

The Catholic Record.

Published weekly at 24 and 25 Richmond Street, London, Ontario.
Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.
REV. GEORGE R. NORTHGRAVE,
Author of "Mysteries of Modern Catholicism."
REV. WILLIAM FLANNERY,
THOMAS COFFEY.

Publisher and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY, 24 and 25 Richmond Street, London, Ontario.
P. J. NEVENS are authorized to receive subscriptions and transact all other business for the Catholic Record.
Agents for Advertising—Ten cents per line each insertion.
Approved by the Archbishop of Toronto, and recommended by the Archbishops of St. Boniface, Ottawa, Kingston, and the Bishops of Hamilton and Peterboro, and leading Catholic Clergy men throughout the Dominion.
Correspondence intended for publication, as well as that having reference to business, should be directed to the proprietor, and must reach London not later than Tuesday morning.
Address must be paid in full before the paper can be sent. A change of address should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Catholic Record.

London, Sat., Feb. 8th, 1890.

DR. LAING ON SEPARATE SCHOOLS.

The Rev. Dr. Laing, who has long been one of the most uncompromising opponents of Catholic schools, has a paper in a recent number of the Canadian Nation, the organ of the so-called New Party, in which he asks, "What shall be done with the separate schools?" We understand very well the doctor's kindly intentions, and those of his so-called New Party, and from their point of view the answer to his question would be, "Sweep them out of existence," but it so happens that others beside them will have a word to say in this matter.

In the present paper Mr. Laing sets out by saying: "The separate schools should be made efficient, should be carefully inspected, should have the subjects taught which the public schools have, and should have authorized text books, free from disloyal historic references or superstitious legends."

None are more anxious than the Catholics themselves to have the separate schools efficient, but we cannot forget that Rev. Dr. Laing has been one of those who most officiously labored to hamper the Catholic school trustees with vexatious conditions, in the hope that some Catholics who are desirous of supporting the separate schools may, owing to their negligence of certain formalities, be entrapped as public school supporters. We have before us two letters of this Rev. Dr. dated respectively Nov. 29th, 1886, and Feb. 28th, 1888. That of 1888 is addressed to the Minister of Education. In this letter he urges the introduction into the public schools of a system of religious instruction which will suit him, but will not suit Catholics.

The adoption of his suggestions would undoubtedly be the means for the Protestantizing of the public schools, under the pretence of introducing a "common Christianity;" while in his letter of 1886 he aims at harassing the trustees and supporters of the separate schools in such a way that their efficiency may be destroyed. This is the real inwardness of Dr. Laing's affection for efficient Catholic education. It is needless to say that from such a quarter we do not look for advice as to how our schools are to be conducted.

We wish our schools to be efficient, and the annual reports of the Minister of Education prove that in this respect they do not at all fall short of the public schools of the Province. The demands of Mr. Laing that they shall be properly inspected, and that all the subjects taught in the public schools should be taught in them, and that the books used should be both "authorized" and "loyal," are all attended to; but the doctor evidently wants more than this. He wants that he and his colleagues of the Equal Rights Association shall have the authority conferred upon them of interfering with their working. To this we decidedly object.

We can read between the lines what Dr. Laing means by eliminating from our books all "superstitious legends," if he were made the judge. All Catholic doctrine and practice, and Catholic Church history, would be positively forbidden subjects in Catholic schools. He would destroy the very purpose for which Catholic schools are instituted. Indeed, the doctor is honest enough to acknowledge this as his object. He says in his recent paper:

"Now, we ask confidently, is it wise for our rulers, is it for the best interests of our country, to maintain from public funds schools in which a large portion of our youth are thus handed over to occultism, and taught that obedience to an alien potentate is their first duty, as being obedience to God; are trained to regard as irreligious and morally wrong that right of private judgment and liberty of conscience according to which, to quote from the Syllabus, 'Every man is free to embrace and profess the religion he believes to be true, guided by the light of reason.'"

The doctor thus reproaches the Church because it does not maintain that every one has the right to embrace what religion he pleases. Well, then, let us for the moment agree with the doctor. Why should he endeavor to limit our right to

hold and to teach the Catholic religion? He calls it a system of "occultism," but according to his own principle he should leave us free not to look upon it in the same light. The Catholic Church has always been the patroness of education, and of learning in every sphere. She built and supported elementary and high schools and universities before State systems of education were dreamed of. The doctor's cry of occultism against her is simply nonsensical twaddle. He bases his belief on the declarations of the Presbyterian Standards of Faith, that every teaching of the Catholic Church is "superstition," but these are some of the points on which the "Standards" are sadly in need of "revision."

What is meant by the refusal of the Church to accept the favorite infidel doctrine that "every man is free to embrace and profess the religion he believes to be true, guided by the light of reason?" This doctrine asserts man's right to reject all truth. It proclaims man's independence of God. It is not a question of the employment of force in the propagation of religion; it regards man's moral right, before God, to reject His Revelation. The Catholic Church tells us he has no such right. In this she is certainly in accord with our Lord, who says to His Apostles, when sending them on their teaching mission:

"But whosoever shall not receive you, nor hear your words: going forth out of that house or city, shake off the dust from your feet. Amen I say to you, it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom and G. moria in the day of judgement than for that city." (St. Matt. x, 14, 15)

But what are we to think of Dr. Laing's honesty in making this charge against Catholics, when we know that his own Church has made declaration that it is not lawful to believe any doctrine but that which is contained in the Presbyterian Standards? Here is the teaching of the National Covenant, ordained by the Parliament of Scotland, and by several Acts of the General Assembly, especially in 1590 and 1639:

"We all and every one of us under written protest that, after long and due examination of our own conscience, in matters of faith and duty, we have concluded with our hearts, consciences, and constantly affirm, before God and the whole world, that this only is the true Christian faith and religion, pleasing God, and bringing salvation to man, which now is, by the mercy of God, revealed to the world by the preaching of the blessed Evangel; and is received, believed, and defended by many and sundry notable Miracles and signs, and chiefly by the Kirk of Scotland, the King's majesty and three estates of this realm, as God's eternal truth and only ground of our salvation, as more particularly is expressed in the confession of our faith."

And therefore we abhor and detest all contrary religion and doctrine; but chiefly all kind of Popery."

Here follow the special doctrines of Popery, which are condemned in no measured terms. It is then declared:

"That Popery and superstition may be utterly suppressed according to the intention of the Acts of Parliament repeated in the 5th Act, Parliament 20, King James VI. And to that end they ordain all Papists and priests to be punished with manifold civil and ecclesiastical pains as adversaries of God's true religion, etc."

This exhibits the spirit in which Dr. Laing would eliminate "superstition" from Catholic text-books.

It is said "they who live in glass houses should not throw stones." In the face of such a declaration, the above, it becomes Dr. Laing to accuse Catholics of teaching false doctrine because we do not limit the moral right of every man to accept every doctrine which pleases his fancy.

In reference to the doctor's assertion that public funds should not be used for the support of Catholic schools, we answer that we only require that Catholics shall be allowed to use their own money for the education of their own children, in accordance with their religious convictions.

Honest advocates of Equal Rights would acknowledge the justice of our demand. But the pretended Equal Rightists who are willing indeed to respect the conscientious demands of Protestants, but wish to do violence to Catholic conscience, cannot conceal the wolf within though their outside garb be that of a most meek-mannered lamb.

Dr. Laing's representations that the Separate School Act of 1863 was a finality, that all Catholic property is withdrawn from the public schools, that separate schools are asked only by the Catholic clergy, not by the people, and other assertions, are so manifestly false that it is enough to state them to show the want of truth which is characteristic of his whole conduct.

We sympathize most sincerely with the good fathers of Berlin, Ont., who recently received the announcement of the death of the founder of the college in that town. Dr. Funcken was a great as well as a good priest, and is now reaping the reward of his arduous labors in behalf of religion.

We are pleased to note that our contemporary, the Irish Canadian, has been appointed an official organ of the C. M. B. A. This step will have for effect the spreading more widely the great advantages to be derived from membership in this admirable association.

A CHANCE FOR A BOGUS PATRIOT.

The Canadian Nation, the recognized organ of Rev. Dr. Sutherland's "New Party," has an article in its issue of 9th January, in which it tells the "independent" voters of its following how, if they but "stand together, they can carry the country." The course recommended is precisely that which Mr. Meredith falsely named His Grace the Archbishop of Kingston of recommending to the Catholics of the Province. The Canadian Nation tells its readers that "the power of the independent vote in Ontario will be readily understood by any one who knows how small are the majorities by which members of Parliament are elected."

At the last general election the majorities ranged from one to seventy-four in twenty-three constituencies, and in twenty-three other constituencies the majorities were from ninety-three to two hundred. The organ asks: "If the independent voters could score seven hundred and seventy six votes in a 'Reform hive' like Lambton 'what can they not do in these constituencies where the old parties are pretty evenly balanced?'"

Here, then, is a very overt recommendation to the Equal Rightists to throw their influence and their votes with one party or the other, according as they find the candidates willing to adopt more or less entirely the Equal Rights or anti-Catholic platform.

Here is an opportunity for that pure patriot, Mr. Meredith, to reiterate the unparliamentary policy of endeavoring to put the Government into the hands of a clerically controlled minority, by the disreputable means which he denounced so strongly when he pretended to respect a Catholic Archbishop of employing it. Here is an occasion on which it would be quite in order for Mr. Meredith to call upon all true and patriotic Canadians to unite against the efforts of Dr. Sutherland and his party, to make use of the disreputable means of the two great parties of the Province as a means of bringing a factional minority into power.

We have an expectation that the leader of the Ontario Opposition will denounce this attack upon the liberties of the people. His principles too strongly resemble those of Dr. Sutherland, and his hope is that the Equal Rights party vote may be secured to his candidates. He would never have dreamed of proclaiming the necessity of Protestant union against "the common enemy" were it not that he had the Catholic body in view. As far as he is concerned, the Equal Rightists are at perfect liberty to jeopardize the precious liberties of the country.

The advice given by the Canadian Nation is the same which was offered to the party by the Mail.

THE DEAN OF PETERBORO ON THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY.

The Dean of Peterborough has declared his belief in the validity of Christian sacraments, even when administered by non-Episcopal ministers, and he has been lauded by Rev. Dr. Parker of London Temple for this declaration. But Dr. Parker asks him the very pertinent question: "Why do you not take one step further, and occasionally occupy a nonconformist pulpit?" Of course the Dean's view of the case must be adopted by the Church of England, as a necessary preliminary to the union among the various denominations which Anglicans as well as others are now striving to bring about. But if it be true that a clerical body selected after a fashion which any self-respecting and self-called "Church of Christ" may appoint, becomes thereby, equally with St. Paul, "ministers of Christ and dispensers of the mysteries of God" (Cor. iv, 1), what is the necessity of ordaining a clergy at all? Why not, at once, after the Independent manner, let every one who can raise a congregation to listen to him be the minister of that congregation? It is very true that Christ gave only to His Apostles and to their lawful successors this authority in the Church, but the Presbyterians and Methodists, equally with the Independents and Congregationalists, deny the need of any apostolic succession. It is a matter which every Church is held to be empowered to settle for itself, notwithstanding that holy Scripture tells us: "Neither doth any man take the honor to himself but he that is called by God, as Aaron was" (Hab. v, 4). It is no wonder, however, that the sect reject the necessity of apostolic succession, for with the claim of from fifteen to eighteen centuries between the date of the Apostles and the beginning of their respective churches a claim to such succession would be ridiculous.

The Church of England, however, has kept up such a claim, and the Thirty-Sixth Article of the Church declares that its "Bishops, priests and deacons," ordained according to the Ritual of Edward the Sixth, are "rightly, orderly and lawfully consecrated and ordered." This plainly implies that those who have not been so ordained have no claim to be considered as lawful ministers. If the Dean of Peterborough's view be adopted the Church of England will give up its very reason for existence. As a matter

of fact, the claims of the nonconformists to a lawful ministry are just as well founded as those of the Anglicans. Both are equally separated from the source of all ecclesiastical jurisdiction.

A SCOFFER AT RELIGION.

Professor Goldwin Smith delivered an address before the 19th Century Club in the Metropolitan Opera House, New York, on Friday of last week. The subject was "Canada, Great Britain, and the United States." The purpose of the gathering was to consider the political and commercial relations of the three governments, but Mr. Smith could not let the occasion pass without a malicious fling at the people of Quebec, both in regard to their race and their religion. In reference to race he said: "The feeling of Quebec is difficult to divine at a moment when, owing to the development of a strong French nationalism there, everything is in a state of fermentation and transition." It is true there are political parties in Quebec just as there are in the other Provinces of the Dominion; but why Quebec should be singled out as in a state of fermentation and transition beats our comprehension. There is the best of feeling there between the Catholic majority and the Protestant minority, and nothing exemplifies this better than the readiness with which the Premier of Quebec receded a small balance due to the Protestants in the apportionment of the \$400,000, on account of the Jesuits' estates, as soon as the disapprobation was pointed out. There was none of that "fermentation" of which the Professor so hubristically speaks.

The fermentation which betokens a transition state seems to be peculiar to our own very model Province of Ontario. It is here that the Orange lodges, encouraged by ministers of nearly all the denominations, and by political leaders whose hope of attaining office overrules their love of country, are fruitlessly threatening to transform the Dominion into a Bedlam of animosity. It is in Ontario that the professed ministers of the Prince of Peace are endeavoring to stir up from their pulpits the spirit of strife.

The pretended efforts to stir up a French Nationalism are more ghastly, invented by such men as Mr. Smith, to satisfy their unwholesome aims. The people of Quebec, it is true, cling to their language and religion, and thus far, in a certain sense, they are French and Nationalist in a sense which is perfectly consistent with their loyalty to the country which belongs to them, equally with their would-be persecutors. But let those persecutors desist from their efforts to trample upon the rights of the people of Quebec and the transition indicating fermentation will also cease to exist. The fermentation does not come from French Nationalism, but from Orange and Ministerial intolerance.

The Professor that speaks of the religion of Quebec: "The natural tendency of a priesthood is to cling to seclusion and twilight." We can well believe this of the Hotters, Wildes and Langs, whom Mr. Smith will admire and encourage as long as they give vent to the bigotry which is their characteristic, but the Catholic priesthood of Quebec are men of a different mould. They are truly men of learning and piety, entirely devoted themselves to the work of securing the welfare of their people. The thought of encouraging their people to murder, even those who are endeavoring to create division, never entered into their minds, nor have they any crazy pet theory that their people are rediscovered lost tribes whose mission it is to dominate over their fellow-citizens of other races.

We are told next: "Quebec is the only part of this Northern Continent in which little is collected by law." It has yet to be demonstrated that this mode of supporting the priesthood and the Church is at all inferior to the mode preferred by the people of Ontario. The population of Ontario and the United States are so divided religiously, that it would be for them an impossible task to support their clergy by a tithe system, and we readily concede that for them a purely voluntary system is the best, if not the only possible one, without producing heart burnings most disastrous to the respective countries. But, be it remembered, in Quebec the position is altogether different. The Catholics of Quebec are about 86 per cent. of the population of the Province. If they prefer to support the Church by legal tithes, as being the most ready and effective method, no one has a right to complain, except those who would be obliged to pay for the support of a religion in which they do not believe. But as Protestants do not pay tithes there is no such grievance class. Under this grievance the nonconformists, as well as Catholics of enlightened England and Wales, labor, but the Protestants of Quebec do not. They have therefore no reason to complain, and Ontonians who make it a subject of complaint and threatenings are merely impatient maddens. It is no new thing for Mr. Goldwin Smith to be found in

this class, and the late Lord Beaconsfield knew his exact measure. *Verbum sapienti*. The manner in which the people of Quebec will support the Church is a matter which they are themselves quite competent to decide, and if the Goldwin Smiths of Ontario are bent upon forcing their notions upon a sister Province, they will find themselves unceremoniously told to attend to their own affairs. If we are to believe the representations of the Equal Rightists, Ontario is badly in need of being looked after, and it will need all the attention which these busy-bodies can afford to give to it.

Mr. Smith adds: "Quebec is the only part in which miracles are performed, though perhaps it is the part in which they are least needed."

This sneer against miracles is quite in harmony with the sentiments which were so plainly expressed by a Toronto journal, we believe, while Mr. Smith was one of its editors. The people of Canada have not forgotten that the journal in question embraced the Epicurean in opposition to Christian doctrine, and ridiculed the possibility of divine interposition in the affairs of men. But Christianity has not disappeared from this country yet; and it is the teaching of the founder of Christianity that "these signs shall follow them that believe." (St. Mark xvi, 17) For this reason we are told, Acts v, 12: "By the hands of the Apostles were many signs and wonders wrought among the people."

It is undoubtedly true that in Quebec incontestable miracles of God's power have been wrought at certain sacred places. We hold that these attestations of God demonstrate the excellence of Catholic devotion, and Mr. Goldwin Smith's sneers only prove that he and those who with him job at sacred things would find their suitable place rather in Bob Ingersoll's lecture hall than even in Dr. Wild's tabernacle or conventicle. We would call his attention to these words of our Saviour:

"Who unto thee Cerebus, who unto thee Bethesda, for if the mighty works (miracles) which were done in you had been done in Tyre and Sidon, they would have been cast down in sackcloth and ashes. But I say unto you, it shall be more tolerable for Tyre and Sidon at the day of judgement than for you." (St. Matt. xi, 21, 22. St. Luke, x, 13, 14)

A further statement made by Mr. Smith exhibits his insufferable insolence and egotism to a degree which leads us to be surprised that he was not laughed down by the highly intelligent audience that listened to him. He suspected on good grounds as he has been of unauthorized proclivities presumed to impeach the loyalty of the Province of Quebec as a "passive loyalty." Well, even that is better than active disloyalty. But he added:

"The loyalty has become of late more than ever passive, and is morally superseded by allegiance to the Pope, whose authority in the case of the Jesuit Estates Act has actually been introduced into French Canadian legislation."

Mr. Smith would like to pose as a profound statesman, but the statements of Canada and Great Britain have expressed their convictions already on this subject, and we may be pardoned for saying that their opinion on the force of legislation is worth fully as much as that of Mr. Goldwin Smith. He ought to know, if he does not, that the Pope's authority over Catholics through the world is spiritual, not temporal. It is the fashion for bigots of his stamp to represent that the Catholic view of the independence of the Church from civil interference, is a repudiation of the Royal authority. It is simply a consequence of the doctrine that we must "Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's and to God the things that are God's." Except the Church of England, there is not a prominent Protestant denomination which does not hold the same. For this doctrine the Presbyterians of Scotland fought and bled, until it was established as the law of the land. Nothing but sheer ignorance or persistent knavery could lead any one to single out the Catholic Church as an object for persecution under such a pretence. But nothing better could be expected from Mr. Goldwin Smith.

GHOUISH BIGOTRY.

The London Free Press had in last Monday's issue a leading article that for "ferocious" bigotry was hardly ever surpassed. It aims at nothing less than the smashing up of the British North America Act, and the utter extinction of the Catholic Separate schools. "It should be borne in mind," it says, "that the sectarian schools were instituted to vex and curse this Province." This will be news to most people. The Separate schools have been in existence for over thirty years and it is the first time we are told that they are a curse to Canada. Were it not that every other dodge has been tried to upset the Mowat Government, the overthrow of the Separate schools would not now be called for. It is because the idol of the Free Press, Mr. Meredith, wants to upset the Ontario Government that the Catholic Separate schools are a "curse to the country." It is especially because one ambitious bigot connected with the schools of this city

rears a remote chance of his being appointed Government School Inspector that our Separate schools "are not for the good of the community," and that the public is asked: "Is it necessary to uphold them at the public expense?" It is because the Free Press and its friends and editorial contributors are looking forward with anxious and greedy eyes and open jaws for the morsel of pottage and for the leaves and fishes in the local government trough, it is for this reason that Mowat is hounded down for making those schools "more and more offensive to the general public." We would calmly ask all reasonable men who have lived in Canada for the last thirty years to say in what way or manner have our Separate schools been offensive to the public—how, or in what, have they been a source of vexation and malediction to the Province? It would be utterly impossible for the hungry bigot who writes about our schools in the Free Press to advance even a shadow of a proof that Catholic Separate schools have been injurious to the country, whereas proofs are in abundance to show that our schools have been of the very greatest benefit everywhere. If other proofs were wanting it could be shown that the rivalry existing between them and the Public schools has been beneficial to both, and that loyalty to the Canadian nationality has been vastly promoted by the fact of all Catholics in this Province being able to boast of educational privileges that do not exist in the United States.

But however the Free Press writers may rage in order to reach their own selfish and ghoulish ends, the great bulk of the Canadian people will remain true to the constitution and will take pride in the Canadian spirit of tolerance that allows Catholic Separate schools to its Catholic loyal subjects. The writers in the Free Press would break the North America Act as the government of William and Mary in times of persecution violated the Treaty of Limerick almost before the ink was dry with which it was written. The motto of the Free Press is the motto of Bishop Dopping, who, in Chatelet Church, Dublin, on the Sunday after the Treaty of Limerick was signed, declared from his pulpit "that no faith should be kept with Papists." Should the Free Press and its Belfast canting friends succeed in destroying our Separate schools it should be well understood that the Protestant Separate schools in Quebec might fall at the same time.

RETALIATION.

The Equal Rightists held a meeting in Holland Centre last Thursday evening at which Dr. Fraser said that it was from no animosity to French-Canadians or Roman Catholics that he was such, as he entertained towards them the most kindly feelings. But what he complained of was: "That we had not the same rights and privileges meted out to us as had the French-speaking and Catholic people." Here it is said the Doctor quoted and explained quite a number of instances in which this was the case. The Mail's correspondent contributes the above item, and we regret very much the instance of injustice done to Protestants in Ontario or Quebec are not mentioned. No doubt the Mail is ashamed to print them, in order to shield his correspondent or Dr. Fraser from public ridicule. We could mention many instances, however, in which it is all the other way. Principal Owen, for instance, obtained from the Ontario Government lands valued at \$150,000 for the benefit of the Knox College, over which he presided in Toronto. The Methodist in Toronto obtained a site of land for church purposes valued at \$20,000. At least such statements have been made several times in the press of Ontario, and have never yet been contradicted. The Protestants in the Province of Quebec are allowed every latitude in Separate school legislation, whereas Catholics in Ontario are for ever tormented and harassed and threatened with coercive laws about the education of their own children. The Hon. Mr. Colby, now a Minister of the Cabinet, declared in Parliament at its last session that no religious minority in any country under the sun is so liberally and so generously treated as the Protestants in Quebec.

We challenge Dr. Fraser to itemize the instances of favoritism shown to Catholics in Ontario. In fact the doctor, and many like him, while professing esteem and kindly feeling towards us Catholics fancy that we owe them a debt of gratitude for being permitted to live. And now the mayors of cities are instructing the city assessors to mark down every ratepayer as a supporter of the Common school, so that his taxes may be gathered into the treasury of the Common school fund, and that Catholics who have not their eyes open wide and their ears on the alert, like the envage on the war path, may be fleeced to the tune of thousands of dollars and the schools erected by their hard earned cash be utterly demolished or rendered useless.

The Protestants in Quebec are all con-

sidered Separate school supporters, no matter how distant their residence may be from the school house. And the Quebec Catholic members of the Legislature are raising no hue and cry about that privilege or about any of the other privileges which Protestants enjoy, but which we dare not ask for in Ontario. The Protestants of Quebec obtain one third of all the school taxes levied on corporate bodies, such as railroad property, banking institutions, commercial companies, etc., whereas in Ontario the Catholic Separate schools do not receive one farthing from all these rich sources. And even now there is a movement on foot to rob us of our school taxes. Surely Tyranny and Hypocrisy are twin brothers.

So sure as persecution goes on after this fashion, and so sure as Mr. Meredith carries out the programme laid down in his London speech of crippling our schools, so as to render them unworkable and to diminish their number, so sure the hour will come when a retaliatory policy will be inaugurated in the Province of Quebec, and then we shall be startled with a howl. Hon. Mr. Meredith has already given warning in private conversation, however, but which has been circulated in the press, that a policy of retaliation will be carried out in Quebec for any injustice or persecution shown to Catholic minorities in other Provinces, and the journals of Ontario have been loud in their denunciations of what they call a "threat." But they have no denunciations for what is not merely being threatened in Ontario, but for what is actually being done, and being made part of a legislative policy as something that must be done, viz, the destruction of our Catholic Separate school system, for no one can deny that, according to the programme laid down and proclaimed to the world in the London pronouncement, our schools are menaced, first with being crippled and rendered ineffectual, and then with being utterly crushed and destroyed. Meredith and his party may not be so tyrannical at heart or so vindictive as to initiate Ontario's bigotry and intolerance, but no argument can be advanced against the justice and the fairness of a retaliatory policy.

THE ADDRESS ON FRENCH SCHOOLS.

The final session of the sixth Legislature of Ontario was opened on the 30th ult., a brilliant throng of prominent ladies and gentlemen gracing the occasion with their presence. His Honor Sir Alexander Campbell, Lieutenant-Governor of the Province, was received with the usual marks of respect by a guard of honor composed of fifty-eight men of C.S. school of Infantry, under command of Major Vidal and Captain Evans and Leader. The regimental band, comprising twenty-two men, was also in attendance.

The address from the throne was read by His Honor, who congratulated the Legislature that an Act of the Imperial Parliament had settled the northern and western boundaries of the Province in substantial accordance with the award of the arbitrators in 1873. He also spoke in congratulatory terms of the increased receipts from timber duties and crown land sales, and of the interest taken by farmers in the application of improved methods in agriculture, notwithstanding the depression which naturally arises from the falling of the crops below what was expected.

In reference to the French schools of the Province His Honor said:

"It having been alleged that the regulations of the Education Department, requiring instruction in English to be given in all the Public Schools of the Province, were not observed in certain localities in which the French language prevailed, Commissioners were appointed to visit these schools, to report the facts and to consider in what way the study of English may be most successfully promoted among the pupils whose mother-tongue is French. The same Commissioners were afterwards directed to visit the German schools of the Province, and to report in like manner regarding them. Their reports will be submitted to you, as well as certain regulations for giving practical effect to the recommendations of the Commissioners, so far as this could be done by immediate executive action. You will be asked to make the grant which is necessary for the establishment of a training school in Eastern Ontario, as recommended by the Commissioners."

The course taken by the Government in relation to the French schools is that which common sense and prudence dictates. There is no debate, no difference of opinion, in regard to the desirability of the silent teaching of English in all the schools of Ontario. We do not need to be told by the Francophobes that the people of Ontario wish it and must have it. They would wish English to be thrust down the throats of the French-Canadians of Russell, Prescott, Simcoe, Essex and Kent just as a nauseous drug might be forced down the throat of an unwilling patient.

The French Canadian settlers in the counties named have no objection whatsoever to learn English, and to have English taught in their schools. They are anxious for it, and, from what we know of them, they are making special efforts to have good teachers in their schools,