

The Catholic Record

Price of Subscription—\$1.50 per annum. United States & Europe—\$2.00.

Approved and recommended by the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa and St. Boniface, the Bishops of London, Hamilton, Peterborough, and Ogdensburg, N. Y., and the clergy throughout the Dominion.

Obituary and marriage notices cannot be inserted except in the usual condensed form. Each insertion 50 cents.

For the publication of special notices such as "favors received," etc., the price is 50 cents.

When subscribers ask for their mail at the post office it would be well were they to tell the clerk to give them their CATHOLIC RECORD.

Subscribers changing residence will please give old as well as new address.

LETTERS OF RECOMMENDATION. Apostolic Delegation.

Mr. Thomas Coffey. My Dear Sir—Since coming to Canada I have been a reader of your paper.

In St. John, N. B., single copies may be purchased from Mrs. M. A. McGuire, 220 Main Street.

Mr. Thomas Coffey. Dear Sir—For some time past I have read your admirable paper, THE CATHOLIC RECORD, and congratulate you upon the manner in which it is published.

Yours faithfully in Jesus Christ, D. FALCONE, Arch. of Valencia, Apos. Deleg.

LONDON, SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 2, 1912

THE BILINGUAL SCHOOL QUESTION

The CATHOLIC RECORD has always been found amongst the most strenuous defenders of Catholic educational rights whenever or wherever these were attacked or threatened.

School questions in the past have been the occasion of agitations which convulsed this province of Ontario and the whole Dominion of Canada.

Whatever the merits of the questions at issue, wherever lay the blame for dragging Catholic educational rights through the turmoil of political campaigns, no one will deny that such politico-religious agitations are extremely regrettable, hurtful alike to religion and to the country, and inimical to good-will, Christian charity and to the spirit of Canadian patriotism which as Catholics and Canadians it is our duty to foster.

Looming up from that quarter of the province where storm-clouds gather is another menacing school question which, let us hope, will be kept strictly outside the sphere of party politics.

The merits of the bi-lingual school question we have no reason just at present to discuss. We shall merely state some facts connected therewith and define the issue.

The term "bi-lingual school" is a most elastic one. It covers three distinct classes of schools. First, those schools in which there are French-speaking and English speaking pupils.

These schools have, in many cases, been built and maintained by English speaking rate-payers, Catholic or Protestant or both.

The advent of some French families begets an agitation for a bi-lingual teacher. The bi-lingual teacher is qualified in some sort of way for the emergency, but is often, for lack of training, incapable of teaching French or English or anything else.

In many places English-speaking farmers, both Catholic and Protestant, have sold their farms and moved elsewhere, solely for school considerations.

Their places are taken by French Canadians. Some eastern districts have thus become as purely French as any part of the province of Quebec.

Then there are so-called bi-lingual schools in French districts in which little or no English is taught.

There is still another class of schools that have been recently put into the category of bi-lingual schools.

These are schools that have always been English schools but, because of a certain number of the pupils being of French origin, though speaking the English language, they have been classed as bi-lingual schools and given to bi-lingual inspectors.

These conditions have obtained for many years, gradually becoming more pronounced. Then began the aggressive campaign of the French-Canadian Educational Congress of Ontario for a very material extension of rights and privileges hitherto enjoyed without

question except by the English-speaking rate-payers who suffered from local school conditions. Soon the interest in the question was province-wide. It became necessary, or at least desirable, for the government to appoint a commission to ascertain the facts.

These are now in possession of the public in Dr. Merchant's report.

In no sense and at no time was the question one of religion. Ever and always the question at issue was the right to use the French language as the medium of instruction in the schools, or whether the whole system and its inevitable extension was or was not detrimental to the school system of Ontario.

Religion was never an issue; the right to separate schools was never questioned. There are bi-lingual Separate schools, there are bi-lingual Public schools. Some of the loudest complaints came from English speaking Catholics.

Finally the Government took action defining the limits within which French may be used as a medium of instruction, and appointing inspectors to see that its regulations with regard to the teaching of English be carried out.

But these inspectors are Protestants. And our French-Canadian friends make this a ground for complaint.

That the regulations of the Department of Education were not enforced by the French inspectors, is evident from Dr. Merchant's report. It was necessary to appoint men who would enforce these regulations. If the Protestant inspectors were authorized to interfere, or attempted to interfere, with the teaching of religion in Catholic Separate schools, there would be ground for such complaint.

The Separate schools as well as the Public schools are part of Ontario's Educational system, and both alike are under the control of the Department of Education. The Department has not only the right but the duty to see that its regulations are observed. It has the right and the duty to appoint officials to enforce its regulations. To object to such officials on the ground of their being Protestants is puerile; but it is something more, it is a dishonest attempt to obscure the issue, to make a question that is purely and exclusively a question of language, one that involves religion and the right to Catholic Separate schools.

Open defiance of the authority of the Education Department is inculcated; in some places the children, acting under instruction, have taken their books and left the class-rooms when the inspector arrived in the school. Where will all this end? We do not know, and frankly, we do not care, provided some misguided people do not try to make the teaching of the French language a matter of conscience for Catholics.

The attitude of the Ottawa Separate School Board is difficult for outsiders to understand. In Ottawa it is understood only too well by the English-speaking rate-payers. But that certain English speaking trustees have succeeded in befogging the issue, is evident from the following sensible editorial in the Citizen of Oct. 17th:

THE REAL ISSUE. A correspondent makes the statement in a private communication that "the real issue in the bi-lingual question is whether the French Canadians in particular have any historical or constitutional rights to have their language placed upon an equal footing with English in the schools of Ontario. That is the issue in their eyes and that is the issue that has to be fought out."

He is quite right. It resolves itself into the necessity of showing the constitutional validity of the claim. It is a matter of law, and as such must be regarded. The trouble has been that there was too evidently the desire upon the part of many to make the bi-lingual issue but a part of a sectarian struggle, in which it properly did not belong at all. And when this was done, the real issue had to yield place to an entirely different one.

If this had been made the open issue by the advocates of bilingualism from the start, instead of involving it intricately with separate school issues and Protestant Inspectorships, the situation would have been entirely different. But involved as it was, it has been quite impossible for either press or public to dissociate the one from the others, or to judge the one issue upon its merits.

Let the issue be separated and clearly stated, as has been done above. Let the right of the case alone be heard, and its settlement will be in sight. Otherwise nothing can be gained, and a great deal of good feeling must be lost.

Precisely; that is the real issue. The question to be decided is a legal or constitutional question. The French-Canadians in Ontario claim certain legal, constitutional, or treaty rights with regard to the French language. The Protestant Premier of Ontario dissents; the Catholic Attorney-General unequivocally denies the rights claimed by his French co-religionists. The question, we repeat, is in no sense a religious one; the place to have it decided once and for ever is in the courts, if necessary in the Court of last appeal, the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.

Our readers will understand the Citizen's reference to the efforts to make the question a part of a sectarian struggle when they learn that an English speaking trustee has felt called upon to fill column after column, day after day, to

make known to all and singular that Irish Catholics consider the French language question as one of vital interest to themselves.

Some of his reasons for so prominently identifying himself with the French side of this question are worth reproducing. The French members voted for the Home Rule resolutions.

He has his own opinion as to the legal and constitutional rights of the French language.

He has even felt called upon to publish an explanatory note on Bishop Fallon's position with regard to bi-lingual schools.

In a semi-apology for language that he feared Catholics might consider too violent he claims the right as the son of an Ulsterman to use "vigorous Anglo-Saxon." His published interviews and letters bear many other ear-marks of Ulster. But just as North East by East Ulster will not be allowed to defy the authority of the Imperial Parliament and involve all Ireland in civil war, so North East by East Ontario will not be permitted to defy the authority of a department of the provincial government, and involve the whole province in sectarian strife.

The French-speaking population of Ontario, supported as it is by the active sympathy and financial aid of the French province of Quebec, is well able to take care of itself. If they have language rights which are denied them the courts will give them redress.

The use of the French language in Ontario Schools is not a question affecting either Catholic rights or the Catholic conscience. And while the sympathies of individual Catholics may be on one side or the other in this bi-lingual school difficulty, it is the duty of all Catholics, French and English, to confine the dispute within the limits of the question at issue.

When necessary we shall repel the attack of the enemy outside the walls, but we cannot overlook the traitor within the gates who would involve us in a quarrel which is not of our making, and which does not touch our rights, or affect our interests.

ANOTHER ONE. We refer elsewhere to a meeting of the Baptists of Ontario and their deliberations regarding the Grand Ligne Mission to the "Romanists" of Quebec. These baptist people, it seems, have declared war all along the line on the Catholic Church and we now find that even in Windsor, N. S., the United Baptist Women's Missionary movement of that province likewise have some things to say about the old church characterized by all uncharitableness as well as untruthfulness. The lady President gave utterance to this pretty little sentence, which smacks somewhat of novelty: "The Grand Ligne Mission, like a beacon, sends its rays of light streaming out into the darkness of ignorance and superstition around it, guiding many into the haven of safety and peace." Incidentally we may mention that the rays of light cost the Baptist denomination \$25,000 a year. This is a goodly sum per ray. The President also called Quebec "the Samaria of Canada." This is very pretty too, and will no doubt serve to open the ladies' chate-laines. The President, we take it, has never been in the province of Quebec, has never seen the simple, holy devoted lives of the people. They figure largely in their churches, sending up petitions to the Most High to forgive them their transgressions, and beseech Him to grant them the grace of leading holy lives. Certain other people figure largely in well-appointed churches listening to discussions on the topics of the day, including base ball. They figure largely, too, in the divorce courts, and the other sins of society are not unknown to them. Judging by her remarks about the Catholic Church, we take it that the President of the society as well as her associates have acquaintance with very few authors of good literature. We have often wondered why these people deliberately misrepresent the old church, and if they do so through ignorance. Slanders against her have been denied thousands and thousands of times but they are repeated again and again. The ridiculous position in which sectarians place themselves may be due to ignorance, but we are forced to the conclusion that in the majority of cases malignity and disregard for the truth is the motive. What else can we think when we find this woman declaring: "In that province the Bible is withheld from the people." We would ask her to examine the family bibles in the Catholic homes of Nova Scotia, and she will find therein that even the Pope himself admonishes the Catholic people to read the Scriptures. It is tiresome work, this correction of misrepresentations. No matter what we say, it will be declared at the next meeting of the Baptist Women's Missionary Movement that the "Romanists" are not allowed to read the bible. Truly there is much insincerity and dishonesty abroad. Proof: the reading matter in the daily papers and the cash registers.

"THE MENACE" Our readers will pardon us for once more making reference to a disreputable paper published in the United States. Its title is "The Menace." Its editor is a Rev. Mr. Walker. To what denomination he belonged we know not, for all manner of non-Catholic Christians refuse to class him as one of their particular circle. The primary purpose of "The Menace" is to make money and to this end Rev. Mr. Walker has embarked upon a crusade against the Catholic Church. All the old time vilifiers of the faith from Foxe to Maria Monk and Chintiquy have been requisitioned for this purpose. The most preposterous stories about Popes, Bishops, priests and nuns have been scattered broadcast, and the purpose of the Rev. Mr. Walker seems to be to warn Americans that something dreadful is going to happen through the machinations of "Romanism." It is the old story; a knave doing business with fools. The mystery of our day is to be found in the fact that thousands of these fools bite the bait thrown out to them by Rev. Mr. Walker. He appears to be a perfect type of the degenerate. Dr. Charles J. Cummings, of Williamsport, Pa., has deemed it worth while to carry the war into Africa and has placed this person, who has disgraced the clerical garb, in an unenviable position. He has issued a challenge to Rev. Mr. Walker in the following words:

Now, Mr. Editor of the Menace, you will please stand up, sir. Webster has defined a lie to be an untruth told with the intent to deceive. I charge you with lying about all things Catholic and about the Knights of Columbus. I now offer you not only an easy way to prove your accusations, but a chance to make a lot of money in doing it.

I will agree with you under a \$10,000 bond to submit your accusations, together with my refutations, to three reputable, disinterested judges, one of whom you may choose. I, one, and these two the third. I will even agree that all be non-Catholics.

If the majority of these non-Catholic judges decide that the Menace has not lied concerning matters Catholic and the Knights of Columbus, I will pay to the editor of the Menace \$10,000.

We may take it for granted that the challenge will not be accepted. A gentleman would take up the gauntlet and at least endeavour to prove his assertions; but Rev. Mr. Walker is not a gentleman. That the miserable man is capable of much mischief we have no doubt. Such will be the case so long as a great proportion of our non-Catholic neighbors continue to hug old-time prejudices and read with avidity every slander uttered against the Catholic Church, blindly refusing to make enquiry as to what that church really is. They prefer to recognize it as the unlovely institution it is pictured to be by its enemies — by deliberate detractors such as Rev. Mr. Walker, and others who have been ejected from its communion for just cause. This miserable man may after all be a blessing in disguise for his writings may lead to an enquiry classed many of the Know-Nothings of other days found their way into the Church on making study of its claims to be the real Church of Christ, after the smoke of bigotry's battle had been dispelled.

LIKE UNTO THE SOUPERS IN IRELAND. Our friends the Baptists recently had a meeting in Brantford and the Grand Ligne mission to the French Canadians came under review once more. To keep together the little band of perverts in that locality it costs this denomination nearly \$27,000 a year and great satisfaction is evinced because nearly \$1,000 were collected this year over and above the expenditures. Another source of gratification is found in the fact that the new recruits are learning to give much more liberally. From what we know of people of this class we are inclined to use the words of Mark Twain when he read his own obituary notice: "The report is exaggerated." These perverts are as a rule either those who are looking for material advantages, such as fine clothing or generous foodstuffs for which they will not have to pay, or those whose mode of living called for sharp rebuke from the Lord; or they again have taken to the Baptist fold, or, we should say, folds, to escape the payment of tithes, which in all cases are not by any means oppressive. Indeed the habitants do not pay nearly as much for church purposes as the non-Catholics of the province of Ontario. Quite true were the words of the editor of the Globe, himself a Protestant clergyman, published in that paper a few years ago, to the effect that these missions to the French Canadians are humbugs. This may not be the exact word he used, but it was to that effect. We remember well the editor was called sharply to task for this pronouncement by the extremists who are in a perpetual ministerial maelstrom. This work in which the Baptists, Methodists and Presbyterians are engaged is simply a reproach to these bodies. It is the outcome of a fanaticism which has hidden good-day to common sense. The money spent in French Canada for proselytizing purposes could be used to much better advantage in the city of Toronto where thousands live without a

knowledge of God, in squalor, ignorance and crime. Some of our ministerial friends will have to account for many a sin of omission because of their ungodly disposition to hurl a stone at "Romanism" on every opportunity.

DISSIMULATION. Frequently we have drawn attention to the dissimulation of the average prohibitionist, and as the world gets older we do not see any reason for changing our opinion. For long we have had in existence in the country an association called the Dominion Alliance, composed of gentlemen who are dealers of prohibiting the manufacture and sale of intoxicants. It is not our purpose now to discuss the pros and cons of this phase of the question, but merely to draw attention to a notable instance of inconsistency on the part of some of these people. An election was held last week in East Middlesex to fill a seat in the local legislature. The candidate of Mr. Whitney pledged himself to vote for carrying out that gentleman's programme of abolishing the treating system. The Independent Conservative candidate, Mr. Sutherland, went a step farther and pledged himself to favor Mr. Rowell's platform of abolishing the bar. The gentlemen of the Dominion Alliance met in solemn conclave and decided they would not make pronouncement in favor of either candidate. Now one would think that if these gentlemen were true to their principles they would favor the candidature of Mr. Sutherland for the reason that his position embraced both schemes, because if the bar is done away with there will as a consequence be no treating. And so it has ever been with this Dominion Alliance. Some of its members are, we doubt not, honest and sincere and strive to better social conditions, but the rank and file will, for three years and three hundred and sixty-four days deliver fervent denunciations of the intoxicant and all its belongings, but on the three hundredth and sixty-fifth day, being polling day, their temperance principles are dropped and they will glide into the party wigwag and cast their vote for the Grit and Tory candidate, as the case may be, according to their political proclivities. We can always take it as a matter of course that the Tory temperance man will ever vote Tory and the Grit temperance man will always vote Grit. There may be exceptions, of course, here and there; but the exceptions prove the rule. If the Dominion Alliance people sought to attain the possible and relinquish their dreams about the impossible they would do something tangible in the cause of sobriety. Their dissimulation is a distinct injury to the cause. It will be remembered that some years ago the liquor question was taken out of politics and submitted to the country in the form of a plebiscite. The great majority of the people of Ontario favored total prohibition, but we feel convinced that were it made a party question the result would have been different. We may take it then that one of the most regrettable features of our public life is the fact that prohibitionists, as well as others, are but the slaves of party, and will sacrifice principle that the party candidate may lead the poll.

AS TO CRIMINALS. A despatch from New York tells us that the native American residents of that city, and in particular those of Dutch and British descent, are beginning to feel the oppression of the yoke of the foreign element. We had formed the opinion from reading current literature that the bulk of the terrible crimes perpetrated in the United States were committed not by the foreign, but by the native element, or the second or third generations of the emigrants. The Jews, for instance, before they set foot on American soil, were noted for remarkable freedom from criminal tendencies. How comes it then that their descendants in the great Republic become adepts in the ways that are dark and the tricks that are mean. There is one way of accounting for it, and it matters not how much theorizing may be advanced, the ugly fact nevertheless stares us in the face: it is Godless education. Only too many of the youth of America are imbued with a modern paganism. They live their lives seeking bus money and pleasure. Eternal reward and eternal punishment in the world to come gives them no concern. The champions of the little red school house sowed the wind and are now reaping the whirlwind. Nor should all the crimes be laid at the doors of the descendants of the impoverished emigrants who landed in America. Some of the descendants of those who came over in the Mayflower, and who make boast of it, figure largely in criminal annals chiefly in the matter of unfaithfulness to the marriage tie, bank defalcations, forgeries and gambling, commonly called high finance. Dexterosely they will relieve a man of hundreds of thousands of dollars in stock exchange transactions, but they look with contempt upon their fellow citizen who will hold up a wayfarer and relieve him of \$10. Truly we live in an age of humbug, insincerity and hypocrisy.

THE "OATH" AGAIN. The Toronto Globe quotes the Barnum theory that a new lot of fools are born every day to replace the old ones who die. This has reference to a number of people in the county of Elgin who are put in faith in an oath said to be taken by the Knights of Columbus. "The operators think," says our contemporary, "they can work an old and played out piece of stupid deception by merely changing a name. Evidently lacking ability or time to revise the old document, that did ignoble service as the supposed Jesuit Oath, they have stuffed in an attack on the A. F. and A. M. The addition to the pretended oath reads: "I will not rest till they (the Freemasons) are extirpated from the earth." To the editor of the CATHOLIC RECORD, who is a Knight of Columbus, this oath is indeed most startling news. The oath circulated in the county of Elgin could not very well be the oath taken by the Knights of Columbus for the simple reason that the Knights do not take any oath whatever. For the benefit of our simple and ill-instructed non-Catholic neighbors we will give away the "secrets" of the Knights of Columbus. Nothing can be found in its proceedings, in its constitution or in its bylaws which is contrary to the teachings of our divine Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ and His Church. If the A. F. and A. M., the Sons of England, the Orange Society and other bodies outside the Catholic Church could make the same claim Canada would be a much better country to live in, and there would not be so much corruption in Dominion and municipal politics. Very recent movements on the municipal slate in the city of Toronto give us proof abundant that such is the case. Touching this subject the following from the Philadelphia Catholic Standard and Times will be of interest:

The subjoined letters, recently printed in the Meadville (Pa.) Tribune-Republican, demonstrate what decent people think of the outrageous literature of the present campaign of slander against the Catholic Church and the Catholic people in the United States. Rev. Lefferd M. A. Haugwout is rector of the Episcopal Church, Meadville, Pa., and Francis A. Christie is professor in the Unitarian Theological School of the same city:

Editor of the Tribune-Republican: I have been shown a printed slip which is being privately circulated and I have been asked what I think about it. It pretends to be a copy of a blood-curdling oath taken by members of the Knights of Columbus, the well-known Catholic society. I deem it a social duty to publish the fact that such a document is circulated and to protest against the outrageous deception attempted, not only because it does a grievous wrong to our fellow-citizens who are Catholics, but also because it insults the intelligence of us who are not Catholics. I have no knowledge

whatever of the rules of the Knights of Columbus, but any man with at least a minimum of common sense can pronounce the circular a falsehood on the first sight of it.

I am disturbed at this document, not because I fear that many Protestants will be deceived by it, but because the people who are capable of inventing such things are a social menace. If any person has been deluded by this circular, let him remember how he displayed the credulity of Russian Christians when they believed Jewish neighbors guilty of brutal murder. Let him remember how he laughed at those European Catholics who were taken in by Leo Taxil's bogus revelations concerning diabolical practices of free Masons. Let him remember how he applauded the good sense of other Catholics who, without waiting for proof, denounced Taxil as a swindler before he confessed the swindle. When Taxil's revelations began to appear, I asked a Jesuit father what he thought of it. His reply was, "He must be insane." That is the way healthy American sense deals with such things. Now that I am asked what I think of the printed slip in circulation, I answer that if the author is not insane, he thinks that the rest of us are insanely gullible, and we may be sure that some other motive than religion controls him.

FRANCIS A. CHRISTIE.

ENDORSED DR. CHRISTIE'S LETTER. Editor of the Tribune-Republican: "I wish to second the eminently sane words of Professor Christie regarding the fictitious "oath" of the Knights of Columbus, and also to call attention to the fact that this is only part of a carefully engineered campaign to create a sentiment of hatred for the Roman Church, through the circulation of literature of an altogether preposterous character. A scurrilous periodical, appropriately named "The Menace," is being distributed in many Meadville homes, with this purpose in view. It is a mosaic of inconsequential fact and deliberate falsehood, well calculated to mislead the uninformed. One does not have to have any particular "leaning" towards the Church in question to feel a sense of outrage at the circulation of this sort of thing. It is a plain appeal to fanaticism, and does irreparable injury to the cause of religion.

Respectfully, LEFFERD M. A. HAUGWOUT.

UNIVERSITY QUESTION IN NOVA SCOTIA. The government of Nova Scotia has appointed a commission of seven to enquire into the system of university education in Nova Scotia. The appointment of this commission took the public somewhat by surprise, as no previous intimation was given of the intention to appoint it, and as yet there seems to be very great caution as to the exact purpose of the move. The chairman of the commission is Mr. W. E. Maclellan, post office inspector for Nova Scotia, and formerly editor of the Morning Chronicle. The selection of Mr. Maclellan for chairman is an excellent one. He has had a wide experience in educational work, is a man of high intelligence, and is in every way competent to fill the post with distinction.

MR. ARCHIBALD. There is a gentleman on the police department of Toronto named Archibald. He is, we believe, Staff Inspector. Mr. Archibald was the star performer in a scene in Toronto's police court on the 23rd of October. It seems that Father Conway, a distinguished Paulist Father who is now giving a non-Catholic mission in Toronto, went for an auto ride with two companions. Constable May stopped the car and threatened arrest for speeding. The three occupants of the car swore that it was not going more than four miles an hour. "I will fine you for this," declared the constable. Upon hearing the evidence Magistrate Kingsford dismissed the case, whereupon Chief Inspector Archibald became wrath and exclaimed: "I think this man should be locked up on a perjury charge. These foreigners should be taught they can not come into this court and get away with an attempt to make a liar out of a constable." "Thank God we've got honest judges on the Canadian bench, if we haven't honest men on the police force," was the priest's farewell compliment. "Show that man out of the court, and do it at once," shouted the inspector. Father Conway and his friends departed amid loud laughter among the spectators over the discomfiture of Inspector Archibald.

Upon reading this incident most people will naturally inquire: Is not Constable Archibald guilty of contempt of court? Has it come to this that a policeman may criticise the verdict rendered by the Judge on the bench, and this in open court? His declaration that we should "teach foreigners coming to this country," etc., was in exceedingly bad taste. He should not forget that a couple of millions of Canadians and their descendants are living in the great Republic and that Americans are not wont to refer to them as foreigners. But would it not be well for Staff Inspector Archibald to remember that he himself is a foreigner? When he came to this country, through what influence, we may ask, did he obtain the position he now holds? Was it because he had experience in dealing with criminals in the old country? If so it should not be considered fitness for office in Canada. Prison methods in the old land incline to that which is heartless and cruel. The "Goddess of