

THE TRUE WITNESS

AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED AT

No. 761, Craig Street Montreal, Canada.

ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION

Country.....\$1 00
City.....1 50
If not paid in advance: \$1.50 (Country) and \$2 (City) will be charged.

Subscribers, Newfoundland, \$1.50 a year in advance.

TO ADVERTISERS.

The large and increasing circulation of THE TRUE WITNESS ranks it among the best advertising mediums in Canada.

A limited number of advertisements of approved character will be inserted in "THE TRUE WITNESS" at 15c per line, first insertion, and 10c per line each subsequent insertion. Special rates for contracts on application.

All Business letters, and Communications intended for publication, should be addressed to D. M. QUINN, Proprietor of THE TRUE WITNESS, No. 761 Craig street, Montreal, P. Q.



Office of Grand President

G. C. of C. M. B. A.

Brockville, Ont., Nov. 10th, 1892.

J. K. FORAN, Esq.,

Editor True Witness, Montreal:

Dear Sir:—By authority vested in me by the Executive of the Grand Council of the Catholic Mutual Benefit Association of Canada, I hereby appoint THE TRUE WITNESS of Montreal, Que., an Official Organ of said Grand Council in the jurisdiction of said Council for the term of two years, or until said appointment is cancelled by me, or by my successor in office, or by said Grand Council.

Witness my hand and seal this tenth day of November, 1892.

Signed,

O. K. FRASER,

Grand President,

Of Grand Council of C.M.B.A. of Canada.

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 16, 1892

OUR SCHOOL BOYS.

Last week we spoke somewhat strongly with regard to the punishments meted out to children in certain schools, but especially the severe and degrading treatment to which boys were subjected some short time ago in large educational institutions. Since our last editorial we notice that the same question has been brought before the Protestant Board of School Commissioners and they have decided in favor of corporal punishment. On Saturday, in an editorial, the Daily Witness advocates "thrashing." We agree that it would be highly improper and even dangerous to allow the pupils to think, or to know, that there was no longer a whip or rod to be used; but we cannot agree that learning was ever or ever will be hammered into a child. Then, again, we speak of the younger ones. There are rough, hardy boys who often earn and require a severe punishment, otherwise they could not be controlled. Still how few of our teachers ever distinguish between the strong lad and the young, sickly, or feeble urchin! It is not our intention, however, to criticise either the Protestant Board or the Witness; they must know their own business, act and speak from their own experience. But neither the members of that Board, nor the writer in the Witness, ever experienced what we described last week. They never went at eight or ten years of age to one of our colleges and there remained during as many years. We most emphatically say that it is highly improper and very unsafe to give a general permission to all teachers, study-hall masters, and those who have charge of pupils in recreation

or elsewhere, an unrestricted right to use their own discretion and to beat children as they please, or according to their whim, or their passion. We know whereof we speak; and we are confident that any honest and truthful college director, who has had a few years experience, will corroborate our remarks. We do not speak of all, nor of the many amongst our educational establishments; we refer to the exceptional cases; but these exceptions, like in the French Grammar, are so numerous that they require more attention than the rulers. We would never send a child to an institution where the corporal punishment was not subject to the dictation of the Superior.

If a boy is so bad that he actually cannot be tamed otherwise than by means of the rod, let the class-teacher send that boy to the master of discipline; he then may administer the punishment in a proper manner. The class-teacher, in nine cases out of ten, will be in a red-hot passion, and instead of making the boy feel that it is a punishment for a fault committed, the youth is led to believe that it is a piece of revenge or spite, and passion creates passion, and the good effect is lost in the arousing of anger, hatred and wickedness in the pupil's breast. But if the teacher were to simply send the child or boy to the Director, with a line stating his offence, the latter—cool and dispassionate—would remonstrate as well as punish, and the desired result would be obtained.

We cannot refrain from recalling another remark of the Witness; it closes that editorial with the words; "As for corporal punishment being degrading, that is largely a matter of prevalent sentiment." It may be so in the case of such punishments as the writer of that article has been accustomed to witness, such as a good whipping, or a beating with the ruler. But he evidently was never forced to pay for a mis-spelt word by sticking his nose in the dust, and creeping on his knees up to a master's desk, and there kissing the unswept floor a half dozen times; he never knew what it was to be set to work sweeping or scrubbing on account of silence broken in the study-hall; he most certainly never had to blacken boots as a punishment for a class missed, and to polish them so well that if they were not as bright as a shilling he might expect a few slaps or kicks. Now, we don't say that these really degrading punishments are universal, but what took place can again take place; and the writer of these lines has been subjected to all these and even other punishments that he would be ashamed to record, and for the infliction of which two teachers were expelled from the college as soon as the good Superior heard of how they treated the children.

We are not theorizing; we are speaking from experience, and we say that in the matter of punishments more caution should be used than in any other branch of treatment in our colleges, academies and other institutions of education. While on this subject we will refer to another point that is of great interest to parents as well as to pupils. It is well known that the majority of the pupils that attend our schools are the children of parents who are not independently rich. It is generally a great sacrifice for the hard-working father and an economizing mother to keep their boys at school and to dress them neatly and properly. A boy, the very carefulest, needs too good suits of clothes—a winter one and a summer one—and a "knock-about one" at home to spare his school coat and pants. Parents don't want their children to go meanly dressed, the boys have a certain pride and they like

to be clean and well clothed; to keep up this appearance great care is required. This brings us to the point of objection. We object to the boys being obliged to sweep the school-rooms, halls, classrooms, stairs or study-rooms. The parents pay for their children's education; not to have them play servant. If they want their children to do such-like work, goodness knows, they have lots of it at home. They don't send their boys away from the home, sacrifice their earnings to pay for tuition, pinch and stint to keep them neatly dressed, all for the sake of cleaning out the school—sweeping and washing.

If you want your schools swept, pay someone to do the work; but don't make servants out of your pupils. How do you expect a boy to be neat, clean and tasty; how do you expect him to look upwards and seek to emulate the *Excelsior* youth; how do you expect him to have a proper estimate of his own dignity, if you (without any right and against all laws of decency) turn him into a school-house scavenger, or a sweep? In the name of the parents and of the pupils we object to that treatment, and we advise parents to question their children as to whether they are taught their lessons or taught to clean the floor in return for all the money paid for them.

THE PRESIDENTIAL CONTEST

The great struggle is over; Cleveland is elected; the Democrats have carried everything before them. There has scarcely ever been a quieter election than that which ended on the 8th November. The change of opinion throughout the Union is somewhat difficult to explain. Seemingly the whole contest turned upon the tariff policy of the Republican party. We do not think there is much sentiment in American politics, and the progress and prosperity of the great Republic alone sway the minds of the voters. There seems then a something very inexplicable in that silent, yet almost universal upheaval of opinion; for, certainly never was the country in a more prosperous condition than it is to day, and its progress is phenomenal. In view of these facts we feel entirely at a loss to account for the change.

As far as either party is concerned, we have no particular leanings. With regard to Canada, if there is to be any change it must be for the better, since it would be difficult for Cleveland's administration to treat us worse than did the Harrison party. As Canadians it was better, indeed, that the change took place, for it will enable us to find out whether the cavalier manner in which all our advances have been received, was due to a party or to the whole American people. Beyond this point our interest does not go; and we honestly believe that the change will have very little effect upon our prospects.

There is, however, another phase of the question that cannot be passed over in silence. It will be remembered that the A. P. A.—that American Protection Association, the twin-brother of the Anti-Popery Association of England—cast its lot in with the Republican party. From its secret conclaves and through the few newspapers under its control it flung the lowest of insults at the Church, it heaped the vilest of abuse upon the Catholic hierarchy, and it used every means at its disposal to persecute the members of our faith. It pleaded, begged, threatened, thundered in favor of the Republican party; and in its every appeal was an attack upon Rome and a series of the meanest insinuations and accusations against Catholics—public and private. We don't say that the Republican party wanted the support of that faction; but it had

the misfortune of being chosen as the party of its predilection. That most fanatical of all American journalists—Shepherd of the *Mail and Express*—went into the contest, red hot and furious; he went into it, not so much against Cleveland and the Democratic party, as against the Archbishops and Catholic faithful. He became the speaking trumpet of the A.P.A.; his organ bellowed out its falsehoods, fulminated its villainous accusations, hurled its forged assertions, belched out its mad and reckless statements, and up to the very eve of the election, vomited its spleen and disgusting bigotry in the face of a whole nation. Is it any wonder that a party—however unwilling it might have been—that was supported by such a foul-mouthed, slanderous organ, was defeated by an immense vote all over the Union, and crushed beyond recognition in the State and city where that vampire publication pollutes the atmosphere? From this standpoint it is a glorious victory for the Catholics of the United States. The defeat that the American A.P.A. received at the polls last week, was as emphatic as the defeat that the British A.P.A. sustained on the occasion of the Lord Mayor's Day in London during the same week. On both sides of the Atlantic these fanatical, blind, frenzied enemies of Catholicity have been taught—not by Catholics, but by honorable, honest, self-respecting Protestants—that the world is too small and life is too short to permit of their existence. Like the miasmatic insects generated in the swamps of unwholesome principles, they flutter for a day and then pass away forever. They come like the plague, and the world shudders; they pass like the plague, and the world cries "Thank God!" Had the Presidential election no other result we could have been grateful for this grand triumph. Will Dr. Drennan permit a paraphrase?

"Drive the Demon of Bigotry home to his den, And where scoundrels make brutes, let our voters make men!"

THE POPE AND RENAN.

There are a great many queer and very unsatisfactory rumors flashing along the wires about Rome and the Holy Father. Especially with regard to the choice of Cardinals are the opinions of the news-mongers who seek to impress the world with the idea that they are into all the secrets of the Vatican. The *Universe* wisely says that "the Pope's mind is known to the Pope himself, and no Catholic journalist would have the impertinent curiosity to pry into it or the arrogant absurdity to pretend to reveal it." In this connection we quote the following from the *London Daily Telegraph*:

"To-day is published a telegram from Rome, the writer of which, who is described as a 'diplomat,' gives an account of the manner in which the Pope received the intelligence of Renan's death, derived, as he affirms, from the prelate who communicated it to His Holiness. It was on Sunday evening, and the Pope was about to retire to rest. He remained silent a moment and then asked, 'How did he die?' 'Impenitent,' was the reply. Leo XIII. reflected a moment and then remarked very quietly, 'That is better.' The prelate having manifested some surprise, the Pope went on to explain that Renan had proved by his end that his doubt was sincere. He would be judged by his sincerity, which if it was thorough might absolve him. A few moments afterward Leo XIII. observed that Renan had done more good than harm to the Church. He had aroused theologians from their torpor. He had embodied the doubts of modern thought. He had marshalled its forces. The Church had been surprised, but could they believe that all this was not designed by Providence? And they might hope that particular indulgence would be shown to one who was the instrument of God's wrath."

Had the Pope passed these remarks it might indicate the broadness of his views and the elasticity of his charity; but there is no probability of such words ever having fallen from the lips of the Sovereign Pontiff. In the first place, the persons with whom the Pope holds intimate conversations and to whom he gives expressions of views, especially if they even verge upon the dogmatic, are not likely to telegraph his words all over