

The Catholic Record

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum. United States and Europe—\$2.50. Publisher & Proprietor, Thomas Coffey, L.L.D. Editors: Rev. James T. Foley, B.A. (Thomas Coffey, L.L.D.) Associate Editor—H. P. Mackintosh. Manager—Robert M. Burns. Address business letters to the Manager. Advertisements for teachers, situations want, etc., 50 cents each insertion. Remittance must accompany the order. Where Catholic Record Box address is required send 10 cents to prepay expense of postage upon replies. Ordinary and marriage notices cannot be inserted except in the usual condensed form. Each insertion 50 cents. The Catholic Record has been approved and recommended by Archbishops Falouto and Borretti, late Apostolic Delegates to Canada, the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa, St. Boniface, the Bishops of London, Hamilton, Peterborough and Oshesburg, N. Y., and the clergy throughout the Dominion. In St. John, N. B., single copies may be purchased from Mrs. M. A. McGuire, 249 Main St. and John J. Dwyer. In Sydney, N. S. W., single copies may be purchased at Murphy's Bookstore. In Montreal, single copies may be purchased from J. Milloy, 241 St. Catherine St. West. In Ottawa, Ont., single copies may be purchased from J. W. Gagnon, 233 Nicholas St. The following agents are authorized to receive subscriptions and canvass for The Catholic Record: General Agents: M. J. Haggarty, Stephen V. James, Vincent J. LeBlond, Agents: Miss Brute Saunders, Sydney; E. R. Costello, 141 10th Ave. West, Vancouver, B. C.; S. J. Johnson, 210 Rochester St., Ottawa; Mrs. Geo. E. Smith, 233 Nicholas St., Montreal; B. F. O'Toole, Lebrun, Sask.; Miss Anna Hogan, 87 Langside Street, Winnipeg, Man.

LONDON, SATURDAY, JULY 9, 1921

THE CONSTITUTION AND SEPARATE SCHOOLS

Preaching to the Orangemen of London district the Rev. Mr. Reid, a Methodist pastor of this city, devoted a large part of his sermon to Separate schools.

"In discussing this subject," said Sir John A. MacDonald, "I have always found that when it is fairly laid before the people, they always, by their applause, signify their approbation of the consistent course of the Government in regard to it."

Aye, there's the rub. It is not always fairly laid before the people; it is sometimes discussed by men like the Rev. Mr. Reid who through prejudices are quite incapable of presenting it fairly, and who through ignorance and misinformation are not able even to discuss it intelligently.

A passage from Sir Joseph Pope's Life of Sir John A. MacDonald will illustrate that "consistent course of the Government" with regard to Separate schools which the great Father of Confederation declared always received the approbation of the people when fairly laid before them. Here is the passage:

"There remains but one question of practical politics in relation to which I propose to outline Sir John A. MacDonald's attitude. I refer to those issues of race and religion which periodically threaten the peace of Canada. It must be apparent to the most careless student of Sir John MacDonald's history, that British and Protestant though he was, at no time in his career had he any sympathy with that fierce intolerance of everything French or Roman Catholic which at the present time is abroad in Ontario. As far back as 1854, we find him counting on his 'friendly relations with the French.' In 1855 he introduced and carried a Bill in the interest of Separate schools against the bitter opposition of George Brown. In 1863 he supported by speech and vote R. W. Scott's Act, establishing a system of Separate schools. In 1867 he perpetuated this right to the Roman Catholics of Ontario, and at the same time provided the French Canadians with liberal guarantees for the security of their language, institutions, and laws. In 1870 he secured, or thought he had secured, like privileges to the Roman Catholics of Manitoba."

Mr. Reid told the Orangemen: "The constitution of our country has stood for the Public school, for equal education of all classes of society."

Perhaps Mr. Reid understands his terms; apparently he does not. The Constitution of Canada is the Act that made of the several independent British provinces the present Confederation. The British North America Act constituted the Dominion of Canada, and is, therefore, "the Constitution of our country."

And "the Constitution of our country" does not stand nor has not stood for the Public school.

Canada is a federation or confederation of the pre-existing provinces. Long discussions and negotiations preceded the union. Conditions, which as the very name implies are of the nature of a treaty between the provinces, had to be mutually agreed upon. One of these conditions was that the Protestant minority in Quebec and the Catholic minority in Ontario should have their rights to Separate schools guaranteed by the fundamental law of Canada, guaranteed by the Constitution.

And when the educational resolution of the delegates at the Confederation conference was submitted to the Legislature of the united Province of Upper and Lower Canada in 1865, it was endorsed even by such staunch opponents of the Separate School Act of 1863 as Brown and Alexander Mackenzie, and ratified unanimously. This resolution gives the provinces authority to legislate in the matter of education, "saving the rights and privileges which the Protestant and Roman Catholic minority in both Canadas may possess as to their denominational schools at the time when the union of the Provinces goes into effect."

This treaty condition was incorporated into the British North America Act, its object being to protect the Protestant minority in Quebec quite as much as the Catholic minority in Ontario.

In any case the Constitution of our country "has stood" and will stand for Separate schools in Ontario unless or until intolerant bigotry makes a scrap of paper of solemnly guaranteed constitutional rights.

In the light of this basic condition of confederation what is to be thought of this farrago of the Rev. Mr. Reid:

"We are not trying to destroy the Roman Catholic faith by the Public school, but only to say that they shall have a good education. What if the Baptist, Anglican or Presbyterian church or any other but the Roman Catholic church were to ask money from the public treasury in order to carry on their education? But they say we are mean and narrow because we will not do that for them. All we want is equal rights and are the friends of all citizens of this country. I want you to feel that we stand for this great principle of freedom, the larger education of all the people and the broader life that makes for more perfect understanding of one another, so that we may be together in the making of this great nation."

Whence comes the money in the public treasury? Do not Catholics contribute dollar for dollar with Protestants?

By the very act which constituted the Dominion of Canada, Separate schools are entitled to their proportionate share of the grants from "the public treasury" for educational purposes. We ask for no favors; but we shall insist on our rights.

Turning from the intolerance and misinformation of this little agitator, consider this statesmanlike view of Sir John A. MacDonald on the question of Separate schools. It is from a speech made before Confederation when no Constitutional guarantees for Separate schools existed:

"I have called the attention of the people to the fact that the 19th clause of the Common School Act became law long before I was in the Government at all; so that the merit of it, or the blame of it, is not with me, but rests entirely with the Baldwin-La Fontaine Administration, as it was brought in under the auspices of Mr. Baldwin particularly, that pure and honest man of whom I always love to speak, though we were opposed in politics. And if it be asked why we did not repeal it, I answer, in the first place, that it is one thing to give a right or a franchise, and another thing to deprive people of it; and in the second place, we have the indisputable evidence of a disinterested witness—a man who cannot be suspected of any leaning towards Popery—I mean Rev. Dr. Ryerson, a Protestant clergyman himself, at the head of the common school system—a person whose whole energies have been expended in the cause of education—who states deliberately to the people of Canada, that the Separate school clause does not retard the progress or the increase of common schools; but that, on the contrary, it 'widens the basis of the common school system.' If I thought that it injured that system, I must say that I would vote for its repeal tomorrow. You must remember, also, that Lower Canada is decidedly a Roman Catholic country—that the Protestant population of Lower Canada is a small minority, and if Protestant schools were not allowed there, our Protestant brethren in Lower Canada would be obliged to send their children to be educated by Roman Catholic teachers. Now, I don't know how many Protestants or how many Roman Catholics I may be at this moment addressing, but I say that as a Protestant, I should not be willing to send my son to a Roman Catholic school, while I think a Roman Catholic should not be com-

mitted to send his to a Protestant one. In Lower Canada the teachers are generally the Roman Catholic clergy, and, of course, it is their duty to teach what they consider truth, and to guard their pupils against error. But the system in vogue there is more liberal than even ours, in that it not only permits the establishment of Protestant schools for Protestant children, but allows the whole municipal machinery to be employed to collect the rates to maintain them. In discussing this subject, I have always found that when it is fairly laid before the people, they always, by their applause, signify their approbation of the consistent course of the Government in regard to it."

That was the spirit of the man who played a great part in bringing about Confederation and consolidating the new Dominion of Canada. That is the spirit which alone can make for the continued progress of our great country which owes its very existence to the tolerance, the sense of justice, and the vision of the Fathers of Confederation when they unanimously agreed to place Separate schools for Ontario and Quebec beyond the reach of shameless panders to prejudice and passion.

A RECKLESS SLANDERER

On page 1 of this issue of the CATHOLIC RECORD we reprint from the issue of July 10th, 1920, Bishop Fallon's charge to the priests of London diocese in the matter of the observance of the Ontario Temperance Act. This charge was given on the occasion of the annual retreat of the diocesan priests, and the Bishop was induced to allow a summary of it to be given to the press. As a Canadian Press despatch it was carried in all newspapers of standing throughout the province. The following Sunday the priests of the diocese strongly exhorted their people along the lines traced by Bishop Fallon—a fact that was noted in many local papers.

It must have been, therefore, with full knowledge of this emphatic and unequivocal pronouncement that the Rev. L. W. Reid of Hale Street Methodist Church, of this city, addressing the London District Orangemen, uttered this reckless and malicious slander: "I know personally," declared Mr. Reid, "that the Roman Catholic Church has stood behind bootlegging in Essex, and one priest in the southern part of North Essex actually told certain men how to organize and finance the business and where to go to pay their fine. It is a disgrace that smells to heaven."

So he is reported in the London Free Press of June 27th.

In the circumstances the Rev. Mr. Reid is in honor and in justice bound to give the name of the priest he alleges to have acted in open defiance of his Bishop's solemn charge, and to furnish proof that his allegations are founded on something more substantial than malicious gossip which is rife in the Border cities. If one were to credit the thousand and one stories that gossip circulates there is not a man of standing along the border that is not vena, not an officer past or present that has not made malfeasance of office a source of fabulous wealth.

But gossip is one thing, proof is quite another. Prompted by prejudice the Rev. Mr. Reid may have been the victim of his own credulity; but that does not relieve him of the obligation of making good or retracting his public statement with regard to the individual priest against whom he prefers his specific charges; nor, in view of the public pronouncement of Bishop Fallon, of withdrawing his monstrous charge against the Catholic Church.

If his sense of honor and justice does not impel the Rev. Mr. Reid either to substantiate or withdraw his public accusations he brands himself as a reckless slanderer whose offense against the decencies of life smells to heaven.

NOTES AND COMMENTS

ROME HAS been selected as the place for holding the International Eucharistic Congress of 1922, and committees are already at work preparing for the solemn ceremonies in St. Peter's, at which it is expected the Holy Father will assist in person. The Eucharistic Congress to be held in Quebec in the same year pertains only to North America. The Montreal Congress of 1910 was International, and now that the clouds of war have cleared away Canada may not unreasonably look

forward to the holding again of this momentous event within her borders.

A Rev. Richard Whiting closed his pastorate of the Dominion Methodist church, Montreal, with a strong protest against "coercion whether in religious, industrial or social life." All such coercion he pronounced "damnable," and intimated that possibly his own church was the leader in this form of repression. Close observers of current events in Canada will be disposed to agree with him.

COMMENTING ON a new theory as to Shakespeare's purpose in writing Hamlet, the Toronto Globe indulges in some characteristic covenanted reflections upon Mary Queen of Scots, around whose heroic and pathetic person the theorist in question builds up her fabric of conjectures. It is a bold stroke that she has attempted and we are not concerned at this stage to animadvert upon what may be safely left in the hands of those who have made Shakespearean study a science in itself.

IT IS the Globe's crudities which more immediately attract attention. The statements that "Bothwell abducted Mary possibly with her connivance," and that "they were married with her free consent" are in keeping with the traditional Presbyterian attitude towards the unfortunate Queen. The Globe ignores the fact that these are just the questions that are in dispute, just as is the imputation that Mary was privy to the murder of her husband. Readers of Hoase's monumental vindication of the Queen can afford to smile at these outcroppings of Calvinistic malice and mendaciousness. "The theatre of the world," said Mary, "is wider than the realm of England," and while the fiendish malice of her enemies has made her cause one of history's most tenacious mysteries, that her complete vindication will yet come no one who has studied her life with an open mind can doubt. With that theatre of the world to which she appealed in the crisis of her sorrows, the ultimate verdict rests.

ROMAN CARDINALS are usually regarded as busy officials whose time and energies are too much taken up with the administrative affairs of the Church to permit them to indulge in literary or scholastic pursuits. Yet they have contributed their own share to the world's stock of books. The latest to distinguish himself in this respect is Cardinal di Lai, who has just published through the Vatican press a magnificent volume on the Passion of Our Lord. Those who know of His Eminence's busy life marvel that he should have been able to compose a work of such profundity and breadth of treatment as this is pronounced to be. It is not merely a religious treatise, though breathing faith on every page, but it is also an historical survey and critical examination of all the evidence which could be gathered together on the events of the Passion. The work is described as of interest alike to the student and the devotee, and equally valuable to the believer and the unbeliever. A book of this description from such a source should be made available to English-speaking readers.

THE FORCE OF ANGLO-IRISH TRADITION

BY THE OBSERVER

I have just finished reading in The Manchester Guardian a very fine editorial on the Irish situation. Irishmen, I think, fully appreciate the service that has been rendered by The Guardian in the discussion of Anglo-Irish politics. It needs high moral courage to tell English readers, day after day, the grim truth about English methods in the administration of Ireland; and The Guardian has done that, and has done it fearlessly and clearly. In the article which I have just read, the truth is told vigorously and plainly. For instance: "These are the events of a single day. Here, alas! there is nothing new. The history we are making is, in every single respect,—executions, arson, the ravages of our irregular forces, political oppression,—as old as '98." The Guardian does not "fear to speak of '98," nor to tell the England of 1921 that she is pursuing the same policy of cruelty and brutality with which she first provoked, and then crushed in blood, the Rebellion of 1798.

And again: "The Irish people judge the partnership that they are offered by the spirit which insults their self respect, executes men and boys who are not guilty of murder, and lays waste farms and villages. It is doubtful whether under any circumstances Ireland would have accepted the arrangements set up by this Bill, but Ministers have acted as though they wanted to make her reject them. Their want of imagination has been so glaring as to give the look of deliberate intention to their blunders. Would it ever have occurred to Mr. Lloyd George that the way to make Ulster accept the Home Rule Bill of 1914 was to treat her with a ferocity for which our history finds no parallel since the crimes of the Hessian troops at the time of the Rebellion?" Here The Guardian comes to the question of "Ulster," as the six counties are called. And at once what I have called "the force of Anglo-Irish tradition" makes itself felt; for nothing else can account for the clear vision of The Guardian becoming dimmed, and for its proceeding to adopt the shibboleth, "Ulster must not be coerced."

"It is our boast that whereas other empires have come to grief because they could not satisfy the legitimate aspirations of peoples found under their flag, the British Empire has known how to change itself from an empire into a commonwealth. Ireland is a notable exception, and she is an anomaly in our system. What prevents us from applying our principles in this case? Ultimately, if we probe deep enough, pride. We may call it by other names, but that is what we find if we carry our analysis far enough. We cannot pretend that we govern Ireland successfully; the whole world would burst into laughter at the suggestion. We cannot pretend that it is really fear, for nobody who looks dispassionately at the circumstances of the two countries can really suppose that there is some insuperable difficulty in securing the safety of both. In some quarters there is a selfish spirit—the spirit that ruined Irish industries in the past. But if we ask ourselves why we cannot treat Ireland as we treated South Africa, the answer is mainly pride. We camouflage it by phrases about secession or the example of Lincoln—the sort of phrase that makes a man a prisoner and prevents his using his judgment in freedom."

In the first sentences of this extract history is not accurately related. So far as Canada forms part of "a Commonwealth" she had to do just what Ireland is doing now before England gave her responsible self-government; and we cannot be certain that she would have given it then, had she not had the loss of her American colonies, then recent, before her eyes. Nor can we be certain that she would ever have given us self-government, had it been demanded by a Catholic majority and opposed by a Protestant minority.

Nor is it certain that in the case of Australia, or in that of South Africa, she would have conceded Home Rule, had the English settled there, after all, there were still unexplored regions in geographical knowledge, and would have drawn the sacred circle of Protestant ascendancy around a few counties or districts, here and there; provided the compass could have furnished enough points whereby to designate the divisions and partitions rendered necessary by the traditions of English Protestantism.

The Guardian goes on:

"Does anybody think if Mr. Lloyd George, Mr. De Valera, and Sir James Craig sat down to discuss the relations of the two countries, with a single eye to the interests of the two countries, there would be any insuperable obstacle to peace? Clearly the rest of Ireland would have to leave Ulster what she has; she might, and probably would, succeed in persuading Ulster that her own interests might be better served by some other arrangement or by some modification of this arrangement, but it would have to be persuasion and not force. So, too, between Great Britain and Ireland. No arrangement that rests on force can endure or be other than a permanent danger. We have to persuade Ireland, as Ireland has to persuade Ulster."

I do not undertake to say what might not result if the persons named should come to the possession and use of the "single eye" which The Guardian mentions. But I find no difficulty in perceiving that Mr. Lloyd George and Sir James Craig would have both eyes on the Anglo-Irish tradition, and I am reluctantly forced to conclude that the Editor of The Guardian would have at least one eye on the same.

For, mark you, he shows us just how far he can go. The veto exercised by "Ulster" is to remain until "Ulster" gives it up. It being the duty of twenty-six counties to satisfy or "persuade" the other six, the six can hold out as easily for another fifty years as for the last fifty; and meantime Malin Head, the northernmost point in Ireland, remains, by legislative geography, part of "Southern Ireland." And this geographical absurdity is in perfect accord with fifty other legislative and administrative absurdities which are made necessary by the "two nations" or "two peoples" theory; and which he who cares to, may read in "The Government of Ireland Act, 1920."

If they "probe deep enough" some of the Englishmen who join in the chorus: "Ulster must not be coerced," will find something else besides "pride" or besides "pride" in the sense in which The Guardian uses the term. Some of them, I say; not all of them. Mr. Asquith, who, despite his clear vision, and clear speech, cannot yet get away from that shibboleth, in the making of which racial pride, commercial interest, and Protestant Ascendancy tradition have all had part,—he might, in time, recognize the fallacy and the hollowness of it. We do not doubt that the Editor of The Guardian will see it as it is within the next ten or fifteen years, if he lives so long; as we hope he will.

Mr. Lloyd George, possibly would see it one way one week and another way the next; and would be as vehement and as insincere when he was for it as when he was against it. But the shibboleth remains; and is to remain. Few shibboleths, in the long history of the sons of men, have better suited the political and commercial and financial interests of those who have made use of them.

Observe from how many angles this particular shibboleth appeals to Englishmen: It means money to the English exploiter of Irish trade, manufactures, railways and banks. It means votes to Mr. Lloyd George. It means the assertion of class privilege to the House of Lords. It means a kick at the Pope to the Orange Lodges. It means social and political satisfaction to Sir James Craig and his confederates in "Ulster." It means the postponement of the end of the Bureaucracy of Dublin Castle, which goes on very much as before under the twopartment arrangement; and will go on as long as the artificial partition of the country is persisted in. Incidentally to this, it means the continuation of the present system of office-filling, which is largely Protestant, proscriptionally.

It means, for present "Ulster" aspirants, such ambitions as it has meant to those who have passed to their reward. It means Lord Chancellors and Lord Chief Justiceships, and Judgeships, and all that the Smiths and the Carsons, and the Campbells, have found in it, from 1690 to 1921.

But enough of that. It does not mean any of that to The Manchester Guardian. How comes it that this great champion of democracy challenges a majority to convert a minority; on pain of never getting self government in an undivided country; though all that is involved in the conversion is the acceptance of the ordinary, every-day principle of majority rule in a self-governing limited monarchy.

It is, gentle reader, because not even The Manchester Guardian can let go of the tradition of the Protestant Ascendancy; because the traditions of Protestant domination were crystallized long ago, so far as Ireland was concerned, into a policy; and because self-government for Ireland would place a Protestant minority under the government of a Parliament Catholic in majority.

The editor or editors of The Guardian are probably not conscious of this; will doubtless deny or repudiate it. Yet, it is true; unquestionably true. Will anyone tell me that if it were six Catholic counties that stood opposed, against twenty-six Protestant counties, a grant of self government, that The Guardian or any other single Protestant paper in all the

Empire, would persist in the face of geography, history, and of all the facts and conditions of trade, commerce, and internal administration, in saying they "must not be coerced."

So, let The Guardian "probe deep enough." I have hopes of its striking the root of the matter. Which is more than I can hope for the majority of Englishmen.

IRELAND'S RIGHT TO RULE HERSELF

(By Most Rev. Archbishop Mannix, in The New York American)

I am taking back to Australia a message to the people, and can say with confidence that if there are dreadful happenings in Ireland, these outrages are not to be put to the discredit or to the blame of the Irish people.

I can tell them that in a day there could be peace in Ireland. We hear a great deal about peace, and I should say I am at close range with most of these peace talks and of these peace negotiations, whether they come from one side or from the other, but I know that in a day if England wanted peace she can have peace, and the conditions are very simple.

The day that England ceases from British crime and British aggression in Ireland, there can be peace that afternoon.

Nothing stands between England and peace with Ireland—nothing stands between the British Empire and peace with that little island but British pride and British aggression. That I repeat. I will be able to tell the Australians that the Irish people are looking for nothing except what they are justly entitled to; that they are asking for nothing except that self-determination to which nations great and small were declared to have an absolute right during the War.

Ireland is only asking England to foot the bill.

Ireland is only asking the English to fulfill their promise.

Ireland has asked for a Republic. Ireland claims the right to have a Republic, and Ireland is the only people, that have a right to say what Ireland wants and what Ireland will be satisfied with.

NO OUTSIDE INTERFERENCE While that is quite true, fundamentally, the essential thing is that when the Irish people have the right admitted and granted, and when they will themselves rule for the good of Ireland they should not be interfered with from outside, whether in legislation or economics or in any other way.

So far as it is possible for any nation to be rid of any interference from outside—and it is not possible, absolutely—Ireland has the same right as any of the others. The essential thing is that Ireland's right to complete and full self-determination should be admitted.

If Ireland wants a republic, that is Ireland's business. Ireland is looking for a republic; but if she were to change tomorrow and say she preferred a kingdom, Ireland's right to self-determination would be found in the kingdom just as well as in the republic.

Therefore, anybody who has any special antipathy to a republic—anybody who has of his opposition to Ireland's claim upon any particular form of government that Ireland has adopted—that man is trying to hide the real fundamental issue.

A FUNDAMENTAL QUESTION Does he admit or does he not, that Ireland has a right to rule herself, like Belgium or Poland? Fin him down to that. Don't discuss the merits of a republic as against a monarchy, or an empire, or any other form of government.

The main thing is to get them to face what they won't face, namely, the right of Ireland, like Poland or Belgium, to rule herself, just as these countries rule themselves. In Australia, in America, in Scotland, or anywhere I have gone my claim has been, and is, that Ireland has this right, and until it is granted there will be no peace in Ireland; there will be no peace between Ireland and England, and I hope there will be no genuine friendship between England and anybody who can endeavor by withholding friendship, to make England do her duty.

They will say, too, that short of a republic Ireland can get anything she wants—anything at all. That is what we hear whispered about by those that are supposed to be in the inner circle and are able to explore avenues that probably are closed to me.

They say, "Give them full Dominion Home rule—anything at all within the Empire."

Now, I refer to this simply to say that, so far as I know, there has been no clear, firm offer of anything—I don't say worth taking, but anything worth considering—absolutely nothing worth considering up to the present moment.

They talk of Dominion Home Rule. Well, Australians know what Dominion Home Rule is.

NO PARTITION THINKABLE They know, first of all, that in Dominion Home Rule we have nothing like partition. England does not say to Australia that she should be carved up according to the sweet will of the people in Downing street, London.