

The Catholic Record.

Published Weekly at 484 and 486 Richmond street, London, Ontario.
Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

EDITORS:
REV. GEORGE R. NORTHGRAVES,
Author of "Mistakes of Modern Infidels,"
THOMAS COFFEY.

Publisher and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY.
Messrs. L. K. KING, JOHN N. GIBB, P. J. NEVIN and W. M. A. NEVIN, are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transact all other business for the CATHOLIC RECORD.
Rates of Advertising—Ten cents per line each insertion, space measurement.
Approved and recommended by the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa, and St. Boniface, and the Bishops of Hamilton and Peterboro, and the clergy 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. Arrears must be paid in full before the paper can be stopped.

London, Saturday, Sept. 21, 1895.

OFFICIAL.

The clergy of the counties of Essex and Kent will meet in conference at Windsor on Thursday, September 19, at 11 a. m.; of the counties of Huron, Perth, Oxford and Norfolk at Stratford on Tuesday, September 24, at 1 p. m., and of the counties of Middlesex, Elgin, Bothwell and Lambton at London on Thursday, September 26, at 2 p. m. A full attendance is requested.

By order of the Bishop,
THOMAS NOONAN, Secretary.
London, Sept. 5, 1895.

THE EDUCATION QUESTION BEFORE THE TRADES AND LABOR CONGRESS.

The Dominion Trades and Labor Congress which met recently in this city did wisely in rejecting the motion brought before it by delegate St. Pierre of Ottawa, in reference to Separate schools.

Mr. St. Pierre is, professedly at all events, a Catholic: yet it was he who moved a resolution to the effect that: "Inasmuch as the present school system is costly and unsatisfactory to the toilers of this land, and further, that it is a channel from which emanates a large amount of the disagreements among the different nationalities and creeds of this country, and further, that as under the present system a workingman's child has no chance of obtaining a fit and proper education so necessary for their future life: therefore be it resolved that this congress desires to express itself as being unqualifiedly in favor of a free compulsory and non-sectarian school for all classes, and that the different Provincial Governments be petitioned accordingly."

We shall not raise the question as to how far a gentleman who uses a plural pronoun as a representative of *child* is qualified to become the leader of any special educational movement, as Mr. St. Pierre evidently desires to be. We shall therefore here speak of this resolution simply on the intrinsic merits of what it proposes.

In the first place, its demand is based upon the matter of expense to the "toiler," and on this ground it asks for an abolition of the Separate school system.

In the matter of education, where it concerns the very serious question of educating our children morally and religiously, the question of expense should be the last thing taken into consideration. No matter what the expense may be, parents and all Catholics, clergy and laity, should make the sacrifices necessary for the religious education of the children of the community.

It is scarcely necessary now to prove that the schools ought to inculcate religion and morals. The question has been thoroughly debated from every point of view, and though there are thoughtless people who fall in with Mr. St. Pierre's views, no Christians who really know the consequences of a purely secular or godless education now maintain that education ought to be separated from religious instruction. There have been letters in the Toronto daily newspapers of late from some persons who have maintained that there should be no religious education. These letters come for the most part from persons whose chief occupation seemed to be to propagate the Deistic or Atheistic views of Tom Paine, Voltaire and Col. Ingersoll, and others; but the Protestant clergy, and others who really wish to see the rising generation grow up Christians, do not desire to see religion entirely excluded from the schools. Many of them, indeed, through a detestation of Catholic education, would have a godless school system in preference to the system whereby Catholic schools are provided for; but they would not have a godless system by choice.

We find that nearly all the Protestant clergy and the religious laity are favorable to some compromise whereby a modicum of religion might be taught by agreement among the sects, but none or almost none advocate the total abolition of religion from the

schools. We must say we feel humiliated as Catholics that a professing Catholic should be found willing to give over the whole educational system of Canada to the hands of Atheists and infidels by whatever name they are known. The advocacy of a godless system of education should be left to Col. Ingersoll's disciples, such as a writer from Selby, Ont., who recently had a long letter in the *Globe* with this purpose in view. This writer, who has hitherto busied himself in attacking all Christianity, seems to be now concentrating his energies against the Catholic Church, but his efforts will be in vain, for we have the promise of her Divine Founder that the gates of hell shall not prevail against His institution.

It was apparently the efficient motive with Delegate St. Pierre to secure a name for himself as a man of liberality and broad views in taking the course he adopted; but he failed in his object, not so much perhaps from any fact that the majority of Protestant delegates to the council disagreed with him on the general principle, as because they felt that Mr. St. Pierre introduced a bone of contention with which the Trades and Labor Council had nothing whatsoever to do, and accordingly the resolution was defeated by the decisive vote of seventeen to twelve. There were two Protestant gentlemen who moved and seconded the amendment which brought Mr. St. Pierre's proposed resolution to grief: viz., Messrs. Ashplant, of London, and Geo. T. Beales. These gentlemen took the view that the matter is foreign to the Constitution and objects of the Council, and it was on this account it was defeated. There were Protestants, however, who declared that it would be inadvisable to withdraw religion from the schools. Among those who took this view we may mention Mr. Powell of this city.

We have already spoken of Mr. St. Pierre's plea that Separate schools increase the expense of education. We have answered that even if this were really the case, it would be a poor reason for their abolition, because religious education is of such prime importance, that it ought to be provided, even if the cost were considerably greater. On the other hand, by this statement the gentleman shows that he knows very little of the question with which he professes to be so conversant. It is a fact shown by the education reports year after year that the Separate schools do not cost per pupil nearly so high as the Public schools, so that the principal motive urged in favor of the resolution is a fallacious one.

It is not to be said that the reason for the lower cost of Separate schools is that they are inefficient. This is not the case. The education reports, as we have several times shown in our columns, prove that the Separate schools generally are efficient. We admit that in some cases, through negligence or apathy, they have fallen below the standard they ought to have reached; but this is the case also with Public schools in some localities. The system is to be judged by general results, and not by failures in a few localities, which are more than counterbalanced by success in other places.

There are other reasons advanced by Mr. St. Pierre for his proposal, besides that we have already mentioned. We are told that the godless system of education will "build a great nation out of Canada." To this we may remark that a religious education will make Canada much greater, if morality in the people is an element of greatness. We have had recently a report from the American Guarantee Company to the effect that defalcations in the United States during the past year amounted to \$25,000,000, and that this condition of affairs is growing worse from year to year, at present at the rate of \$6,000,000 annually. May we not reasonably judge that the want of efficient religious training is the cause of this enormous amount of fraud among employees? Yet we have a moral certainty that even these huge figures fall far short of the truth, for there is much defalcation of which the Guarantee Company has no knowledge. How much higher the reality must be than that Company estimates, we have no means of knowing, and we shall not attempt to make an estimate. We are confident, however, that if religion were taught in the schools these frauds would be of much less magnitude.

Mr. St. Pierre also asserts that the abolition of religious teaching would "create a better feeling among the different creeds and nationalities in Canada." A celebrated writer, said: "Religion sees even in an enemy the face of a brother." This being so, how can it be said that religious teaching creates discord? On the contrary, it is in the P. P. A. and similar lodges that discord and hate are inculcated and nourished. It is by discouraging these associations, and not by abolishing religious teaching, that peace and goodwill will be to be nourished among citizens of all creeds. It is among those who have received little or no religious education, or who trade upon the prejudices and passions of the ignorant or malicious classes, that discord is engendered. Mr. St. Pierre's reasons for the abolition of religious instruction are totally without foundation.

THE ANGLICAN ESTABLISHMENT AND THE BRITISH ELECTIONS.

We have received the following communication from an esteemed correspondent:

Montreal, Sept. 8, 1895.
To the Editor of the CATHOLIC RECORD, London, Ont.:

Sir—Though not one of your subscribers, I am sometimes afforded the pleasure of reading your paper by the kindness of a Roman Catholic friend. Perhaps you will accord me the privilege, sometimes accorded your co-religionists by Anglican papers, of pointing out a mis-statement. I refer to the article, in your issue of August 31, in which you state that the recent Tory victory in Great Britain "was achieved by a coalition of the Church of England clergy and the liquor interest." You have no proof to offer in support of such a statement beyond the fact that somebody said so and all the Liberal and Radical journals repeated it. Referring to the slander the *Church Times* says: "We cannot pass from these more general lessons without uttering one indignant protest against the unscrupulous charge made by politicians of the calibre of Sir William Harcourt and Sir G. O. Morgan, that there is an alliance struck between 'Beer and the Bible,' the bigots and the spigots—to quote unsavory phrases that have done duty many a time. Sir George speaks of 'the unnatural alliance between parson and publican, Church and drink'; and Sir William, not to be outdone in crookedness, declares that the Church has made alliance with the drink traffic in order to secure their temporal interests. The answer to it is very simple. There is not, and there never has been any alliance between the parson and the publican. What has taken place is that Sir William's party conspired to rob the Church and to rob the publican. Naturally the destined victims defended themselves against a common foe, who, in the bitterness of his soul, immediately prates of an alliance. Another and equally convincing reply is that the very existence of the Church of England temperance society, the strongest temperance society in the kingdom, gives the lie direct to the very unworthy charge of the late Chancellor of the Exchequer. Add to this fact that Sir Wilfred Lawson—no particular friend of parsons or publicans—has often testified to the good work done by the Church of England Temperance Society. The society will doubtless again introduce its Bill to abate the evils caused by drink, and it is pretty safe to say that if it passes it will do as much to diminish those evils as the Local Veto Bill would have done to increase them." I believe that if the liquor question had not existed the Tories would have been returned with a good majority, for, of the 670 members elected, nearly 400 are pledged, more or less deeply, to reject any disestablishment measure. Out of the 181 members (English and Welsh) who in the last Parliament voted for the second reading of the Welsh Bill, and who offered themselves for re-election, 73 were rejected at the polls. The majorities of those elected were in almost every case considerably reduced—in Merthyr by more than 7,000 votes—being 75,551 less than in 1892. Pardon me if I suggest, in conclusion, that the article is quite unworthy of a place in your paper and that if "Reunion" is ever to mean anything more than a pious desire in the breast of the worthy occupant of the Papal chair, both Anglicans and Roman Catholics must first refrain from needlessly wounding each others' feelings."

Our friend is unnecessarily disturbed by the remarks we made concerning the alliance for election purposes, which was witnessed during the last campaign in Great Britain between the Church and the saloons or the liquor interest.

We by no means meant to insinuate that the clergy of the Church of England desire to perpetuate the saloons, but we pointed out what strange bedfellows the political situation had brought together in England during the campaign, and the fact was there, so there was no mis-statement on our part: for the coalition really existed, at least for the time being, and our correspondent admits in the above letter that this was the case. Where, then, was the misrepresentation on our part? Does not our friend himself say: "Sir William's party (the Lib-

erals) conspired to rob the Church and to rob the publican. Naturally the destined victims defended themselves against a common foe, etc."

Then there was an alliance; and the parties thereto must bear it with equanimity if the press poke a little fun at them on account of the incongruity of the combination; and from the quotations made by our correspondent it will be seen that we were much more moderate in our remarks than were many of the British Protestant journals, even those of the Anglican Church, while treating of the subject. In fact our allusion to the ecclesiastical ship having gained a safe harbor by sailing over a sea of beer was nothing more than a somewhat figurative mode of saying that it was only by making common cause with the saloonists that the Tory victory was achieved, and the Welsh Church saved for the time being from disestablishment. In all this there was no misrepresentation or mis-statement, and our correspondent must be irritable in the extreme if he has taken umbrage at our remarks.

We have never spoken disrespectfully of our Protestant brethren, even in the midst of controversy, and it was not likely we should wish to do so in reference to the British elections. On the other hand, we have a right to expect due toleration of a certain amount of liberty of speech and of the forms of rhetoric while discussing facts and principles.

The quotations of our friend from British journals which spoke of the "unnatural alliance between parsons and publicans, Church and drink, bigots and spigots," do not concern us, as the language is not ours. Yet there was some foundation even for these witticisms, and as the clergy can scarcely avoid pleading guilty to the implications contained in them, they would show more wisdom by submitting to the jocose language with a good grace.

Our correspondent uses very strong language too, and he might be a little tolerant even if others do likewise sometimes. He accuses the Liberal Government of desiring to "rob the Church." Has he forgotten that the Church was endowed by wholesale robbery of the Church which preceded it, and that Anglicans are accustomed to justify the act? If it were lawful for the British Government to despoil the Catholic Church in order to enrich the new-born Anglican establishment, surely there is no robbery if the same power disendow the latter again in order to leave it to live on its own intrinsic resources. But besides this wholesale robbery, the Welsh Church, which the Liberals propose to disendow, is supported by an unjust title levied on a population which detests the Church they are thus forced to support. Surely this is a greater robbery than disestablishment would be, and the less said about robbery of the Church, the more good sense will the supporters of the Establishment display.—EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC RECORD.

THE OTTAWA SEPARATE SCHOOLS.

At the present critical moment, when the Catholics of the Dominion are endeavoring to maintain the constitutional rights of our brethren in Manitoba, the troubles which have arisen in regard to the Separate schools of Ottawa are a peculiarly unfortunate occurrence. The enemies of Catholic education have taken occasion, from what has happened, to decry Catholic schools in general, and to maintain that they are everywhere inefficient, and that they should not be tolerated either in Manitoba or any other Province.

This view of the matter is notoriously unjust. The Separate schools throughout Ontario are efficiently conducted, and the praise they have earned from the education department cannot be snatched from them by a failure in any one locality, arising out of the peculiar admixture of two nationalities, speaking different languages.

As far back as January, 1892, Mr. J. F. White, the efficient and courteous Inspector of Separate schools for Ontario, made a special report to the education department, in which fault was found with the management of the French section of the city schools. He pointed out that teachers are changed too frequently, that there was not sufficient accommodation for the children, that public examinations were not conducted in a manner to make manifest the real status of the pupils, that English especially is very poorly taught, and in some of the schools not at all, that even French is not properly taught, that several of the French

books used are not suitable for their purpose, that the provisions for health and cleanliness are insufficient, as are also the provisions for the escape of the pupils in case of fire or other accident.

This catalogue of charges is truly appalling. In justice to the good Sisters, who have charge of the girls' schools, we must add, however, that Mr. White's report attests that the charges which affect the methods and success of the teachers do not apply to them, but solely to the boys' schools, taught by the Christian Brothers. The report also does not refer to the English schools, but solely to those in which the children and teachers are French, and wherein French is the language supposed to pre-eminently.

This report of the Inspector was followed in subsequent years by other reports in which, though some improvement was admitted, substantially the same charges were made in a less degree; and if these charges are even approximately correct, the French section of the Ottawa schools must indeed be in a deplorable condition.

We have deeply at heart the cause of Catholic education, and we have maintained it against attacks from every quarter; but while doing this we lay it down as an indisputable proposition that those upon whom the duty lies to manage the details of such education, should see to it that it shall be quite up to that standard which the spirit and progress of the times demand. There is nothing to prevent Catholic schools from being equal in every respect to the Public schools, unless it be culpable apathy on the part of those who have control over them, whether these be the trustees, or others who should take a lively interest in their success. In regard to the Ottawa schools, we must remark that in Mr. White's later reports than the one we have already alluded to, it is stated that in several respects a great improvement had been made for the year 1894. Thus, in his report for that year he says: "The study of English has made very satisfactory progress in the girls' divisions, where the teaching has been thorough and systematic under capable teachers specially charged with this duty. Though some progress has been made in the boys' schools, their standing in this subject is not equal to that of the girls."

Again: "In written French there has been an improvement since the date of my last report." Also: "The equipment of the schools is fairly good, though not complete in all rooms are small, and the lighting and ventilation not altogether satisfactory."

Brother Flamien, of Montreal, the Superior of the Christian Brothers, has stated publicly that the outcry against the condition of the schools in Ottawa is the outcome of a party-spirit against the order, and he bitterly denounced Mr. White for his scathing criticisms on their teaching. We must say that we have too much confidence in Mr. White's ability and fairness to believe that either he has totally misrepresented the condition of the schools, or that he was actuated by hostility in making his unfavorable reports. The matter was submitted by the Ontario Government to a Commission of Investigation consisting of Messrs. Edward Ryan, B. A., M. D., of Kingston; J. J. Tilley, Inspector of Ontario Model schools, and Wm. Scott, Vice-Principal of Toronto Normal school—one Catholic and two Protestants, and the report of the commissioner fully bears out Mr. White's statements.

It cannot be asserted that the commission was disposed to hostility to the Brothers; and as regards the education department, it must be said that the Minister took every precaution to have the investigation fairly conducted. The commission, too, as originally constituted consisted of two Catholic members and one Protestant. Messrs. Ryan and Tilley were appointed to take the place of the first named two Catholic members, who resigned. We think that the Brothers in at first opposing the investigation did not act discreetly; but they repaired this fault by afterwards affording every facility to the commission to do their work.

It is to be remarked that the chief, if not the whole, cause of the trouble is the difficulty of supplying teachers competent to give instructions in two languages. As regards other matters which lay in the power of the trustees and teachers to remedy, there has been no desire on the part of either to shirk their duty, and we have no doubt an effectual remedy to the existing defects will be applied without delay. The Christian Brothers have long taught both in Canada and the United

States with success. In Toronto their methods are highly appreciated, and in New York City their schools stand in the first rank for efficiency, their pupils having beaten those of the Public schools with whom they came into competition, year after year. There is no doubt, therefore, that the order has able teachers; and Brother Flamien said truly that in many countries they have gained the highest approbation from educators for their successful methods. We admit the difficulty of appointing efficient men where the teaching is conducted in two languages, but for this very reason a special effort should be made to conquer the obstacles which lie in the way, and to supply capable teachers in a city like Ottawa.

There is a difficulty also in dealing with a French population in an English-speaking Province, and no doubt a large part of the present trouble arises out of this fact. The French-Canadians are very much attached to their language, and look very much askance at any one who presumes to suggest that the language of their schools should be English. We submit to their consideration that they should endeavor to accommodate themselves to the circumstances in which they may find themselves placed.

We by no means desire that English should be forced upon French-Canadians, to the exclusion of French; but in Canada, and especially in Ontario and in the far East and West, English is, and in the nature of things must continue to be, the predominant and business language. Our French-Canadian friends should realize this once for all, and should make provision for the proper education of their children in English.

We have before now opposed the attempt of some Ontario politicians to force English upon the French-speaking population, to the exclusion of French. This course would result in preventing the present rising generation from being properly educated at all; but if our French fellow-citizens scattered here and there through this Province do not make an effort to have their children taught in English, they must fall behind in the race. It is for their interest and welfare, therefore, that we urge upon them the necessity of having English taught in the French schools. The French language alone in this country is a very poor outfit for boys and girls in Canada, who must earn their own living; and this is especially true of the provinces in which English is almost exclusively spoken; that is to say, in all the provinces of the Dominion except Quebec.

Whitby, Ont., Sept. 14, 1895
E. C. CATHOLIC RECORD, London:

My dear Sir—A friend of mine, Mr. Samuel Quilley, of this town, called my attention yesterday to an editorial article in the RECORD of Sept. 7, wherein you assert that the editor of the *Whitby Chronicle* is "one of those who hold the conviction that Orangeism is in some way or other, the guardian of civil and religious liberty." As I have never written any articles on Orangeism, and as I do not hold any such views as you credit me with, I presume you must have mis-stated the name of the editor you had in mind at the time you penned your comment on the question. If you are familiar with the articles written for the *Chronicle*, I presume you will know that I do not hesitate to express such views as I do hold on any subject, either religious or otherwise, but I do not care to figure in the list of religious bigots who hold to any faith. I judge from what I know of your fair and reasonable articles that you try to be perfectly just to all sects and denominations, and I have no hesitation in addressing you in reference to this matter, which I am anxious to have cleared up, as I would be very sorry to have the impression spread that I am a religious bigard. I may say that my Catholic friends here—several of whom have spoken to me about it—appeared quite surprised to see such a charge flung at me, whom they appear to regard as anything but a bigot.

I am, yours fraternally,
S. H. GRAHAM, Ed. *Chronicle*.

We can assure our esteemed friend that we had not the slightest intention of doing him any injustice in our criticism of the article which appeared in the *Whitby Chronicle* of July 12. As he says he has never written any editorials on Orangeism we must not, of course, hold him responsible for the article in question, which appears to have been written without due consideration of the true nature of the Orange organization. The closing sentence of the *Chronicle's* article reads: "The 12th of July will be celebrated for many a century to come as the day of the emancipation of religious conscience." It were indeed a puzzle to us to make out how the waddances performed each year on the 12th of July serve in any way to protect civil and religious liberty; and the puzzle becomes all the more difficult of solution when we remember that those who take part in these Calathumpian exhibitions are very much less Protestant in practice than their Protestant neighbors who do not belong to the organization. The whole Orange combination is a paradise for the demagogue who seeks to rise into prominence on the ruins of good-fellowship and good-citizenship.