

In so many instances prevented by conscientious objections, from doing likewise, we have a right to protest against the application of Catholic taxation to their maintenance and extension. We do hold, and we fear not say, that if we of the minority are entitled to Catholic separate elementary schools, and to devote our taxation to their support, we are, in all justice and equity, entitled to devote that portion of the high school fund coming from Catholic sources to the support of exclusively Catholic high schools. But more of this again. Let us return to the separate schools of the Province. The total number of pupils enrolled in these schools for 1885 was as above stated 27,600, an increase of 127 over the previous year. We subjoin a list of the number of pupils and teachers in the principal cities and towns of Ontario for 1885, giving priority to the places with the largest number of pupils:

Table with 2 columns: Teachers, Pupils. Lists data for various locations including Ottawa, Toronto, Hamilton, Kingston, London, Peterborough, etc.

There are, needless to say, flourishing schools in many other towns. Space, however, forbids our mention of any with a smaller number of pupils than two hundred. Turning to the counties, we find that there are in all 117 Catholic Separate schools, with 5497 pupils. The following are the counties with four or more Separate schools.

Table with 2 columns: Schools, Pupils. Lists data for counties such as Prescott and Russell, Grey, Wellington, etc.

Taking them according to ecclesiastical divisions our Catholic separate school teachers and pupils are thus distributed. We give priority to the dioceses having the greatest number of schools:

Table with 3 columns: Schools, Teachers, Pupils. Lists data for dioceses like Hamilton, London, Kingston, Toronto, etc.

It will thus be seen that the Diocese of Hamilton ranks first as to the number of schools, second as to pupils and third as to teachers. Toronto is first as to pupils and teachers and third as to schools. London is second as to schools, and fifth as to teachers and pupils. Ottawa is second both as to teachers and pupils, while Kingston, third as to schools, is fourth as to teachers and pupils. The new diocese of Peterboro and the Vicariate of Pontiac make a very creditable showing, and of the figures, as a whole, it may be said that they are of an encouraging character. We cannot close without a reference to the reports of the two Catholic school inspectors for the Province. Mr. James F. White, who has charge of the Inspection of the Eastern Division, very properly draws attention to the lack of better school accommodation in many places. He acknowledges, however, that usually the trustees and supporters of our separate schools have made praiseworthy efforts to provide suitable buildings even at a considerable sacrifice. One paragraph of Mr. White's report deserves special attention from teachers, trustees, clergymen and all others interested in the work of Catholic education in Ontario. He writes:

In general there is a very respectable supply of furniture and the most necessary appliances for teaching; usually these are of a modern approved kind, but there yet remains in a few of the towns and city schools the long unwieldy desks and benches without backs. Comparatively few schools are supplied with standard dictionaries, gazetteers, encyclopedias, and other works of reference. There are very fair libraries in connection with some of the larger schools in the cities and chief towns. In Peterboro' there is a large, comfortable, well-furnished room devoted to this purpose, and papers and some magazines are furnished in addition to the books. Much good has resulted from these institutions, but their usefulness would be greatly increased if a substantial addition of good works were made every year, and care were taken in choosing such literature as is best suited to the needs of school children, not omitting to provide interesting and instructive reading for the younger classes. By a little extra effort fair libraries could be secured for many more schools; the expenditure of a comparatively small amount each year would supply a fresh stock of books, thus keeping up interest in the library. The bene-

fits that could be derived from such educational helps it would be hard to over-estimate."

Mr. Donovan, the indefatigable Inspector for Western Ontario, reports that during the year 1886 he travelled in the discharge of his duty 4,000 miles, visited 268 classes, distributed among 118 schools, with 243 teachers and 11,587 pupils on the roll. Mr. Donovan reports an improvement in school buildings and finds that while in some few cases overcrowding still prevails, the accommodations are generally adequate and comfortable. He draws attention to a deplorable abuse in fitting terms:

The practice, prevailing in cities and towns, of withdrawing boys from schools at an early age and putting them at work, is much to be deprecated. It may be a matter of necessity in some cases, but as a rule this need not be done. These children, often bordering on infancy, enter factories and other workshops, where they soon become physically and mentally dwarfed, and learn many things of which they ought to be utterly ignorant.

We are glad to notice that Mr. Donovan feels justified in speaking of the teachers of his division in complimentary terms:

It gives me pleasure to again bear witness to the efficiency and zeal of the teachers as a body—the number of those whom I could characterize as being incompetent being few indeed. All who could do so, attended the county conventions and teachers' institutes; for those who were not in a position to attend these I endeavored to provide a substitute, by assembling as many as possible at convenient places and giving lectures bearing on school work. In these and in other cases, I readily perceived that the teachers in general were fully alive to the progressive tendency of the age in the matter of education.

The growth of our Catholic Separate Schools is a source of just satisfaction to the Catholics of Ontario, but this growth has not been as marked or as rapid as we think it should have been. In the past ten years the number of schools has increased by 51, we do hope and trust that in the coming decade the united efforts of priests and people, by the generosity of the Catholics in this Province, and they are not a few, blessed with a large share of worldly goods, and by the steady adherence to principle of all, the number 217 will have swollen to 500 schools. We cannot too closely keep to heart the truth, that upon our judicious use of the educational privileges we enjoy depends our future prosperity as a people, our future influence in the community we live in and in the world at large.

THE SITUATION IN IRELAND.

Not since the critical period immediately preceding the Catholic Relief Bill of 1829, has the situation in Ireland been more acutely interesting than at the present moment. The Tory leaders of that time had long dalled with the question of Catholic Emancipation. They had for nearly thirty years refused to redeem the pledge given by Mr. Pitt, that with the union would come the removal of Catholic civil disabilities. The Clare election of 1828 opened their eyes to the dangers that awaited the empire if they persisted in their policy of exclusion and persecution. They then hastily abandoned that inhuman policy and gave the Irish Catholics a partial measure of relief. If the Duke of Wellington found himself in 1828-9 grievously embarrassed, the Marquis of Salisbury's soul is not less troubled today. The Ireland of sixty years ago was not, by any means, as unanimous or enthusiastic for Catholic Relief as is the Ireland of to-day for Home Rule. The Protestant minority of that period was almost an unit against the concession of civil rights to their Catholic neighbors. The most judicious and far-seeing of the Catholic leaders and spokesmen foresaw that, without the restoration of Ireland's legislative rights, little good could come from the mere removal of the Catholic disabilities still existing. They knew that thirty or forty Catholic members of Parliament, in a hostile body of six hundred English and Scotch representatives, could effect little that was profitable to Ireland. Events that closely followed the admission of Catholics to Parliament justified their apprehensions. Beyond securing for a few renegade Catholic baristers places on the bench, and for a few Catholic soulless political adventurers certain mediocre colonial appointments, the Catholic representatives in the House of Commons did simply nothing for several decades after Emancipation. Not that many of them were well intentioned, not that their first and greatest leader, the illustrious O'Connell, did not display an energy and a self-abnegation that have made him immortal. But powerful as was that great tribune with the masses of his people at home, he never, in the imperial Parliament, commanded a majority of the Irish members. His eloquence was wasted on the British Parliament, and he himself felt so pained, worried, and spiritless over his want of success there, that he, at one time, as our readers well know, seceded from that body. In this movement he was followed by a mere handful of Irish representatives—when to make secession a successful political movement, the great majority, if not all of Ireland's members at Westminster,

should have withdrawn from Parliament. O'Connell had to face not only a defiant English public opinion, he had to encounter a practically unanimous, proud, and aggressive Protestant minority in Ireland, long accustomed to domination and ascendancy. They looked upon him as the Catholic leader of a Catholic movement, and not only held aloof from his repeal agitation, but vigorously and persistently opposed him at every step. Then, too, the Catholics, held for more than a century in the most galling bondage that ever cursed a people, had little of the public spirit that to-day pre-eminently characterizes them. They were diffident, fearful, suspicious, and, in too many cases, servile. The Protestant they had long been accustomed to look to as a superior being. So deeply was the sense of their own inferiority imprinted on their souls, that the fear of the Protestant landlord overcame, in very many instances, their love for Ireland. O'Connell's greatest work was not the emancipation of the masses of his fellow-countrymen from legal thraldom and disabilities—but their emancipation from that abject servility which a century and a half of persecution had inflicted on the Irish multitudes. To his bold and fearless speech, to his undaunted attacks on the leaders of the Ascendancy faction, to his courageous, outspoken condemnation of their iniquitous methods and infamous schemes, Ireland owes her present promising position.

O'Connell made an Irish public opinion a possibility. Yet he failed, as we have said, of success in Parliament. The unanimous opposition of British public opinion and the powerful forces still at the command of the united Protestant minority in Ireland, were too many for the great Irish chief. He had, through the fear inspired by the multitudes at his back, extracted one concession from Britain, but the project dearest to his heart, the restoration of Ireland's Legislative independence, he had, by the exigencies of the situation, to abandon. Even the disestablishment of the Protestant Church of Ireland was not brought about by the Irish Catholic members of the Imperial Parliament. Mr. Gladstone, who took the lead in the great measure of reform, and brought it to a successful issue, admitted that it was forced on him by the intensity of the Fenian excitement, and the dread of anarchy with which that powerful organization threatened both England and Ireland. But the passage of that measure, breaking down forever the barriers of Protestant ascendancy, opened a new era for Ireland. To the Irish Protestant the Legislative Union of 1801 had long been pictured as his protection against Papal aggression. It was pointed out to him that by that instrument his political ascendancy in Ireland was for ever guaranteed. He now saw England, by the necessities of her own situation, casting his claims to ascendancy to the winds, and reducing him in all respects to a level with his Catholic fellow-countrymen. The latter breathed the air of heaven more freely. He now felt himself the equal of any man walking the soil of Ireland. The badge of his inferiority had been stricken off forever, he stood forth "redeemed, regenerated and dethroned." All at once, a good feeling between Catholic and Protestant Irishmen sprang up. No such friendliness had been known since 1782. Men of Catholic faith began to discuss with their Protestant neighbors the claims of Ireland to legislative independence. Honest interchanges of opinion became frequent, and the feeling in favor of the re-establishment of an Irish Parliament found so general, that a new and distinctively Irish political party was founded with Mr. Isaac Butt, a distinguished Irish Protestant, as its leader. Mr. Butt, in the face of adverse and extremely discouraging circumstances, led his party with skill and success. His successor, Mr. Charles Stewart Parnell, has for eight years been at the head of the Irish Parliamentary party, and, in that brief time, has achieved so much of solid success, has so far brought Home Rule within measurable distance of attainment, has so united and consolidated the political forces of the Irish people at home and abroad, has so led his followers in Parliament as to be the very marvel of his time. Lord Salisbury could pay no higher compliment to Mr. Parnell's skill and success than by calling on Parliament to enact such an iniquitous measure as the Crimes Bill. It is indeed an emphatic confession of weakness for a political leader to declare the lawful methods of his opponent illegal and criminal. The National League is, as every body knows, no secret organization. It is a body which meets openly—transacts its business openly—and has been the most powerful political instrument for the repression of crime which Ireland has ever known. Its crime is that it keeps the Irish united in solid columns, sustains the Irish party in Parliament by its perfect organization of the Irish electorate, and, last, but by no means least, holds Irish landlordism in check. The Crimes Bill was specially aimed at the National League. It was the intention of the Cabinet to have at once proclaimed and suppressed that body, but the recent

elections have caused hesitation and delay. The announcement now made that it is the intention to call an autumn session, would seem to indicate that, notwithstanding the repeated condemnation of his Irish policy at the polls, Lord Salisbury is about to be forced into the active exercise of the powers of repression given him by that measure. The British Tory press is loud in its demands for a declaration of war upon Ireland. Stung to fury by accumulated defeat, the Tories must have Irish blood. The *St. James' Gazette* declares:

The league ought to have been proclaimed several weeks ago. It escaped through the remissness of the government. A fresh crop of difficulties will arise if parliament is allowed to separate without the proclamation being made. A repetition of the "victory" in the *Pouébois* park would just now be extremely inconvenient. The one thing the government have to do now is to prove to all the world that they are earnest and not afraid. If they are going to be afraid of Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Parnell, they might just as well be where they are.

But if the Tories are furious, the leaders of the National League are no less determined to meet the government on its own ground. The organization of the tenantry to resist evictions is being daily perfected, and no advantage will be given the agents of the Castle without every inch of ground vigorously disputed. Cable dispatches inform us of strong preparations for resistance made by the tenants on the Ponsobny estates and at Inchiquin to resist eviction. An amusing incident is related in connection with the threatened evictions on the Ponsobny estates, showing the thorough discipline and organization of the people. It is thus set forth in the cable despatch:

In relation to these evictions a meeting was arranged to be held in Youghal to back up tenants on the Ponsobny estate who may be disposed to waver in their allegiance in the "present campaign." On the other hand, a force of armed police has been sent from Cork to strengthen the local police. Mr. Lane, M. P., who travelled by the same train, got out at Killeagh, within five miles of Youghal, and drove to Gort Roe chapel, where he was met by Father Kellar and a large crowd, and where a meeting was held. The advertised meeting in Youghal was merely meant to deceive the authorities. As the proceedings of this meeting were being reported to the police, a number of policemen drove up in the cars in that direction to be only received with derision. While the police remained at Gort Roe Mr. Lane and his friends drove rapidly to Youghal and addressed another meeting in the Mall House before the police had time to return. In his second speech Mr. Lane said it was their duty to show that they had had organization in reality. In a few years men who did not join the National League would have to hold their heads and walk about in shame of their fellows."

The mention of an autumn session is also suggestive of radical changes in the Cabinet. A London correspondent, writing on the 18th, goes so far as to predict a sweeping reconstruction of the ministry early in November. He says that his intimations on this important subject have been contradicted by a few London correspondents of Provincial papers who regard the cackling assurances of the lobby as authentic indications of Ministerial policy, and by some obscure Tory journals, inspired by the "tapirs and tadpoles" of the party, who thinking only of their own selfish interests, have been plunged into consternation at the prospect of a change. He ventures to assert that Lord Salisbury and Mr. Goschen are the only members of the Cabinet behind the scenes. He quotes Disraeli's famous saying of 1840—"the Cabinet consists of Melbourne and Palmerston, all the rest is vapors," and he adds:

I have reason to believe the Queen has never entertained a high opinion of the stability of the Government as at present constituted. Early in the year Her Majesty remarked "They can get through this session well enough." The Cabinet is overlaid with what Sir Robert Peel described as "the mouth street of former administrations." There are also some well-intentioned mediocrities, who are quite unequal to their places, and some square pegs in round holes. A few leather headed party hacks and jobbers may be of the opinion that Lord Salisbury could stagger on with it as it is, but the peculiarities of the situation have not escaped the shrewd eyes of our experienced Sovereign. Sir George Lewis justly observed that the Tories of 1815 had an immense balance of popularity arising from the successful issue of a great war, but that they managed to spend it most completely before 1830. It is the same thing now on a smaller scale, for the present Government has stupidly contrived to muddle away all the prestige by which it was undoubtedly surrounded during the autumn of last year.

Thus has the political situation in England grown interesting. In one short year the Salisbury government has lost strength and influence, to such a degree that its continuance in office, even modified according to the suggestions of the correspondent just quoted, is not to be looked for. Lord Hartington and Mr. Chamberlain have given it all the assistance they could control in the House and in the country. In the House it has been again and again cornered and forced to surrender on abject terms, in the country it has had to meet with repeated rebuff and bitterest humiliation. No one need be surprised if the formation of a coalition ministry is followed by an appeal to the nation. The issue of such an appeal cannot be doubtful.

HARD ON HIS NEIGHBORS.

In the Jubilee number of the *Canadian American*, of Chicago, Ill., we notice a paper on "Scotch Canadians in the Dominion of Canada," by the Rev. Wm. Cochran, D. D. The rev. gentleman, who is unquestionably an able writer, does his countrymen, however, but partial justice in dealing with their influence for good in Canada. With him the terms Scotland and Presbyterianism are synonymous. In fact the Scotchman who is not a Presbyterian is not, according to Dr. Cochran, whose Calvinism is of the rigid, exclusive character, worthy the days of the Covenanters, really deserving consideration as a child of Scotia. He writes, for instance, in these terms:

As a rule, Scotchmen in Canada belong to the Presbyterian Church, though a few, ignorant of their native ancestry and their struggles for religious liberty, or perhaps indifferent to any form of faith, are found nominally adhering to other sects. The most contemptible Scotchman in Canada, or for that matter anywhere else, is the man who imagines that on acquiring some little wealth and social position, he must needs forsake the traditions of his fathers, and renounce the good old forms which they loved and cherished to the death. Such weak-minded creatures are no loss to the church they leave and no real gain to the church they attend. For the sake of so called fashionable society they exchange the rugged principles of Covenanting sires for an insipid colorless creed, so flexible and indefinite that it meets every taste and can be adapted to every opinion. With this change of faith and communion, their influence upon society declines, until at last they are of no value to the body politic, and become objects of pity to their more ardent and sensible countrymen. Too often also in renouncing the faith of their fathers, they renounce the old time morality and honesty of Scottish character, and finally pass out of notice unless it be to point the moral, that stern virtues and valor are invariably associated with a rugged faith in Christian doctrines and creeds.

Dr. Cochran cannot, when he wrote those lines, have had any intention of reflecting unjustly on his Catholic Scotch fellow-countrymen. Neither they nor their ancestors at home abandoned the faith of their fathers." The Calvinism for which the worthy doctor has so strong an attachment, but which deluged the home of his forefathers with blood, has naught of attraction for the 100,000 Catholic Scotchmen of Canada. They remember too well the sufferings of their martyred and persecuted ancestors for the faith preached to the Scots by a St. Columba, a St. Ninian and a St. Mungo. They know too well the value of the heritage of Catholic faith left them by their heroic ancestry, which resisted fire and sword and triumphed over persecution in its most inhuman and diabolical forms, to be guilty of any act of duplicity or dishonesty. Dr. Cochran must have meant his animadversions for that handful of Scotchmen in our cities and towns who have abandoned Calvinism for the more "respectable" and certainly more elastic Anglicanism of the day. He should not, however, have failed to do justice to his Catholic fellow-countrymen who are a credit to the Dominion and to the hardy and heroic race from which they sprang. They have given Canada some of her very ablest men and most devoted citizens. Ever ready to respond to duty's call, they stand in the foreground of Canadian patriotism and Canadian hope and promise.

THE GREAT DEBATE.

On Thursday, the 26th of August, Mr. Gladstone rose in the House of Commons to propose:

"That an humble address be presented to the Queen expressing that the Viceroy of Ireland has proclaimed the National League a dangerous association; that no information has been furnished to parliament to justify a proclamation by virtue of which her Majesty's subjects are to be rendered liable to be punished as criminals without judicial inquiry into the nature of their acts; and that this House in the absence of such information prays that said proclamation shall not continue in force as to the association named and described therein."

The right hon. gentleman, who was received with much enthusiasm, delivered a powerful speech in support of his resolution. He charged the government with substituting arbitrary will for regular legal action. This principle he denounced as a most dangerous and disgraceful one in any country, but especially in Ireland, where law was still on trial. One of that country's greatest misfortunes was that those who administered law, especially locally, were not in sympathy with the people. He declared the proclamation of the National League a near approach to a declaration of war on the Irish people. The people sympathized with the League because of their belief that to the League they owed their salvation. Nothing was done for the tenants till the League was founded. The government evidently intended to work and act in Ireland by summary jurisdiction—without jury, judge, or resident magistrate and no Parliament to control Ireland. He trusted that the Irish would continue to bear the pressure patiently. They would not have long to suffer. They would not obey the law through fear but from a strong, vivid,

buoyant hope that was now livelier and brighter than ever—for the Irish now believed that the government's policy had not the sanction of the British nation. The government saw the ground slipping from under their feet and their action in proclaiming the League was a spasmodic attempt at a display of activity. Mr. Balfour made a very weak rejoinder to Mr. Gladstone's indictment, petulantly refusing to lay on the table the papers from which he quoted to justify his charges against the League. One of the features of the debate was the Marquis of Hartington's bitter assault on the League and his approval of the government's action in proclaiming that association. This speech fixes that nobleman forever in the ranks of the Tories. That momentous old dotard John Bright, whom hatred for Ireland can alone rouse to consciousness, wrote in support of coercion and repression. Hartington's speech and Bright's letter kept the Unionists together and saved the government. Sir Geo. O. Trevelyan and Sir William Harcourt made brilliant speeches in support of Mr. Gladstone's motion, which was, however, negatived by a majority of 194 to 272. The Marquis of Hartington can never again be expected to act with the Liberal party. He in fact, some weeks ago, in a speech at Greenwich, plainly intimated his intention of maintaining his connection with his newly-formed Tory allies. He bitterly assailed Sir George O. Trevelyan, whose secession from the Liberal Unionists was a deadly blow at that organization's very existence—and made it very clear that he (the Marquis) only wanted an opportunity to break once and forever from a party with which he has now absolutely no sympathy. The *Freeman's Journal*, dealing with that speech, says:

"Such a speech requires no fingerposts. It conveys as plain as words can convey anything in what direction Lord Hartington's mind is drifting. He is now between the two parties. To one he is bound in name, and only by the recollection of past association; to the other he is bound by what he himself calls practical alliance, and by every tie of sympathy. His complete fusion with one or other is only a matter of time, and no fault can be found with the Greenwich Banquet speech for not plainly indicating in what direction the forces of attraction lie. We need scarcely say that the cause of Home Rule has everything to gain and nothing to lose from the bodily transference of Lord Hartington to his natural allies."

Hartington found his opportunity to break forever with the Liberals on Mr. Gladstone's motion. He then proved himself the uncompromising foe of Ireland. Nothing of good on the latter country expect from him. He is as much her enemy as is the Marquis of Salisbury himself. His whole heart is now set on the maintenance in power of a government that will concede no measure, even the smallest, of self government to Ireland. The cause of Home Rule has gained immeasurably by his placing himself in an attitude of outspoken opposition to the claims of Ireland and the dictates of truth and justice. Even he cannot save the government from the downfall which surely awaits it.

DIOCESE OF LONDON.

The retreat for the priests of the diocese of London began last Monday and ended on Saturday. It took place in Assumption College, Sandwick, and was conducted by Father F. Ryan, S. J., of Baltimore.

A mission, conducted by a Franciscan Father, assisted by Rev. M. McGrath, of Windsor, is at present being held in the new church of Pelee Island.

Rev. A. Durkin, P. P., son of our respected citizen, Martin Durkin, Esq., has been spending a few weeks with his friends and relatives in this city. For the last three Sundays he sang High Mass in St. Mary's Church, Hill St., also presiding at Vespers. On Monday morning he again celebrated Mass, which was largely attended by the people of St. Mary's parish, who, one and all, joined in prayers that God might bestow on him all the graces necessary in order to enable him to carry out the great work for which he has been destined. He has left for Newark, N. J., amidst the hearty good wishes of his numerous friends.

DEATH OF MOTHER TERESA.

Port Arthur Sentinel, Aug. 28. The late Mother Teresa who died in St. Joseph's Convent, Port Arthur, on Aug. 24th, occupied several important positions in the Community of St. Joseph's. She was assistant Superior for eight years in Toronto, and was held in high esteem for her administrative ability and Christian charity, but owing to ill health retired for a time from that position. By her humble and unostentatious life and retiring disposition she was the model of the community, and in matters pertaining to a religious life her advice was eagerly sought after. A short time ago she expressed a desire to visit the Convent here and see whether a change of climate would be beneficial to her health, and about two weeks ago she arrived here, but her ailment had already taken deep root in her system and baffled the skill of her medical attendant. She passed quietly away, at the age of fifty three years, fortified with the sacraments of the church. Her death was that of a Christian who had faithfully served her Lord and Master by precept and example and was in keeping with her vows of chastity and obedience. She will be missed by the good Sisters of St. Joseph, of which community she was an honored member. Her remains were taken to Toronto to day on the O. P. R. and were accompanied by the station by a large number of the members of St. Andrew's church. The pall bearers were Messrs. J. J. O'Connor, M. Dwyer, Thos. Ryan, W. J. Bawlf, P. Labby, and Geo. Clayer.