

tion which Manitoba has enacted which would compel the Canadian parliament, from considerations of justice and of sound policy, to annul that legislation and deprive the province of the power to legislate on the subject of education.

As for the people of Manitoba, they have made up their minds. They recognize the factors in the situation which operate as a menace to their constitutional rights. But they will not compromise. This, not because of any bitterness or obstinacy, but simply because there is nothing to compromise. If the fundamental doctrines, religious and political, on which the Roman Catholic claims are based, are sound, then the Roman Catholics are entitled to all they ask, and Manitoba does not desire to withhold any portion of it. But if these claims are not well grounded, then the Roman Catholics have already all that they are entitled to, that is, all the rights and privileges enjoyed by an other sections of the community. The people of Manitoba are in thorough agreement with His Grace of St. Boniface as to the impossibility of compromise. They have listened with patience and with very little in the way of retort, to the frequent and occasionally violently expressed charges of bigotry, fanaticism and intolerance. Their resentment at the entire groundlessness of these charges, and at the distortion and misrepresentation with which they have been usually accompanied, has been tempered very largely by amusement, when they contemplated the source of these charges, and considered the incongruity involved in the emanation of such charges from such a source. There is in Manitoba but little of that rancour which is engendered by difference of religious views. There is probably no community anywhere to-day, in which sectarian animosity is so conspicuous by its absence. This question is not with the people of Manitoba, one of the relative superiority or inferiority, of the various forms of religious belief. It is a question of the soundness or unsoundness of the doctrine that the recognition by the state, of any denom-

inational dogmas is inconsistent with the principles on which our form of government rests. It is a question also of the admission of the principle that a legislature may be prohibited from repealing its own acts—a question obviously of the most far-reaching importance.

The people of Manitoba are not in this matter acting in any spirit of bravado. They are keenly alive to the fact that their interests are in the hands of the Canadian Parliament, and that the power of this parliament is great. But because they know that by reason of the greatness of that power, and of their own numerical weakness, they may be suppressed or coerced, it does not follow that they will recede from their position, in order that the coercion may be made less complete or less humiliating.

If, in face of all the facts which have been here presented and all the considerations which have been stated, the Dominion Parliament will deprive the province of Manitoba of constitutional autonomous rights, the crime against constitutional government must be consummated without either the complicity or consent of Manitoba. It will be no party to the outrage, even if its connivance should have the effect of making its punishment a little less severe.

But Manitoba is hopeful that, when the Dominion parliament is brought face to face with the grave responsibility of depriving the province of its constitutional powers, the sense of duty and patriotism of its members will enable them to rise superior to mere considerations of party, and to deal with this matter with the care and conscientiousness which the vital importance of the issues involved demands. The legislation of Manitoba should be left as it is, and the "anomalous" sub-sections 2 and 3 of section 22 of the Manitoba Act should be wiped off the statute book. All rights and privileges which any section of the community ought to possess, are fully guarded by the first sub-section, and they are fully respected in Manitoba's school legislation.