."

First, Dr. Edwards insinuates that Bishop Fallon has deliberately dodged an issue that had recently received much publicity through the press; and then, "again calls attention to the fact that, while the Bishop of London has made many complaints of unfair treatment of the Roman Catholics he has not made any mention of the grants which the Separate Schools now receive from the Legislature."

If the Honorable Doctor's insinuation were justified, if his reiterated and emphasized fact were true, if it were one that could be honestly used by "any person willing to look at the question squarely," then the significance of the subsequent facts that he adduced relative to Separate school grants would be enormously increased. Of this the speaker was evidently very well aware.

Now although Dr. Edwards referred at the outset to Bishop Fallon's Massey Hall address, quoted from it at times later on, and although throughout his whole speech mentioned Bishop Fallon again and again—making it plain that he was definitely replying to the Bishop—we are through politeness compelled to believe that Dr. Edwards did not read Bishop Fallon's Massey Hall address or any report of it.

Otherwise Dr. Edwards' emphatic and reiterated statement "that the Bishop has not made any mention

of grants' would have to be designated in plain Anglo-Saxon by a short and ugly word.

The Honorable Dr. Edwards may choose his own horn of the dilemma. In his Massey Hall speech Bishop Fallon faced this question of grants squarely. It had for some time before been exploited, just as Dr. Edwards continues to exploit it. The Bishop is not the man to shirk an issue of that sort. And he did not shirk it, Dr. Edwards to the contrary notwithstanding. He explained it just as he explained it in his letter to the Free Press after he had read Dr. Edwards' insinuation of shirking and his plain statement of "the fact that he has not made any mention of the grants."

The Bishop, as reported in the Globe, added: "It really isn't anybody's business, because it is our own money. It is the Separate school portion of the legislative grant. It is divided by a law we didn't make, by regulations for which we are not responsible."

But perhaps Dr. Edwards does not read the Globe. He may read the Telegram. Well, the Evening Telegram, Saturday, Feb. 11th, gave more than a column to the report of the Bishop's straightforward and plain dealing with the question of legislative grants to Separate schools and the publicity given to the pother made about them by certain individuals. Yet Dr. Edwards permits himself to "call attention again" to the significant "fact" that Bishop Fallon "has not made any mention of grants!" And London is not the only place; he has done so elsewhere and persists in doing so.

Perhaps there is a reason. Bishop Fallon in Massey Hall when talking about grants pointed out that in the County of Frontenac—Dr. Edwards' county—in the township of Bedford—Dr. Edwards' township—there are two Public schools, one with a registration of one pupil, the other registering two, where the grant in each case exceeded the teacher's salary—over \$300 a pupil in one case and between \$800 and \$700 a pupil in the other!

Dr. Edwards would give the whole game away if he noticed a thing like that—so he accuses Bishop Fallon of side-stepping!

These cases simply show that the bases on which the Education Department apportions the grant to individual schools work out strangely at times in the Public schools as well as in the Separate. But to admit that fact would not suit Dr. Edwards' purpose. If you do not dare to accuse openly but desire to lead your hearers to believe what you dare not say you must carefully select your facts.

"Any person desiring to face this question squarely" can doubtless get full information as to legislative grants from the Department of Education. Any person desirous of humbugging the ignorant, and of prejudicing the case for Separate schools by suppressing the truth and suggesting the false, cannot afford "to face the question squarely" and must sedulously avoid securing or giving honest information on this subject.

A Mr. Spotton, who is associated with Dr. Edwards in this unsavory business, selected three Separate schools in Biddulph where the grants were high and omitted the fourth where the grant was exceptionally low; another peculiar instance of facing a question squarely.

Many of Dr. Edwards' other alleged "facts" were of the same order; sometimes he denatured Bishop Fallon's statements, and so refuted arguments the Bishop never made. Of course, at times, he honestly commented on undisputed facts and his numerous references to Bishop Fallon were always courteous. He kept fairly well his promise not to be offensive. But there is a deeper courtesy that Catholics would greatly appreciate and that is, eschewing appeals to prejudice, to treat this question honestly and on its merits. That, it will rejoice fair-minded Protestants as well as Catholics to know, is not so rare as might be supposed were one to take London as representative of the province. In Peterborough the Hon. Dr. Edwards addressed a "mass meeting" that was even less "massive" than here; and the Ministerial Association of that city passed a resolution calling for a square deal for Separate schools in the matter of taxes, but pleading for one High school.

**THAT "AGREEMENT" AGAIN!**

Dr. Edwards told us at the public meeting that in 1841, at the time of the Legislative Union of Upper and Lower Canada, (Ontario and Quebec) the old Province of Canada was about equally divided in population between Protestants and Catholics, the proportions in Lower Canada being reversed in Upper Canada. For this reason, he averred, there was an agreement or understanding reached by which no law affecting either section of the province should be enacted unless it should receive a majority in that section so affected. "This was agreed to," said this deep and impartial student of Canadian history, "by the leading men of all parties." And he further revealed to an audience, of whose ignorance of history he must have felt entirely assured, that this was rigidly adhered to so far as Lower Canada was concerned. But in the matter of the Separate School Act of 1863 this agreement was broken, a majority of ten Upper Canadian representatives having voted against the measure.

Like many of Dr. Edwards' "facts" this would be very significant if it were true.

But it is grotesquely false. It is true that Governments deemed it impossible or inexpedient to carry on if a majority of Upper Canada members were against them. And French members endeavored at various times to secure the extension of the double majority principle to Lower Canada. They failed.

Often Lower Canada was governed during whole administrations with the overwhelming majority of its representatives in opposition.

The "Double Majority" in the sense explained by Dr. Edwards—which is not the sense in which the term was often used in those days—a French-Canadian member sought to have embodied in a resolution which he submitted to in Parliament. Mr. J. E. Thibaudeau, member for Portneuf, brought forward a motion declaring "that in the opinion of this House any attempt at legislation which would affect one section of the province in opposition to the votes of the majority of the representatives of that section would produce consequences which would be detrimental to the welfare of the province and give rise to great injustice."

Now this is precisely the "agreement or understanding" that Dr. Edwards declares was entered into after 1841 by "the leaders of all parties;" the "agreement" that was "rigidly adhered to so far as Lower Canada was concerned," and that was violated in the passing of the S. S. Act of 1863.

Yet this resolution of Mr. Thibaudeau in 1858—five years before 1863—was defeated after debate by a vote of two to one, "Messrs. Brown, Dorion and Mowatt and other members of the Opposition voting with the John A. Macdonald Ministry against it!"

This is the "understanding" "agreed to," according to Dr. Edwards "by the leading men of all parties!"

The late Professor Edward Kylie in "Canada and its Provinces" discusses this question with the impartial scholarship for which he is noted. We have quoted him before; but the persistence with which, for an obvious purpose, this distortion of history is put forward, makes it desirable to repeat the quotation.

Professor Kylie writes: "This situation gave rise to the demand that the Administration should possess a double majority—a majority, that is to say, in each half of the country. When, under Lord Metcalfe, after the resignation of Baldwin and La Fontaine, the French had little or no voice in the Government, the necessity for a double majority was urged in Lower Canada. When the tables were turned and the majority of the French representatives, but a minority of the English, supported Baldwin and La Fontaine and later the conservative administration, the demand came from the English side of the house."

"Yet it cannot be said that the double majority was ever accepted either as a principle or a convention of the constitution."

"Party leaders would have been only too glad to secure it, and in opposition they were sometimes ready to insist upon it, but they were not deterred from holding office by a failure to command it. The governors consistently opposed it. Though Sir Edmund Head in 1856 'looked on MacNab's resignation as a virtual dissolution of the existing administration, he did not by this admit or sanction in any way the doctrine of a double or

sectional majority as necessary to a government in Canada. On the contrary, he stated unambiguously that it was a doctrine at once irrational and unconstitutional and if carried out might involve the consequence of a ministry being obliged to resign although the party by whom they were defeated did not and could not possess the confidence of the Legislative Assembly." When the new ministry was constituted, the governor told Colonel Tache that he expected the Government formed by him to disavow the practice of a double majority. The idea lingered, however, and to those who could not accept representation by population seemed to offer the only escape from what they regarded as a fundamental change in the whole constitution. The ministry of John Taves of that section of the province to which the measure under debate especially applied. The governor-general, however, "felt at the time that this arrangement was vicious in principle and impracticable in action, but as it only assumed the form of an understanding amongst the members of the Administration, he did not think it advisable to carry his opposition to it so far as to prevent the formation of the Ministry, feeling convinced that it must be abandoned in practice." His judgment proved sound, and when the ministry decided to appeal to the country, he was able to announce that "no change had been made in the general policy of the Administration beyond the abandonment of the double majority practice and making the question of representation an open one."

The italics in the above quotation are ours.

It is perhaps too much to expect Dr. Edwards to study this question; but perhaps some members of Ministerial Associations rather than sit at the feet of this Gamaliel for their history would prefer to read the matter up for themselves. The reference is "Canada and its Provinces," Vol. 5, pp. 148, et seq. Also, "Sir John Macdonald," by Sir Joseph Pope, reference, "Double Majority" in index.

We challenge the Hon. Dr. Edwards—or any of his admiring followers—to submit to any professor of history in any Ontario University this question that covers what he openly states or necessarily implies:

In enacting the S. S. Act of 63, did the French-Canadian members violate any agreement or understanding acquiesced in by the leading men of all parties?

Only before a jury entirely ignorant of history can Dr. Edwards secure a verdict in the sense he desires.

It is only the obvious intent and purpose of Dr. Edwards' statement in this connection that matters. To deepen prejudice, to stir up strife and ill-will, is a sorry business at best; to distort history for this purpose despicable.

Let us face facts squarely.

**MISREPRESENTATION AS A POLICY**

By THE OBSERVER

The misrepresentation of the conditions on the border of what is called "Ulster" is merely the latest manifestation of an unvarying and traditional practice. The Manchester Guardian's special correspondent makes it clear that the account of the commencement of the recent disturbances in Belfast, which has been circulated from Belfast, is false. The first killing was done by an Orangeman; and it was from that that the recent disorders began. The Guardian's correspondent does not say that either side is free from blame since then; but he does say that there had been a considerable period of peace; and that that peace was broken by the Orange party.

Further, with reference to the affair at Scones, a falsification has taken place. The truth is as follows: a party of "Ulster" constables were en route from one part of "Ulster" to another, and were at Scones, which is not in "Ulster," an I. R. A. party approached them; and the Commandant ordered them to put up their hands. That order may or may not have been legal; but it gave no excuse for what followed. The I. R. A. Commandant was shot dead. Then general shooting followed. The affair was bad enough; but it has been studiously misrepresented as

an unprovoked slaughter of the "Ulster Specials." Similarly, the kidnapping of a number of Ulstermen have been reported, for the most part, as unprovoked outrages; the fact being that the arrest of a football team from the South preceded in point of time, all the kidnappings that occurred.

The Belfast street sniping and other disorders and crimes have been put before the public as though they originated with the Catholics and were practically confined to them. Bombs were, only two or three weeks ago, tossed amongst Catholic children playing on the street; two killed and ten wounded.

The Manchester Guardian correspondent relates a recent case of the murder of a young Catholic man; calling it a deliberately planned crime. He was tied and gagged; and then shot to death.

One of the few consistencies in the Anglo-Irish Protestant system of dealing with the majority in that country, has been to maintain always and without a break, the policy of misrepresentation and falsification of the facts. England and the Anglo-Irish "Garrison" had a monopoly of the writing of Irish history, for a very long time, and a monopoly of the credulity of the public which alone could ever have given acceptance and belief to the sort of history thus written. The latter monopoly is enjoyed yet. And why wonder at it? People must get their ideas somewhere; and when almost the whole news gathering service of the world is venal, partisan and prejudiced, what hope can be entertained that facts will ever get an equal chance with lies?

Time was when every English politician who had a turn at administering Ireland, had his corps of hireling writers to blacken the Irish race and to misrepresent every aspiration and every claim they were known to have or make. The thing is not done quite so brazenly now; but it is done; and done to substantially the same effect. Lord Carson has told us,—when roques fall out, you know!—how Mr. Lloyd George used to say: "I give the Times to you; the so and so to you—The so and so to you—See that they all agree tomorrow."

That is a very important system of manufacture; the manufacture of public opinion.

**NOTES AND COMMENTS**

PUBLICATION of the following letter was refused by the Toronto Globe, no doubt because it puts a crimp in the entire argument for the non-sectarian character of Public schools, at least so far as Toronto is concerned:

"There is a short and simple way of determining whether the Public schools of Toronto are what that name implies, or merely sectarian. If they are really 'Public' why should the Board of Education have decreed that the national flag fly over all of them on the Twelfth of July? Actions speak louder than words."

To the same or like effect Mr. Harry Baldwin of Toronto, a gentleman with "Public school" experience, writes in answer to a shallow exponent of the gathering spirit of animosity to Catholic natural and legal rights in this matter, as follows:

"If there exists the slightest doubt as to the exclusively Protestant character of the Public schools, let one of Mr. Dixon's Catholic Public school teachers produce his (or her) rosary some May morning and, by way of a change from the Protestant version of the Lord's Prayer, recite a decade or so before a crucifix which might for the nonce occupy the place of honor usually allotted to the portrait of the Prince or politician of the moment. Let this Catholic teacher make but one sign of the cross in this non-sectarian (but not Protestant) school, how long would he (or she) be retained by the non-sectarian (but not Protestant) Board of Trustees?"

AND, HE adds, "at the history hour, should this same deluded teacher attempt to broaden the non-sectarian minds of her little pupils by non-Protestant interpretations of English history, picture the results: Henry the Eighth, the genial founder of this Church of England, distorted beyond recognition; his little affair with Anne Boleyn disapproved by the Pope because, forsooth, it was immoral; the divorce refused because divorce was not recognized by the Catholic Church; the Virgin Queen shown up as being rather a bigger rascal than her sanguinary sister; while

the monasteries, Cromwell, and the Reformation would supply material for non-Protestant revelations frightfully unsettling to the non-sectarian minds of the poor little Protestants."

MR. BALDWIN, therefore, rightly affirms, what is too generally forgotten in the fervor of declamation that "much confusion would be avoided if it were generally admitted that Protestants and Catholics differ fundamentally, and that in the matter of the education of youth they cannot agree." There are, it is true, earnest minded Protestants who realize the dangers of divorcing education from religion, and lament the present day trend along that line. Then why, it cannot be too often asked, should they seek to put stumbling blocks in the way of Catholics who put into practice what they only preach?

THE DEATH of one Pope and the election of another are great events in the history of the world, yet how soon they pass into the great stream of affairs and cease to be the theme of comment or discussion. Benedict XV. was a man who in the way of either mental endowments or personal character suffers not by comparison with the great Popes of the past. To his lot it fell to steer the Barque of Peter through one of the most troublous periods in history and by the common consent of all thinking men, this great responsibility was discharged with honor alike to himself and to the Master whom he served. And yet it is already as if his passing had been an event of years ago instead of but of yesterday, so quickly does the march of human affairs resume its resistless tread. As by the burning flax a Pope is reminded at his coronation: "So passes the glory of the world" Benedict has passed into the wings and another Pius comes upon the scene.

OR PIUS XI. the world has already heard much that is pleasing and assuring. Still in the prime of life as Popes go, endowed with a scholarly mind and having a great fund of varied experience to draw upon, few Popes have entered upon their stewardship under more propitious circumstances. That he may belong spared to rule the Church will be the prayer of all. From what the world has already learned of him it is no hazard to conjecture that ere many months have come and gone he will have won for himself in the hearts of the faithful a place beside the great and good Pius X. whose name as Pontiff he has chosen. According to one who has known the new Pope intimately for over thirty years, Pius X. is indeed one of his enthusiasts. And to the innumerable spiritual children and admirers of Cardinal Newman it will be gratifying in the highest degree to know that in the regard of Pius XI. the English Cardinal occupies a place at Pius Tenth's side.

AND who better than Newman has outlined the duties of the faithful with "Public school" experience, writes in answer to a shallow exponent of the gathering spirit of animosity to Catholic natural and legal rights in this matter, as follows:

"Of our obligations to the Holy See," he said in that celebrated sermon on 'The Pope and the Revolution,' "what need I say more to measure our own duty to it and to him who sits in it, than to say that in his administration of Christ's kingdom, in his religious acts, we must never oppose his will, or dispute his word, or criticise his policy, or shrink from his side? We must never murmur at that absolute rule which the Sovereign Pontiff has over us, because it is given him by Christ, and in obeying him we are obeying his Lord. We must never suffer ourselves to doubt, that, in his government of the Church, he is guided by an intelligence more than human. His yoke is the yoke of Christ, he has the responsibility of his own acts, not we; and to his Lord must he render account, not to us. Even in secular matters it is ever safe to be on his side, dangerous to be on the side of his enemies. Our duty is—not indeed to mix up Christ's Vicar with this or that party of men, because he in his high station is above all parties,—but to look at his formal duties, and to follow him whither he goeth, and never to desert him however we may be tried, but to defend him at all hazards, and against all comers, as a son would a father, and as a wife a husband, knowing that his cause is the cause of God."

**BOY LIFE**

**RECOGNITION OF SCOUTING**

The spread and development of the Boy Scouts Association depends to quite an extent upon expected recognition from a community for its services as a medium for character building and citizenship training among boys. For some unknown reason, many communities, though profoundly believing in Scouting's worth, are somewhat adverse to openly commending the Scout Movement for its efforts and in consequence tend to stultify a national enthusiasm for Scouting by this apparent oversight. The fact remains, nevertheless, that we are greatly indebted to Scouting for its work among boys; its principles are sound and good and true and accordingly worthy of all honor, and therefore its devotees should, whenever possible, attempt to pay this debt of recognition and in so doing to inspire the movement to greater and more far-reaching effects than ever before.

From time to time, however, the value of the Scout Movement as a factor in community building is recognized as such and commendation forthwith appears in the columns of the community's press. Such an editorial came to our attention recently in the Owen Sound Sun-Times. It reads in part as follows:—

"Without display, or in fact publicity of any kind, real work is going on in the interests of the boys of this city. It is going on under different auspices, but with the same object—that of upbuilding a clean cut manly type of lad who will grow up to be a worth while asset to the community. The Boy Scouts Association is one of these efforts and given half a chance the city should soon be chock full of this organization. Other influences are also at work. It is real good to find one prominent organization backing the boys club at Northcliffe section. I do not know of a finer bunch of boys than those taking an active part in connection with this particular branch of local work. Recently at a luncheon held by the sponsors of this effort, an octette supplied the programme of a most enjoyable half hour. Devoid of boldness, nervousness, in its nasty form, they exhibited an easy self control and a gentlemanly address that few could excel. You could hardly make me believe a year or so ago that such development was possible. A residence has been converted into a club house, games and music are indulged in and as the week nights go by the lads are there and getting the benefit of the training the club affords. Generous contributions have been made towards the equipment and furnishing of the house and the latest addition has been a fine little library managed on the same lines as the public library. Next summer a bathing beach is aimed at and with the generosity of friends it is hoped that bathing and swimming facilities will be available for the Northcliffe chaps, who deserve the highest compliment on the manner in which they are acquiring themselves. They are making good, every one of them, and the big ones are helping the little fellows in a real big brotherly way. The organization having the matter in hand will find its reward in knowing that it is responsible for the accomplishment of great good to the lads and to the community at large."

ANOTHER example of Scout training in preparedness and resourcefulness comes from Napanee, Ont. As their fire department consists of only a volunteer force, owing to the size of the community, the volunteer firemen are sometimes delayed by various untimely circumstances. At a recent fire in Napanee the volunteer force arrived on the scene some time after the alarm had been given to find the hose cart already in position manned by three Scouts of the 1st Napanee Troop and their Scoutmaster. They had succeeded in turning one hose upon the fire and were in the act of laying a second when the firemen arrived. It is sufficient to say that the blaze was extinguished in short order. Could your non-Scout son be prepared to act in such an emergency as this?

**A PLEASANT OPPORTUNITY TO MEN**

It would be easy to enumerate almost countless incidents which show the civic pride and real patriotism aroused by the principles of cleanliness, thrift, honour,