

(June 10). "Every Roman Catholic child in those districts, irrespective of nationality, will have to attend one particular school. English and French children will then attend the same schools *to their mutual detriment*, and teachers who are unable to teach French will not be employed," stated Trustee Genest. "If the courts uphold the enforcement of the injunction," said Trustee Freeland, "we will carry out the academic portion of the regulations to the letter, but the French people will never submit to dual inspection. We will appoint our own inspector, and when an inspector other than our bilingual appointee enters a school for the purpose of inspection, the children will leave the school in a body. All annexes will be done away with at to-morrow night's meeting, with the result that on September 1, there will not be room for many of the children in the schools, which even with the present annexes are not sufficient for the ever increasing number of pupils."

The first resolution has already been acted upon. On June 20, Chairman Genest dismissed all the lay teachers. The few French lay teachers can easily be replaced by French nuns or brothers, as these are plentiful in Ottawa, but there are no nuns nor brothers to replace the forty-eight English lay teachers that have been dismissed. It is planned to replace them with French teachers, who would be unqualified and incompetent to teach English children.

These resolutions were commended, June 11, in *Le Droit*, a paper which is edited by French Oblate priests and which is approved and supported by all the French Nationalist clergy of Ontario. It shows how far French Nationalist members of the clergy will go, when they will connive at a plan which, by abolishing the annexes, would deprive 700 Catholic children of school accommodation, and which by illegally turning the sixteen English schools into bilingual schools to be run in defiance of government inspectors, Catholic or Protestant, would outrage the natural scholastic rights of three thousand English Catholic children, and force them into the public schools. It is, however, in line with that utter disregard for the rights of English speaking Catholics which has characterized this whole Nationalist campaign. The plan is, apparently, that the French should capture the Separate Schools, and make them French schools where a certain amount of broken English could be learned, and that English speaking Catholics be then refused the sacraments, if they do not support these French schools. This plan supposes a tyrannical abuse of ecclesiastical authority, a bartering of the sacraments worse than simony, which a true Catholic does not care to consider. Yet evidences from Russell and Temiskaming would tend to show that the scheme is already in force; and that in some sections English speaking Catholics are unjustly forced to choose between sending their children to French schools, to learn broken English, and getting the sacraments as a reward, and sending them to public schools, to get, without danger to faith, an English education, and being refused the sacraments as a punishment. That surely is the *chef d'œuvre* of French Nationalism. The Gallicans of France wishing to identify the interests of the Catholic Church with those of a State, would have made the Catholic Church the slave of the French state; the Neogallicans of Canada wishing to identify the interests of the Catholic religion with the varying interests of a language, would make the Catholic Church the slave of the French language.

A final word. If there be anything certain at all in this question, it is this: The time has come for ecclesiastical authority to act. Thus far, Archbishop Gauthier has not acted and doubtless he has had reasons for this stand. He saw that the French priests and people of his diocese, intoxicated with Nationalism, were in open revolt against civil authority, and, were he to interfere, would be in open revolt against ecclesiastical authority. Even Archbishop Duhamel could not control them in 1906: he was placed in the humiliating position, after having made an agreement with the English speaking people, of having to admit "that he did not think that he could do anything at present with the French people, as they were in too excited a state of mind." If their life-long aggressively French leader could not control them, what chance would Archbishop Gauthier have, a bishop only half-French, a bishop whom they insulted at his enthronization. The French clergy who instigated and supported the refusal of an address to their Archbishop, because he would not boycott a brother Catholic bishop, could scarcely be counted on to obey his rulings, in a school question round which their strong national prejudices had already been aroused to an extraordinary degree. This explains the inaction of Archbishop Gauthier before his present visit to Rome. Things had gone so far, the French were so aroused, that only the voice of Peter could calm them. It is this voice that all now await.