

Mr. James Fisher, M.P.P., says: "When the settlement is satisfactory to such representative Catholics as Mr. Laurier and Mr. Tarte, surely it is not insufficient." Of course, it will not be unsatisfactory or insufficient to the men who have made it. The point is, will these men turn out to be truly representative Catholics? We sincerely hope they will.

The Rev. Alex. Grant thinks the settlement "contains the obnoxious feature of what to me is practically a Separate School." Where there is a large number of Catholic pupils, religious teaching necessarily entails separation to some extent. Mr. Grant should advocate purely secular schools if he wants no sort of separation.

Mr. Dickey thinks the agreement would eventually lead to separate schools, and no doubt it may do so; but the separate schools would only be supported by the irreconcilables; the bulk of the people will no doubt choose a superior education, less taxes, and some independence of the clergy under public schools, in preference to supporting the separate schools. They have largely done so already.

Mr. Ewart very naturally does not look upon the settlement as a valid one. His friends are not in it, and besides, to continue the fight will pay better. With a very large number of Protestants, he said, he "resolutely opposed the elimination from what are usually termed secular studies of the religious element." The same old story. It is not enough to have God in the school. You must have him in the algebra and geometry lessons, in handwriting and drawing classes, in geography and anatomy. If the way is not very plain, the priest or teacher has plenty of time to straighten it out, and the children will only learn a little less of some things that are "not of much use without a knowledge of God." No, friend Ewart, as you say, it "does not require a prophet's eye to foresee" the outcome of such teaching as this. The people in Quebec form an object-lesson about which there can be no mistake.

Mr. Paul G. Martineau, avocat, says the settlement, to be final and unappealable, must be ratified by similar Dominion legislation to that to be passed by Manitoba. But, like the others referred to, he forgets the point of the last decision of the Privy Council—that the minority had the right of appeal to the Governor-General in Council. If the "Governor-General in Council" hears the appeal and decides upon it in the sense of the agreement, and in a manner satisfactory to the Manitoba Government, no Dominion legislation is necessary. It is only in the event of the Governor General in Council deciding in a way adverse to the Manitoba Parliament that Dominion legislation would be necessary.

The *Patrie* blames Archbishop Langevin for not accepting the school settlement, and it says: "In the interest of our race and even of our faith, we cannot follow the Archbishop of St. Boniface; we are unwilling to follow him on the dangerous ground where he wants to carry our whole province."

Mr. St. Pierre, the Montreal *Herald's* correspondent who is investigating the condition of the schools throughout Quebec, tells the story of his visit to Abbé Perus, of St. Tite, a young parish with a large population and a magnificent stone church. The correspondent stated his mission, but the Abbé looked at him in horror as he replied: "Sir, education belongs to the bishops. Laymen have no business to meddle with the schools. It was to the bishops that Christ said: 'Go forth and teach all nations.' *Comprenez-vous?*" He did, and left.