

founded on democratic constitutional principles, as I shall endeavour to illustrate.

We are all tolerably familiar with the doctrines of the Church with reference to the Pope's jurisdiction and attributes, and we know that in order to secure the continued existence of the Church as a powerful and wealthy hierarchy, the promulgation of these doctrines is necessary. The principal of these with which we have now to deal are those by which are claimed for His Holiness, not only spiritual, but temporal supremacy, as also infallibility. Being the head of the Church, and infallible, he is the arbiter of conscience and his dictates are unquestionable. Let us suppose, then, that in the interests of the Church His Holiness should deem it necessary to mark his disapproval of the course of some heretic State by enjoining such citizens of that State as were members of his communion from paying any taxes whatever. Being good Catholics and subscribers to the doctrines just referred to, they must refuse to pay the taxes. This, of course, would be a direct blow at the very life of the State itself, but on the "conscientious scruple" argument of our Separate School apologists, they would not only be justified in their refusal, but entitled to ask the approval of the State in their course.

It will, of course, be objected that this is a very strained and exaggerated hypothesis, as every one knows that there is not the slightest danger of the Church taking any such action at the present day, in any English-speaking community at least, but we must bear in mind that she has not abandoned one iota of the pretensions referred to. In fact, it is within recent years that probably the most important of all has been enunciated. If these claims are well founded they are none the less right because it may be physically impossible to enforce their recognition. But if they are right, what becomes of the fundamental principles of constitutional government, and how can a believer in their righteousness be an honest supporter of popular government?

It may be said that the doctrine of temporal supremacy is practically a dead letter, and that probing into such matters is simply disturbing harmony needlessly. If it is a dead letter, why does the Church not set all doubts at rest by repudiating any such pretension? But I think I have shown that the present difficulty exists simply because of the practical vitality of this doctrine. I am one of those who believe that no permanent harmony in practice can exist unless based on logical and harmonious principles, and that the attempt to patch up harmony on any basis other than that of strict justice and logical principle is analogous to the futile action of the ostrich, who, by simply hiding his head in the sand, fancies he has obtained safety. It is crying Peace! Peace! when there is no peace.

History shows us that we do not require to go into the distant past to learn how, by these very doctrines, the Church has shown such disagreeably warm interest in the civil affairs of more than one State. Every one knows the consummate skill and diplomacy displayed by the Church in influencing civil politics in popularly governed countries to its own advantage at the present day, and no country affords a better illustration of this than Canada. In fact, in your own district at the present time the determined hostility of the clergy to secret voting is naively suggestive of the inordinate interest which this admirably organized body takes in mundane concerns.

It is these temporal pretensions and this fact that the Church is an active and aggressive political, as well as a religious, organization which constitute the essential difference between Catholics and all other sections of the community, and which cause the concession of their claims in regard to the Separate Schools by this constitutional Province to be absurd and paradoxical. To the strictly spiritual doctrines and ethics of the Church of Rome I have not the slightest hostility any more than to those of any other denomination, and this is the feeling of the great body of the people here. They have, in their minds, however, the distinction I have just referred to, and are determined to settle the question as to what is the supreme power in this Province in a most effective way, and, having clearly in view the real issues, are not to be deterred by any sophistical, empty accusations of bigotry or intolerance from doing what is right. Nor are they to be deterred by the recent threat that if they dare to do what is right, the Province of Quebec will deliberately perpetrate a wrong, much as they regret the frame of mind and the state in which matters must be in that Province, to make the threat possible.

The other party, which, for purposes of distinction, we may term the Protestant Ecclesiastical Party, has very strong objections to the present Separate School system. They admit the great disability of national Common Schools. Their dislike to the present system, however, is not at all equal to their aversion to purely secular schools. The Bishop of Rupert's Land (Anglican) and Rev. Dr. King (Presbyterian), who may be considered as the leaders of this party, seem to think that there is a possibility of agreement between the Roman Catholics and all the Protestant denominations on some form of religious instruction which would embody no distinctive doctrines, and at the same time be acceptable to all, and save the schools from the stigma of secularism. Should this be found impracticable, however, they would be compelled to take one of two alternative positions. They would require, by force of a numerical majority, to compel the embodiment in the school system of a form of religious instruction suitable to themselves or to insist on the maintenance of the *status quo*. While the former course would not be

open to the objections which condemn the present system, it would, under the circumstances, savour strongly of intolerance, and would certainly be most expedient. I do not believe, however, if this party were prepared to go to that length, that they are at all strong enough to carry their point. The latter course, besides being now impossible, is not, I believe, necessary either to the moral welfare of the rising generation, or in the interest even of harmony.

The objection of this party to secular schools is founded on the belief that the withdrawal of the religious instruction at present imparted in the schools would be disastrous to the morals of the scholars and, therefore, dangerous to the State. The recent lecture of Rev. Dr. King on the subject was characterized by that divine's well known ability and moderation, but I was very much surprised that he made scarcely any effort to demonstrate the soundness of his premises. In order to illustrate the effect of secularism in education he gave an illustration showing the agnostic and material tendencies prevalent in France at present. This, however, was surely inapplicable for the purpose, as it is pretty generally known, that the shallow demagogic spirit which he illustrated was in existence in France before the advent of secular schools, and was the product, not of secularism, but of a fatal overdose of clericalism, autocracy and aristocracy. Dr. King also omitted to allow for the great difference in the temperament, genius, and tradition of the Gaelic and Anglo-Saxon peoples, a very important consideration in making analogies of this kind. The reverend doctor seemed to fear an influx of teachers of agnostic or immoral tendencies once the flood gates of secularism were swung open, although he did not give any very intelligible reason for such fear. He must, however, always bear in mind that the public intelligence, and not a small knot of malevolent atheists, will decide the matter, and he can rest assured that the bent of the public mind is in the direction of respect for religion, and that it is sufficiently intelligent to understand the absolute necessity of having teachers whose capacity and character will bear the strictest scrutiny, and may be trusted to see that none others are employed. The reverend gentleman evidently believes, and it is the inference of all the utterances from his party, that a school education in which the Bible is not used is not only incapable of developing the moral nature of the pupil, but would tend to produce a callous, cynical spirit and a moral bluntness whose effects would soon be disastrously apparent in society and in the nation. If the reverend gentleman's fears are well founded, then we want much more religious teaching in the schools than we now have, as, to the ordinary lay mind, it seems almost fatuous to picture such dire results as ensuing upon the elimination of the modicum of religious instruction at present administered. There is a species of unconscious "fee-fo-fum" in thus conjuring spirits from the vasty deep, which there are not good grounds for believing are really there.

It should be understood that the great bulk of the advocates of secular schools (myself amongst the number) are not by any means hostile to the recognition of religion in the schools, but while quite willing to admit religious teaching, they do not consider it of such essential importance that its retention should be allowed to operate as a cause of bitterness or bad feeling, nor do they believe that its omission would have a perceptibly deteriorating effect on the morals of the rising generation. The Churches would then have all the opportunity they have now to give attention to the spiritual growth of the young, and if it should be found that the change necessitates some extra effort on the part of the Churches, I don't know but the exertion would be very beneficial. But we are of the opinion, notwithstanding clerical headshakings, that with efficient tuition in the ordinary subjects of education, which is a moral training in itself, the clergy would find, possibly to their surprise, that the young were not at all slipping from their spiritual grip.

The great advantages to be derived from a single national school system from the points of view of economy, efficiency and patriotism are so apparent as to leave no room for dispute, and the establishment of such a system has been the burning question of the hour here. Of course such a question cannot be discussed, much less settled, without dissatisfaction to some. I have endeavoured as far as I could, consistently with my desire to state plainly my honest convictions, to avoid offence to those whose views are opposed to mine. I have no interest in this dispute other than that of a private citizen. I have already avowed my respect for Roman Catholicism as a religious faith while stating my undisguised objection to Roman Catholicism as a temporal power or a factor in civil politics. Being a fellow countryman of the Rev. Dr. King (Scots, you know, are clannish), an adherent, not a member, of the Presbyterian church, and a regular attendant at its ministrations, I cannot be very reasonably accused of prejudice against the views of his party, and I only refer to my personal attitude in this question because I believe it gives an illustration of what will be found to be the feeling of the great mass of this Western community.

It would be folly to expect a settlement of such a question without some friction, but it is to be hoped that the spirit of toleration, which I feel certain will mark the conduct of the people, will go a great way towards mitigating the feelings of dissatisfaction which are inevitable in some quarters. By toleration I do not mean toleration in the sense in which it has too frequently been interpreted, which is simply a toleration of injustice in

order to secure a misleading appearance of harmony. The toleration I mean is simply an absence of the rancour and vindictiveness which generally characterise such disputes. In any case the question has now become a vital issue and it is impossible to let things remain as they are. There can be said on behalf of the public of the Province what the Attorney-General, in speaking on this question recently, said on behalf of the Government, "Having put our hands to the plough, we cannot turn back." A. B. B.

Winnipeg, Nov. 18th, 1889.

WHY CANADIANS OPPOSE ANNEXATION.

To the Editor of THE WEEK:

SIR,—May I say a word or two on the reasons given by Mr. W. W. B. McInnes for the opposition of some Canadians to annexation with the United States?

He says, first: "If annexation took place Canada would be subject to all the dangers that threaten the Republic," and reference is made to the negro question. In reply I would ask if Canada is not now subject to all the dangers that threaten the widespread British Empire? And are not our English-speaking Provinces subject to all the dangers that threaten from the rapid increase of the French Canadians, with their alien language, laws and religion? Is there not danger that the faith that Milton held and the language Shakespeare spoke will be forgotten in a large portion of this fair Dominion?

2. "Among Canadians," Mr. McInnes says, "has grown up an idea that the laws of the United States are loosely enforced, and that influence and capital control the Bench." I would ask in reply, if it is correct to entertain such ideas as to all the States, and of the Bench in every State? Is the Canadian Bench always free from influence? What about the decision by the court below in the Charlevoix Election Case? What about the recent judgment that nuns must be examined in their cloisters and need not attend in court? Are our Parliaments and Legislatures free from influence? What about the law enabling a certain church to say whether or no a body shall be buried in consecrated ground? What about the Jesuit Bill? Is the greatest of our railway corporations without influence?

3. The marriage and divorce laws, we are told, "are so injurious that the average Canadian considers their existence a good reason for opposing annexation." Does not the average Canadian know that marriage and divorce are not controlled by the Republic but by the different States; that each State can enact such laws as it chooses on these subjects? If Ontario went into the Union she could make her divorce laws lax or strict. Nova Scotia and New Brunswick have already got Divorce Courts; and in Quebec the marriage by a Protestant of a Protestant to a Roman Catholic is readily dissolved by the courts. The Republic has bad laws—so have we! In one section of our Dominion a church can change municipal boundaries, can collect tithes, can levy assessments for the building of churches! and all by the laws of the land!

4. Socialism, anarchism, and the like, threaten us in case of Annexation, says Mr. McInnes. But are these dangers confined to the American Republic? I trow not. If we would escape them we must needs go out of the world in this Nineteenth Century. Mr. McInnes might as well try to frighten us by threats of earthquakes like they have in South Carolina, or of the blizzards of Dakota and Colorado.

5. Anglophobia is unpleasant. But who have the disease in the most aggravated forms? Are they not those who have left the Emerald Isle within the last forty years? And have we not thousands and tens of thousands of such among us? And have we not besides a *Parti National* that deems everything that is English as alien?

6. Mr. McInnes says, that annexation would make too large a country; that in such a great territory the disinterestedness and even opposition between its parts would threaten the unity of the whole; that expansiveness has always been the greatest foe to large empires. I ask, what, then, are Canadians to do? Stay as we are? Our present Dominion is nearly as large as Europe; we are part of an Empire which contains nearly nine millions of square miles, while the Republic and Dominion united would only be seven and a quarter millions? Is there not disinterestedness and opposition enough now between the different parts of the Dominion—of the Empire?

As to the seventh reason, are there no spots in our constitutional sun? Are all our birds swans, all the American, geese? Might we not, with our superior wisdom and knowledge, help the Republic to amend its constitution? There have been amendments made in the past, why may not the future bring forth some good fruit?

There may be reasons, and good reasons against the Dominion entering into the bonds of matrimony with the Republic; but assuredly Mr. McInnes has not yet mentioned them. In conclusion, he tells us that "Continental Free Trade and undisturbed peace are almost certain to exist between Canada and the United States without annexation." I say, when will this millennium dawn? Is the light of the glorious day glimmering now in the East, where Canadian gun-boats warn off American fishermen; or in the West, where American gun-boats capture Canadian fishing smacks; or is it seen to the South, between the long row of custom houses which defend the boundary line from ocean to ocean.

R,