

LOYAL LAWYER'S LOGICAL LECTURE.

MR. EWART ANSWERS MR. PEDLEY.

He Begins By Praising Him, Then Proves His Principles False And Shameful, Shows That The Only Points On Which Protestants Agree Are Those Which Antagonize Catholic Doctrine Even With Regard To The Ten Commandments, And That They Cannot Agree As To The Fundamentals Of Morality.

An Undercurrent Of Vivid Humor And Polished Satire.

My first word upon this occasion must be one of thanks to Mr. Pedley and his congregation, for their almost unprecedented kindness in permitting me, from their platform, to make reply to the pastor of their own church. If anyone had ever doubted Mr. Pedley's honest endeavor after impartiality (and I do not think that anyone did) my appearance here to-night will remove his doubt in the most satisfactory manner possible. No one can refrain from admiration for the painstaking and conscientious method in which Mr. Pedley approached the subject. It is one filled with difficulties. It is complicated by legal subtleties that have puzzled some of the ablest judges in Canada; by questions of disputed facts; by problems of morality and religion, of tolerance and freedom, of enlightenment and patriotism. Under these circumstances Mr. Pedley did not rush into the pulpit praying God to send down enlightenment and ready-made wisdom; but getting his books around him he sat down patiently to enlighten himself. And I must congratulate him upon the result of his labors. With one or two almost trifling exceptions he stated the material facts with almost complete exactness. With his reasonings and conclusions from those facts I entirely disagree; and I am here to-night to state why I do so, and to endeavor (with I hope as much fairness and moderation as he showed), to convince you that I am right.

And first let me see what the trouble is all about. One reverend gentleman preached a most vigorous sermon against control of schools by the Roman Catholic church. He abused the church and its management in fine Reformation phraseology, and in ringing tone, whilst poor Rome sat on her seven hills howling with pain and up and down the spiny Apennines ran cold shivers and hot earthquakes. When I informed him through the newspapers that nobody was contending for church control, he naively replied that if that were so there was no use in the sermon. I beg his pardon—the controversy. He should have said no use in the sermon. The Catholics then do not ask for church control. If they did I would not be their advocate. I do not say that it would not be well done. In England their schools are well up to the standard. But I am democratic enough to want to see the people manage their own affairs. I believe it is good for the people, and in the long run good for their affairs.

What then is the trouble all about? To understand the matter we must classify the different kinds of schools. The broadest division of them is into National schools, and Church, and Denominational schools. National schools are those governed by the nation. Church schools are those governed by churches. Separate schools are sometimes national schools, and sometimes church schools, that is, sometimes governed by the nation and sometimes governed by the churches. For our purposes these are the four kinds of schools, and two national schools. (1) Church schools pure and simple, with no assistance from government (St. John's college is an example of this kind); (2) church schools which comply with certain government requirements, and in consideration of their secular work share in the government grant (the English denominational schools are examples of this class); (3) national separate schools which are governed and controlled directly by department of the government (such as the Ontario separate schools); and (4) national separate schools which are governed and controlled directly by government, that is, they are governed through a board of education appointed by government. It was to this class that both the Protestant and Catholic schools in Manitoba belonged prior to 1890. They were national and separate.

It is often assumed that if schools are to be called national they must be all EXACTLY ALIKE.

Scotchmen have a national costume, but the tartans differ. There may be national railways, but with different gauges suiting to locality. There are separate waiting rooms at railway stations, but they are all public. If all the schools in Manitoba were governed by the same body, and were identically alike except that in some of them there were certain religious exercises, and in others there were none, would one of these classes cease to be national? If so the act of 1890 provides for schools which may be national. If not then the separate schools of Ontario to-day are national schools. I advocate then the national schools, but I do not propose length, and that peoples' consciences shall be lopped or lengthened to suit the schools. I believe that schools are made

for the people, and not people for the schools, and that the system should be so flexible (to use Dr. Bryce's commendatory word), that all can take advantage of it. I advocate national schools and I oppose church schools. The most obvious criticism of Mr. Pedley's lecture is that he never defined the controversy. Let me endeavor to state the point clearly, for I have always found in conversation that when that was done almost all opposition ceased—that there was no use in the sermon—I mean the controversy.

Let us see what is admitted between Mr. Pedley and me. In the first place we admit that there must be religious teaching in the schools. That I may not do Mr. Pedley wrong I shall quote his words: "Is it the business of the state to provide religious teaching? Is that the conclusion? Yes, but with this qualification that this be done without partiality or injustice." We may judge of the extent to which religion ought to be taught by Mr. Pedley's contention that "it is the business of the state to provide moral training. But moral training will be ineffective unless supported by the sentiments and sanctions of religion." Therefore he says religion must be taught; and therefore religious "sentiments and sanctions" must be taught. He concludes his paragraph in this way: "What then is the duty of the state? First to teach religion in so far as it can do that without violating the fundamental principles of religion; and second to extend all hospitality and encouragement consistent with justice to the agencies whose business it is to teach religion."—not excluding, I suppose, the Catholic church. To my mind it is not far from this to separate schools.

I am quite aware that this may be thought by many here to be an unsatisfactory point from which to start the debate, and many may think that Mr. Pedley has admitted too much—that purely secular schools are the only remedy for the religious question. And I quite admit that it is harder to answer such persons, although it can be done, and done satisfactorily. But I think that there is no difficulty whatever in answering Mr. Pedley, and those who take the stand that he does; and it is for that purpose that I am here to-night.

Let us see how far we have got: (1) The schools are not to be under church control; and (2) there must be teaching in them of religious "sentiments and sanctions." Is there any thing else we can agree about? Yes. We can agree (3) that all schools are to work up to the same secular standard; (4) that the teachers in all the schools shall pass the same examinations and be certificated in the same way, because of the same qualifications; (5) that all schools shall use the same books, with this almost unnecessary proviso that there shall be nothing in them offensive to any religious body; (6) that all schools shall be subject to state inspection; (7) and that by these, or other means which can be devised, the education of all the children in Manitoba shall be as general, and as efficient as it is possible to make it.

Now, am I right as to this? Let me see. As counsel for the Roman Catholic minority in this province, and with their authority, in addressing His Excellency the Governor-General-in-Council, I said, and I repeat it here to-night: "They do not ask that their church should in any way control the schools. They are perfectly willing to work up to any

be agreement upon such a question? One would have thought that after all the centuries of effort to make people agree upon the most trifling points in religion that it would long ago have been given up as wholly impracticable. But no, here it is again, Mr. Pedley says: "Here is some religion that everybody ought to agree to," and here is the eternal answer, that they won't.

One of the best known efforts to get everybody to agree was the English church service. In the preface we find the following account of itself: "It is more profitable, because here are left out many things, whereof some are untrue, some uncertain, some vain and superstitious; and nothing is ordained to be read but the very pure word of God, the Holy Scriptures, or that which is agreeable to the same; and that in such a language, and order, as is most easy and plain for the understanding, both of the readers and hearers. It is also more commodious, both for the shortness thereof and for the plainness of the order; and for that the rules be few and easy; and whereas heretofore there hath been great diversity in saying and singing in churches within the realm, now from henceforth all the whole realm shall have but one use." "But one use" throughout the whole realm! That was a grand and inspiring idea, but what has come of it? We go from a high church to a low one, and we cannot tell that they even belonged to the same denomination, each having its own use as before.

Queen Elizabeth's parliament over 300 years ago passed an act to establish uniformity. It proposed to "obliterate all lines of demarcation in the state that distinguish creeds, to establish uniformity, to promote harmony and good fellowship, by dint of statutory pressure. When the Emperor Ferdinand interceded on behalf of the Catholics he was told: "The Queen declares that she cannot grant churches to those who disagree from her religion, being against the law of her parliament, and highly dangerous to the state of her kingdom, as it would sow various opinions in the nation, to distract the minds of honest men, and would cherish parties and factions that might disturb the present tranquillity of the commonwealth." (Hallam's Hist. of Eng., Cap. III.) The author adds: "Yet enough had already occurred in France to lead observing men to suspect that severities and restrictions are by no means an infallible specific to prevent, or subdue, religious factions."

Of course the statute failed in its object, as have always, and in every place failed all similar ordinances. With such experience to aid our judgments, I would hardly have imagined that any one now living believed that unity and good fellowship could be brought about in that way, and would argue in all seriousness what Lowell wrote in satire:

I do believe wotever trash
"I'll keep the peace and blindness—
That we the Mexicans can thrash
Right in brotherly kindness.
No comb, shells, grape, or powder 'n ball
Air good-will's strongest magic,
That peace, to make it stick at all,
Must be drawn in with bagnets."

If Mr. Greenway really is moved by kindly feeling towards the Catholics, and is legislating for their good, does he not, by confiscating all their schools, furniture, apparatus, money and all else, at least leave himself open to the question: "Perhaps you did right to dismember your love, but why did you kick us down stairs?" Mr. Pedley would have us send the bill to Ottawa, so he tells us!

But we need not go back to the Tudors and Stuarts for examples of the stiffness of religious views, and the tenderness of conscience in what to others seem to be small matters. At a stone's throw from this church I can throw others on to Grace church, Westminster church, and send a golf ball to Holy Trinity. Tell me the difference in doctrine between a Congregationalist, a Methodist, a Presbyterian, an Episcopalian, and a post-nominal Baptist? What keeps these people in separate churches? Why do they spend thousands of dollars annually in competition with one another in the little villages of the west? If you ask them they will tell you conscience. To one somewhat free from theological prejudices this seems very extraordinary, but I cannot and do not question their sincerity.

With history behind us then, and all these rival churches around us, what ought we to expect from an attempt to get Protestant and Catholic to agree upon the character and quantity of religious "sentiments and sanctions" to be taught in our schools? To my mind it is as clear as the sun at noon-day that the task is one impossible of performance, and that the attempt is one of utter foolishness. I can understand that man who says, well, if they can't agree then we must have none at all; but with great deference to Mr. Pedley, I cannot understand the man who says, there must be religion in the schools, but Mr. Greenway and Mr. Martin (although under no charge of theological prejudice) are to cut off the quantity to be used by everybody. This to my mind is requiring people to fit the school act, and not making a school act.

TO FIT THE PEOPLE.

What then do we want? We are willing to work up to secular standard prescribed by the state; to employ state certificated teachers; to use state selected books (if not antagonistic to Catholic religion); to be subjected to state inspection, and to be free from church control. That I think, is all that the state can require of us, and ought to be a sufficient answer to suggestions of inefficiency and illiteracy; and in return we ask that in schools in which there are none but Roman Catholics, the religious "sentiments and sanctions" to be taught shall be such as we choose, and not those selected by others, however

free from theological prejudice. Is this reasonable or is it not? To test it let me answer some of the objections made to it.

First objection—There is nothing in (1) the religious exercises or (2) instruction which have been prescribed that Catholics can reasonably find fault with. There is the old trouble, one man telling another what he would think if he were only reasonable. To my mind if the Protestant denominations were only reasonable they would unite. But they won't, and what can I do? Legislate for them, as though they ought to, and pass an act of uniformity, with a magnificent ideal of one use throughout the whole realm, or recognize the fact that they differ and have a perfect right to, if it pleases them, of if they are built that way?

Let us see how the Privy Council met this point, for the same thing was argued before them. Their Lordships said: "There may be many too who share the view expressed in one of the affidavits in Barrett's case, that there should not be any conscientious objections on the part of Roman Catholics to attend such schools, if adequate means be provided elsewhere of giving such moral and religious training as may be desired. But all this is not to the purpose. As a matter of fact the objection of Roman Catholics to schools such as alone receive state aid under the act of 1890 is conscientious and deeply rooted."

During the argument one good Irish judge said of Dr. Bryce who made the affidavit: "This gentleman gives it as his individual opinion that the Catholic religion ought to be something entirely different from what it is."

Ought I have to go any further upon this point? In a British colony and speaking to law abiding Canadians, are we not to well submitted to submitting our personal opinions to the final arbitration of courts of law, too well accustomed to recognize that for disputes, constitutional as well as private, there must be some method of peaceful solution, to make it necessary for me to prove that this judgment of the Privy Council is correct? It is unnecessary, and yet that the Catholic position may be shown to be reasonable, as well as legal, I shall pursue the subject a little further.

What then is there in the religious exercises (first) that we object to? Nothing; but suppose I complain of my porridge, that there is no salt in it, ought I to be roughly put down with the statement that there was nothing in it that I objected to?

Let me apply this method of reasoning to the Protestants and see if they will follow it. In the prayer prescribed for the schools I find these words: "For the sake of Jesus Christ, thy Son, our Lord." Now upon the principle that the schools should be (as Mr. Pedley contends) non-sectarian and for Jew and Gentile alike, those words ought to be struck out of the prayer, for no Jew would use them, nor would any Unitarian. But if the words were eliminated no Protestant would use the prayer. I then might say to him, What do you object to? There is nothing in the prayer that you can complain of. And he would say, No, but there is something left out, the same way. I say that the present religious exercises are Protestant. Any one acquainted with the differences between Protestant and Catholic would at once say so and not because of anything in them but because of what is left out.

Then as to the instruction prescribed we object not only to its quantity but to its quality, when in the hands of Protestant teachers. The regulations say: "To establish the habit of right doing, instruction in moral principles must be accompanied by training in moral practices. The teacher's influence and example, current incidents, stories, memorization, didactic talks, teaching the ten commandments, etc., are means to be employed." Am I wrong in saying that that programme sounds very like one for a Sunday school? And are Catholics unreasonable in saying that in the hands of Protestant teachers the flavor of the memory gems, didactic talks, etc., would be Protestant? It could not possibly be otherwise. I defy any Presbyterian to instance who believes his catechism to conscientiously teach the ten commandments without coming in direct conflict with Roman Catholic doctrine. And if we are to assume that the teachers are non-sectarian too—gentlemen without theological prejudices—what reason is he to give to the children why the Protestant divide the Catholics' first commandment into two, making up for it by adding their ninth and tenth together. When he is teaching the Protestants' second commandment is he to state that it is a special commandment aimed at Roman Catholic images and relics? or is he to explain, "Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image," as the Catholics explain that language? And when he comes to the Protestants' fourth commandment enjoining the keeping of Sunday (it is the Catholic third), shall he inculcate Protestant or Catholic belief as to the lawfulness of recreation, and works of liberal, and artistic, character? Let Protestants tell me that they are willing to have their children taught the Ten Commandments by Roman Catholics, and I shall then, but not till then, acknowledge that the present schools are unsectarian. I pray Mr. Pedley to make a note of this for his reply.

I have with me the Presbyterian and the Roman Catholic methods of teaching the decalogue. According to the Presbyterian, one of the sins forbidden by the first commandment is "Praying to saints, making men lords of our faith and conscience," etc.; one of the sins forbidden by the second is "the making of any representation of God, of all, or any of these persons, either inwardly in our mind, or outwardly in any kind

of image or likeness of any creature whatsoever; all worshipping of it, or God in it or by it," etc.; one of the sins forbidden by the third is "the maintaining of false doctrines, etc.; one of the sins prohibited by the fourth is "all profaning the day by..... recreations," and so on. Does any one tell me that for a Presbyterian believing that these are sins, and that they are prohibited by the ten commandments, to teach the decalogue and say nothing about them? I need not stay to contrast the lesson drawn by the Roman Catholics from the same Commandments. Suffice it to say that they are such as are anathematized by all Protestants.

It is sometimes said that the apostles' creed is non-sectarian and could be taught to all children alike. Not to mention the children without theological prejudices, and the Jews who do not believe the creed, what would the non-sectarian teacher tell the children was the explanation of "He descended into hell?" Catholics have one view and Protestants various others. Without dwelling further upon this point I am prepared to say, after a careful study of the question that it is not within the wit of man to devise a means of co-education in religion which shall be satisfactory to Protestants and Catholics alike.

You will observe that I have been showing that Protestants and Catholics

upon very simple matters connected with religion—not even the decalogue which is taught in the 1890 schools. But even if they could agree on these rudimentary points such quantity of religion would fall far short of the allowance which Mr. Pedley has agreed ought to be provided by the state; according to his view, and the Roman Catholic view, the foundations of morality—the religious "sentiments and sanctions" of it must be taught. Now, Mr. Pedley, I have a conundrum for you. Morality is based upon religion, but upon what religion? Is it the Christian religion? Then it must be taught in the schools, is it not? And then what becomes of the Jews and Unitarians? and what of our boasted non-sectarian schools—schools open to every one and providing for every one, Jew and Gentile alike? And another conundrum: Morality is based, shall we say, on the Christian religion (and the Jews and Unitarians can go to where and what parts of it, and what are the essentials of it? Does Mr. Pedley really propose that everybody is under penalty of paying for two sets of schools, to have to agree upon these points? I beg that he will not in reply say: Surely Protestants and Catholics can agree upon the broad fundamentals of religion. I say in advance while broadly they do agree, particularly if you must teach that way they do not; that if you are going to teach religion you do not teach it in a lump, but specifically, and there is no possibility of agreement. I make the audience this offer: Let as many as like write down specifically the religious sentiments and religious sanctions which they think are the foundations of morality. After Mr. Pedley's reply we shall see if any one in this audience agrees with him. If any single individual does agree with him I will pay \$25 to the Children's Home.

Second objection—That it is necessary to the upbuilding of national unity that all children should go to the same schools. Is it? Then how comes it that England to-day is probably the highest type of national unity on the face of the earth? Did English boys all go to the same schools when Crecy and Agincourt, Salamanca and Waterloo were fought? Not at all. The idea then was individually rather than similarity. Moreover this idea of putting boys into the same mould, and turning them out exactly alike, is the most mistaken of all ideas relating to education. The world has made more progress on the principle of diversity, than of similarity, a thousand times over. The principle of similarity is in many respects the principle of intolerance and stagnation, whereas the principle of individual liberty is the principle of good fellowship and progress.

This objection is sometimes put in this way: That in common schools children of different denominations will cease to have theological prejudices, I suppose. I do not think so. If we are to get rid of theological prejudices we need not commence at the schools, for there are none there. It is, I am sorry to say, at the pulpits that we must work—the pulpits of Protestants and Catholics alike—at some very little, but still to some extent, the Protestant and Catholic pulpits respectively deserved, to the extent that they respectively deserved, the congregation would not be behind. The antagonism is, to my mind, largely professional, for in business and social intercourse we know nothing of it, we never hear of it.

Let me give you an example. A short time ago the Methodist ministers of this city passed the following resolution and directed it to be sent to every Methodist minister with a request that he should preach upon it: "The Methodist Ministerial Association of Winnipeg, to the Dominion Cabinet, Ottawa, Sir McKenzie Bowell, premier—Fearing lest silence be construed as indifference, we respectfully, but firmly, protest against interference with the school system of Manitoba as established by law. First, because by this law no injustice is done to any individual; secondly, because such interference would infringe upon provincial rights which are sacred, having been uniformly recognized since confederation, notably in dealing with the Jesuits' estates question." (Sgd.) Geo. R. Turk, president; F. S. Fletcher, sec-

Country.	Catholics.	Protestants.	Schools to which Catholics go.
Switzerland.....	1,084,400	1,577,700	505
German Empire.....	14,887,500	25,660,700	162
Luxembourg.....	197,000	400	142
Norway.....	83	1,704,800	138
Sweden.....	600	4,203,500	138
Netherlands.....	1,313,000	2,188,000	138
Denmark.....	1,900	1,865,000	135
Belgium.....	35,283,000	610,800	151
Austria.....	4,980,000	15,000	123
Great Britain.....	27,904,300	3,571,000	100
Spain.....	4,800,000	25,900,000	83
Italy.....	16,500,000	1,000,000	52
.....	26,750,000	85,000	70

But all these statistics prove nothing to us. The ethnological differences of the people must be taken into account; and this fact also that the figures of years ago would be very different. England is doing very well now, but prior to 1870 her standing was deplorable. Italy's spurt came a few years later, but as you may see from the report of the United States commissioners of education of 1888-9, p. xlv.: "In no state of Europe have more strenuous efforts been made to provide for education by public schools. The expenditure for 1886 amounted to \$20,000,000, of which the national government furnished nearly one-third. Over 10 per cent. of the entire population are enrolled in schools." Italy was one of Mr. Pedley's horrible examples! Statistics are also quoted from our own province. It is said that only 25 per cent. of the French halfbreeds can read or write. I am assured that it is much greater than that, but am surprised to hear that it is so great. Dr. Bryce has compared the French halfbreeds to roadsters, and the English to the tongue of many of those called French is Cree, and their habits until recent years have been those of the roving hunter and voyageur. Why then charge their illiteracy to the Catholic schools? Why not as well charge it to the Protestant schools? Of this 25 per cent. of illiterates how many owe their education to others than Catholics? Credit the Catholics, I say, with 75 per cent. Do not debit them with 45 (even were Catholics responsible), to ask the same results from wild mustangs as from patient roadsters? In the United States educational census there is a separate column for civilized Indians, colored people, etc. It is not the best column!

Perhaps the best means of ascertaining whether the separate schools system is injurious is to ascertain how it works in Ontario. There the supporters of both schools are much the same, and the conditions are identical. How does it operate there illiterate? If you will turn to the Canadian statistical year book for 1894, at page 851, you will find the statement: "The average attendances at the separate schools, being 57 per cent. of the total number of pupils; while the average cost per pupil both on total attendance, and on average attendance, was less than the public schools." I commend this as a text for the Methodist sermons in substitution for their bad-fact resolution. Fourth objection—The objection of defective education is better put by Mr. Pedley when he says that in cases where the population is sparse and mixed, so that there are not enough make two good schools. This is a valid objection and must be met.

First let us see the extent of the difficulty. Dr. Bryce has said: "Out of 719 school districts in Manitoba when the act of 1890 was passed 91 were Catholic. Of these all but a very small percentage are in localities almost entirely French." This small percentage must be in cities and towns where there are enough Protestants and Catholics to form two efficient schools. So when we look vanishes. For the few remaining cases the co-vent school in this city would answer the objection. In that school seeking the benefit of defective education and illiteracy. There while the Catholic children for half an hour learn their catechism other employment is provided for the Protestants. But whether or not that would be satisfactory, I do say that it is not a reason for abolishing a whole system, that there are a few cases in which special arrangements ought to be made.