

pox, to the vaccination of their families as they are to their education. The state in time of epidemic may rightly dismiss the schools, and prevent people from meeting for public worship, if the public health would thereby be endangered. Every one knows the great powers of expropriation vested in the state by which the rights of the individual may be trespassed upon, although in every rightly constituted state the individual is entitled to compensation. It is surely useless to show further how Mr. Ewart's doctrine of "perfect liberty," unwarily advanced by him, would render the existence of the state impossible.

2. The writer further contends that *the state, being founded on justice, may not give special privileges to any class of its subjects.*

Lieber says: "Everything in the state must be founded on justice, and justice rests on generality and equality. The state therefore has no right to promote the private interests of one and not of the other." This is a generally admitted principle. What does Mr. Ewart propose? He proposes that the people of Manitoba should have their public schools, and that one denomination should be singled out and be allowed to teach their "ism" in certain schools to be controlled by them. He was most strenuous, when pleading the Roman Catholic position before the courts, in insisting that Episcopalians and Presbyterians had no rights in the same way. Though they had schools in the Red River settlement, yet Mr. Ewart contended that their sectarian wishes might be disregarded and that they had no rights except as bulked together with half a dozen other sects as "Protestants." Is that justice?

Further, the state has now said there shall be public schools for all classes of the people in Manitoba. Its exact words are: "The public schools shall be entirely non-sectarian." No one maintains that the ordinary subjects

of education are not within the scope of the action of the state. They are subjects taught by the Roman Catholics everywhere, as well as by others. Nobody proposes that the Roman Catholics shall "have their children taught some ism that they abhor." Since the Roman Catholic people are, "all, but a very small percentage, in localities almost entirely French," they have local control of their schools. Is there the slightest ground for Mr. Ewart's unwarrantable statement that, acting from intolerance, "Manitoba has consciously or unconsciously in view the hindrance of the teaching of the Catholic religion, as something depraved?" Manitoba has simply declared, as the Privy Council has decided she had a right to do, that the public schools shall be non-sectarian; and the Manitoba educational authorities are doing their best justly and temperately to carry out the law.

But the mild, gentle-faced tolerance, that Mr. Ewart so adroitly pleads for, is not the reality for which he is arguing. He knows perfectly well that the school which he regards as the creation of so many parents wishing their "ism" taught "so long as they can agree about it," is not the reality. Mr. Ewart's theoretical school involves an element just as objectionable to the Roman Catholic Church, as the public schools contain. The Roman Catholic objection to the public schools is that they are not under the control of the Church. It is the question of authority that is at issue. See how ruthlessly the bishops in Quebec crushed out the aspirations of Mr. Masson and his associates! Read the assertion of the position of the Church in the pastoral of the Roman Catholic bishops of the United States, and see its arrogant claim of control. To have recognition by the state of the teachers which its religious orders provide and to decide what text-books shall be used in the schools are most strenuously insisted on. Under the late separate school law in Manitoba no