

Act. But the practical question which the Ontario bishops had to decide was this: Shall we accept the Separate School system as it will work out on the whole satisfactorily, or shall we pay all our taxes to the Public Schools, and support in addition parochial schools? History records the answer. The Ontario bishops accepted the Separate School Act though it was imperfect. Years ago when a Catholic teacher in Kingston refused to show a Protestant inspector the school register, Bishop Horan apologized to the Department. Canon Law not merely draws up an ideal system, but directs how to deal with the imperfect realities of practical life. The most unsatisfactory features of the Separate School Act have since been remedied, not by defiance to the government, nor by encouraging children to leave the school, but by putting the case with the accord and assistance of the hierarchy before the legislature. This was the proper attitude for the French-Canadian Educational Association and the bilingual school trustees to have taken. It is the attitude recommended by Pope Leo XIII in his famous letter *Affari vos*.

But it may be asked, why were these Protestant inspectors appointed for the bilingual schools? Simply to look after the interests of English, and the interests of the English pupils. In the bilingual schools visited by Dr. Merchant, there were 2,812 English pupils. French inspectors, teachers and trustees were seriously handicapping the education of these children, in very many of the schools. The appointment of English inspectors was an absolute necessity. The government asked certain Irish Catholics to undertake the work, but as they had reason to know from past experience, that they would not be very welcome in the bilingual schools, they declined. Objections to English-speaking Catholic inspectors were in fact raised by certain French-Canadians. Then again the number of fully qualified English Catholic inspectors was very limited. So the government decided to appoint an outsider, who would inspect in conjunction with the regular Catholic bilingual inspector, and appointed the Protestant inspectors. The Protestant inspectors have nothing to do with religious instruction or with faith or morals. If the French were to ask the Government for English speaking Catholic inspectors, they would get them. While ostensibly the objection to the English inspectors is on account of their religion, the chief objection to them is on account of their nationality. If a bilingual school cannot receive for a half a day in the year a visit of a Protestant inspector, how can all the bilingual schools remain all year, and every year under a Protestant Minister of Education? If children should leave school when a Protestant inspector arrives, why do the pupils of the bilingual model school at Ottawa sit day after day under a Protestant principal? There is no English-speaking Catholic in Ontario who does not, as a matter of principle, want Catholic inspectors in Catholic schools. But the temporary appointment of Protestant co-inspectors for the bilingual schools was practically a necessity, and, since neither faith nor morals were at stake, should certainly have been accepted for the time being. The French-Canadian Educational Association's policy of defying and antagonizing the government can be productive only of evil.

Finally it is urged that Instructions 17 violates the natural and constitutional rights of the Ontario French-Canadians. As regards the constitutional aspect of the question, the recent decision in the Green Valley case in which the French trustees were condemned as recalcitrant and recusant makes it clear that the Ontario Government is entirely within its legal rights.

The only argument that remains is the appeal to the natural law. It can readily be admitted that the Ontario Government, like practically all other governments, claims more authority in school matters than Catholic philosophers would concede to it. However, it by no means follows that Instruction 17 is a grievous infringement on natural rights which it is just and dutiful to resist by illegal methods.

Instruction 17 was not designed to prevent education in the French language. It was designed to permit the teaching of French but at the same time to provide that the main bulk of the teaching be in English, the language of Ontario. This latter object can be obtained only by limiting the amount of French teaching. As the French of Ontario themselves desire an efficient education in English, it is illogical to object to the major amount of the school time being devoted to that language, as this is a necessary means to that end. Ontario is an English speaking province, and as French-Canadians admit, 'business requirements make an education in English imperative. If it be claimed that an efficient English education could be imparted, even though more time were