

solve if the organization of landlords in the shape of the British House of Commons was likewise suppressed. By our legal, constitutional, patient attitude we put the Government in a dilemma, and they are now, like foiled gamblers, putting down their last trump and playing their last trick."

As to the effect of the Government proclamations on the popular movement, Mr. A. M. Sullivan's opinion is worth taking. He believes that the work of the organization will, despite what any man may wish or say, be carried on very largely throughout Ireland by secret organization. The feeling of the country is too intense, too much aroused, the question at issue too real, too terrible, to think that the land movement can subside in a night because a printed paper with the lion and the unicorn at its head and Mr. Forster's name at its foot, declares the League to be proclaimed. The thing is preposterous. The movement will go on, but, unfortunately, instead of going on henceforth on an open, public platform, where every one can see the measure of good and ill, the wisdom or mischief of what is said or done, the people will now be driven into secret conclaves, the nature of which it is hard to foresee.

#### THE SCHOOL QUESTION AGAIN.

We have exposed some, and *only some*, of the defects of the Separate School Law of this province. We have shown, that in failing to reach the High School, it halts far short of the end its promoters had in view and every true Catholic wishes it to attain; that in not providing for a Catholic Deputy Minister or Superintendent, it sacrifices our rights and interests to the encroachments, not always wilful, of the majority; that the system of inspection it tolerates is repugnant to the principle of Separate Schools, and injurious alike to our children and their teachers.

Thus far, can it be said we have exaggerated anything? Who that has had experience, as trustee or teacher, will gainsay us in a single particular?

Have we any more complaints to make? Oh yes, lots of them, if we thought a more successful issue would come of a multifarious indictment. The flaws in this piece of legislation are as numerous as the "Wants" in a column of the *Mail*. Why, if you take away the flaws there is hardly anything left.

But most of them are harmless. Are they indeed? Experience reports otherwise, and charges very heavy damages to some of the most harmless-looking. Nay, experience proves that some of the presumably good points—late amendments for instance—are absolutely worthless in action.

It would not facilitate our purpose to recite all these grievances specifically; the most glaring—those already specified among others—will suffice to make out an unanswerable case against the existing Act, and obtain the unanimous verdict of the Catholics of Ontario

in favor of the amendments suggested in these pages or elsewhere.

Up to the present, our course has been approved and indorsed by priests and laymen, and by the Catholic press, who have given the question their attention. We hope, as we advance our lines, to preserve their favorable opinion and good will.

At the very base of this Law, which professes to establish Separate Schools, lies a *weakness* which has caused it to totter on several occasions, and will bring it tumbling down some day if not repaired. It is the weakness of granting to Catholics the privilege of withdrawing—with or without reason—their support from Separate Schools, and turning it over to the Public, non-sectarian, godless Schools.

This is liberty of action, with a vengeance directed against Catholic education. Only Catholics enjoy it; and it is conceded to them for the plain purpose of crippling or killing Separate Schools.

A non-Catholic, so long as he remains such, cannot, under any circumstance, refuse his material support to the Public Schools. They may be a *public failure*—many of them are—but, as a tax-payer, he cannot escape being taxed for their maintenance. He may consider the teachers morally or intellectually, or both morally and intellectually unfit for their position; he may refuse them his *moral* support, and engage a private tutor for his children; but he must pay the Public School tax just the same. There is no appeal.

But a Catholic is more *favoured*—to the end that Catholic Schools may be dis-established, and that scandals may come. He has a chance, once every year, to turn his coat. If a teacher of the Separate School displeases him, he may *boycott* teacher and school most effectively, by transferring his money to the Public School treasury. If he find the school house, furniture, or grounds not up to the mark in his opinion, he may proceed to *separate* himself from Separate Schools. If he and a trustee happen to disagree on any subject, from the market price of cabbages to the Franco-Tunisian business, he may order his name off the roll, and *ipso facto* become a Public School rate-payer. It is always in his power to stop the supplies—with or without cause. He can unfurl the banner of *no rents* or *no taxes* to Separate Schools, and keep it flying with impunity. The Government will not attempt to arrest and suppress him; and the Public Schools will pocket his money without a single qualm of conscience.

What are the results of this two-faced legislation? On the Public School side there is security and steady progress; on the Separate School side, insecurity and irresolution. A Board of Public School trustees can go into the money market, offer its own debentures for sale, and borrow any sum it may require for ten, twenty or thirty years, upon the assessed valuation of the taxable property of Public School supporters, as its security. A Board of Separate School trustees cannot borrow the smallest sum, for a time exceeding one