

doctrinal grounds, to apply for the privilege of sectarian separate or denominational schools? And in the event of either being refused by the Local Legislature, are they not equally entitled to the remedial legislation of the Dominion Government? But should similar application be made by the whole, to the manifest destruction of the educational interests of the province, would Sir Tupper and company be likely to accede to their requests by granting to them each and all, remedial legislation, and at the demand, in this case, of the majority of the people? They would not. On the ground of its militating against the general educational interests of the country, they would refuse it, saying, and saying truly, that such a concession made to meet the denominationally claimed interests of each, would tend to the utter destruction of the educational system of the country and be ruinous, both as to enormity of expense and to the general educational interests of the people as a whole. But this concession that they would thus refuse to each and all, in view of its general educational tendency, they grant to one denomination! and this to an apostate churchly firebrand whose distinctive watchword from centre to circumference, from popish throne to monastic cell is, "Live, but do not let live!" (By international law no such organization, not to call it a "religion," should be permitted to exist upon the earth). But is that fair? Is that granting equal rights to all? If Government support given to the whole would be bad as to its educational tendency, is it not identically the same in its tendency, although limited, when given to one section of the community? It might perhaps be well for the denominations in Manitoba to push the battle to the gate in this way, get up a "grievance," and stand out like the Romanists, for their alleged "rights" in this matter of sectarian education. Also in Ontario, where the "constitutional" services of Mr. Mowat would be again required in the interests of the Roman as against the other churches. Truly our nominally 'Protestant' political leaders are good Roman Catholic supporters. And they have their reward in this world, no doubt, with the prospect of a counter reward, for their criminal, unchristian cupidity, in the next. So far at least as based on his championship of the so called "rights" of Catholic minorities, I do not enter into the spirit of enthusiasm that Sir Oliver's proposed advent to the Federal Parliament seems to inspire. Mr. Mowat is said to have a "clean parliamentary record," but no man, I venture to affirm, has a clean record who has been engaged in the discreditable, not to say dirty work of extending separate school "rights," so called, to professional murderers by the authority of church canon and creed. Mr. Mowat is an honest man, no doubt, but honesty may be deceived, and upright intention may be bleared and blinded. Honesty is not infallibility, nor is apparent honesty of procedure always exempt from the prejudice that personal interests, political and otherwise, so frequently inspire.

We learn from the Globe that Sir Oliver is a "constitutional man," and therefore thinks it his duty to invariably adhere to and enforce the provisions of the constitution. Well, were I in his place, being opposed, as he was to the Confederate constitution when first framed, as embodying the system of Separate Schools, I should think it my duty to continue opposing the system in at