

the welfare and progress of Separate Schools as they do for the growth and development of the man in the moon. Why the Catholics of this Province have tamely submitted so long to such a *farceical* system of Separate School Inspection, we cannot comprehend. We can easily understand how Catholics are excluded from the Educational Department; how that lieutenant to the Honorable Adam Crooks cannot chance to be a Catholic—nay more that even one member of the Central Committee could not happen to be a Catholic; but that *Protestant High School Inspectors*, in whose eyes Separate Schools find no favor, should be permitted to enter our Separate Schools and *report them from time to time* seems indeed incredible. Now, we ask the Catholic teachers engaged in the Separate Schools of Ontario the question: Does the inspection administered in their respective schools by *Protestant High School Inspectors* promote the interests of these Schools? The answer will be without doubt in the negative. But mark you, the High School Inspectors are not supposed to inspect Separate Schools: their duty is wholly bound up in the word *report*. That is, they make a pedestrian tour around the Separate School building; interview the teachers concerning their salaries, certificates and number of classes; examine the Daily Register; fire a few High School questions at a class of little boys or girls of seven, eight, or nine years of age; and then bow themselves out. That is the end. No; we forgot; they *report* at the Department. Yes, they *report*; but through what process of churning these *reports* go ere they appear in the annual Report of the Minister of Education we do not know; but this we do know, that the Annual Report of the Minister of Education, so far as it relates to the Separate Schools of Ontario, is a delusion and a snare, calculated to mislead the public, calculated to injure Separate Schools, calculated to show up the liberality of Protestants in School matters, where no such liberality exists. But we may be accused of making rash statements. Well, let us see. According to the report of the Minister of Education for 1877, the number of Separate Schools in the Province was 185. In the Annual Report for 1878 the number of Separate Schools is put down as 177 showing the report goes on to say a decrease of nine. Now there is not only a false discrepancy here but the reports of the number of Separate Schools for these two years are false on their very face. True, some attempt was made we believe at the time of the issuing of the Annual Report for 1878 to rectify or explain away the bungled mistake; but the impression left upon the public by the press commenting on the report was that Separate Schools were on the decline, and that they were losing favor even in the eyes of their Catholic supporters. Again the report for 1878 goes on to say, "that of 789 teachers of the Roman Catholic Church 456 are employed in the Public Schools of Ontario." Now we claim this is entirely misleading, and misleading too for a purpose. It is a well known fact that there exists

in Ontario, especially in rural districts, a very large number of schools, nominally designated Public Schools, but virtually Separate Schools, almost wholly supported by Catholic rate-payers, with a Catholic Board of Trustees. In these Schools Catholic teachers find employment, and in the Annual Report such Schools are denominated Public Schools; and thus the liberality of Protestant School Boards, in engaging so many Catholic teachers in such *Public Schools as these*, is spread abroad. Now we challenge the Minister of Education or his subalterns in office to point out to us a single prominent position held by a Catholic as Headmaster in either the High or Public Schools of this Province. It is painful, for us to throw out this challenge; but we have a duty to perform, and we intend to write after this form till we have fully exposed *that monopoly, the School System of Ontario*.

—:o:—

PARENTAL RIGHTS IN EDUCATION.

No other right is so sacred, so holy to Catholic parents, as the right to educate their children after the manner of their own heart; and this is a right which no state nor set of men can wrest from them. Not only is the education of children by parents a right, but it is a sacred and binding duty as well. So Dr. Wayland in his *Moral Philosophy* writes: "The duty of parents is to educate their children in such manner as they believe will be most for their future happiness both temporal and eternal. With his duty in this respect no one has a right to interfere. While he exercises his parental duties within their prescribed limits, he is by the law of God, exempt from interference both from individuals and from society." So far Dr. Wayland. Now, let us hear what Herbert Spencer, in the chapter on National Education, has to say upon this point. We feel sure that our Protestant friends, who are such ardent admirers and warm supporters of a Public School System of Education administered by the state, will not refuse to pay heed to the opinion of so eminent a Protestant writer on Educational subjects, as Herbert Spencer. He thus writes: "In the same way that our definition of state duty forbids the state to administer religion or charity, so likewise does it forbid the state to administer education. Inasmuch as the taking away by Government of more of a man's property than is needful for maintaining his rights is an infringement, and therefore a reversal of the government's function towards him, and inasmuch as the taking away of his property to educate his own or other people's children is not needful for the maintaining of his rights, the taking away of his property is wrong." Mr. Spencer then goes on to prove his proposition, and refute objections brought against it by various classes of objectors thus: "The reasoning which is held to establish the right to intellectual food, will equally well