

Northwest Review.

"AD MAJOREM DEI GLORIAM."

THE ONLY CATHOLIC PAPER PUBLISHED IN ENGLISH IN NORTH-WESTERN CANADA.

VOL. XI, No. 50.

WINNIPEG, MANITOBA, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 17, 1896.

\$ 2.00 per Year.
Single Copies 5 cents.

THE CANADIAN BISHOPS AND THE EDUCATION CRISIS.

From The Tablet.

It is owing to something more than a purely fortuitous coincidence that the same question is simultaneously agitating the British Islands and the Dominion of Canada, with a like result of shifting the political landmarks, and substituting fresh frontiers for the old lines of party demarcation. Liberalism moves everywhere towards the same goal, guided, whether consciously or unconsciously, by those who adopt its livery at any particular moment, towards the ideal prefixed for it by the leaders and creators of the Continental revolution. That ideal is the control of the human conscience by the manipulation of human power in the interests of secular or irreligious education, since the two things, though separable as phrases, are shown in practice to be identical. To assert that in the training of the young there can be neutrality as regards the principal subject of human thought, is one of the modern sophisms used to confuse the issue by the adoption of a misleading catchword. That the bulk of the London School Board teachers are unfortunately practically infidels, was sufficiently shown by the indignant protest of the great majority when asked last summer to impart to the children under their charge, in conformity with the requirements of the existing law, some instruction in the fundamental truths of religion. The prevalence of such opinions among them illustrates the spirit in which the Education Act is administered, since it shows that the negation of Christianity must be regarded as a qualification for the position assigned to them. While in all other subjects of the state curriculum some test of competency is imposed, in religion alone is it regarded as tyrannical to demand any proof of the adequacy of the teaching. Yet it is to a system thus perverted to the wholesale inculcation of atheism that many nominally Christian parents are content to entrust the education of their children, while the whole Liberal party in England is committed to its maintenance in the name of freedom and progress.

Here then, in this country, as in Canada, comes the crux of religion and politics effacing the old party distinctions, by the introduction of a new and broader ground of difference, going to the roots of all convictions and beliefs. And as the Irish Catholics have shown that they hold their allegiance to their Church on this question higher than fidelity to their party, we may hope that the Catholics of Canada will in the coming struggle, display an equal loyalty to their hereditary faith. For in the Dominion, too, they have, in Ontario, been Liberals, and must here, too, sacrifice the old ties of habit and expediency to the higher loyalty of conscience. The occasion is one of supreme importance to the future of this country and their religion, since it is a clear case of the illegal oppression of their co-religionists by a tyrannical local minority. For religious minorities in Canada, unlike those similarly situated in this country, have their right to denominational education safeguarded by the constitution itself, expressly framed to meet the contingency which has now arisen. While this right has been scrupulously respected in the Catholic Province of Quebec in regard to the Protestant minority, it has been ruthlessly trampled on in Manitoba, where the preponderance of numbers is the other way. As our readers know, all attempts to induce the Provincial Legislature to redress the acknowledged wrong having been contumaciously resisted, the Dominion Government introduced a bill into the Federal Parliament to override the illegal contravention of the Constitution, and restore the rights of Catholics as guaranteed to them under the solemn and binding Act of Federation. That Bill, introduced by a Conservative and Protestant Government, and opposed by the leaders and bulk of the French-Canadian Liberal party, as a contravention of provincial rights, to which they are committed, was eventually lost, after having passed the second reading, by the obstructive tactics of the Opposition, during the last days of an expiring parliament. The dissolution which followed has brought the country face to face with the prob-

lem, and the general elections which will take place at the end of June, will be decisive on this momentous question. The issue between secular and religious education is complicated by that of Federal versus Provincial right, while the tariff question also divides the parties, the Liberals being, as their name implies, in favor of free trade, and their rivals, of protection. The result will depend on the proportions in which the electors on both sides transfer their votes to their former opponents, in obedience to the new considerations involved. The Catholic support gained by Sir Charles Tupper in Quebec and other districts where the French Canadians are numerous, may be counteracted by the withdrawal from him of an equal or larger number of voters in Ontario and throughout the West generally, where the Orange or ultra-Protestant element is in the ascendant. All the machinery of bigotry and intolerance will be set in motion to defeat and discredit the Government, and the Great Dominion will be torn from the Atlantic to the Pacific by the religious dissensions which the New World has inherited from the Old. The old boundary posts are swept away, and in the new situation created no one can tell to what extent personal prejudice or conviction will prevail over party discipline or opportunism. The position taken up by M. Laurier, the leader of the French Canadians, is, from a Catholic point of view, indefensible, since he maintains his right to exercise private judgment on a question in which the interests of religion are directly involved. He has, therefore, elected to go to the country as the opponent of the Bill for the relief of the Catholics of Manitoba, on the ground of its being an infringement of his view of Provincial rights, a fetish which he thus sets up above the obligations of good faith, of public law, and of the Constitution to the observance of which the recalcitrant province is solemnly pledged.

The Catholic Bishops, on the other hand, have entered the arena in defence of the principles of religious education, so flagrantly violated in the case of their co-religionists in Manitoba. Their views have found voice in a striking sermon in which Mgr. Lafleche, Bishop of Three Rivers, condemned Mr. Laurier's speech in moving the rejection of the Remedial Bill, as the utterance of a rationalistic Liberal, formulating a doctrine entirely opposed to the teaching of the Catholic Church, viz., that a Catholic is in his public life set free from the obligations of religion. He quoted with equal reprobation, the declaration of another French Canadian candidate, who, while acknowledging that Mgr. Langevin, Archbishop of St. Boniface, had a right to deal with the Remedial Bill from a religious point of view, repudiated his title to dictate its treatment from a national, constitutional, or political standpoint. This dictum the Bishop condemned as pure Liberalism, denouncing the principles professed by both these gentlemen as diametrically opposed to Catholic teaching, and declaring that on his fulfilment of the duty of warning them of their error, depended the salvation of his own soul, and of all those committed to his charge. Referring to the assassination of President Carnot, as a striking example of the results of modern education, he went on to instruct his hearers and all the Catholics of his diocese to lay aside party feelings, and give their votes only to candidates pledged to support the Remedial Bill accepted by the Bishops. This address which cannot fail to exercise considerable influence on the result of the elections, has caused a great sensation throughout Canada, and has evoked a storm of angry feeling in the Liberal camp. The organs of the party in their comments on the challenge of the Bishop of Three Rivers, ring the changes on the old shibboleths of spiritual dictation and the separation of politics from the sphere of religion. Their diatribes will have little effect on the minds of the mass of French Canadians, who will on this occasion, we are confident, show themselves Catholics first, and political partisans only in a second and subsidiary sense. They cannot hesitate in a case involving the subjection of their race-fellows and co-religionists to the most odious of all tyrannies, that invades the sphere of conscience and violates the sanctities of religious conviction. The settlement of

the question by a decisive majority is the more desirable as behind the electoral and parliamentary campaign, forming the present phase of the crisis, looms the still more serious constitutional conflict between the contumacious Legislature of Manitoba and the authority of the Federal Government. Manitoban intolerance may indeed prove to have been the evil genius of the Dominion, in raising a question thus fraught with possibilities of disruption. Should the local majority, after the adoption of the Remedial Bill by the new Parliament, still refuse to give its provisions effect, the strain on the relations between the province and the Federation will have reached the breaking point. There would remain for the central authority only the choice between the extreme measure of armed intervention, and tame confession of its own impotence in presence of an act of overt rebellion against its decree. Already the French Canadians are asking to what a constitution serves whose provisions cannot be enforced, and the secession of Quebec is discussed among the possibilities of the future. It is obvious that if the Dominion have no power to compel compliance with the act by which it is constituted as such, it ceases to have any real existence, and survives in name and on sufferance alone. There is, however, good ground for hoping that if the Canadian Catholics do their duty and secure a decisive preponderance in the present juncture, they will not only redress the wrongs of their co-religionists, but lay the sceptre of disintegration by showing that might as well as right is on their side.

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editor of the Tribune.

Sir,—We have seen in a recent issue of the Tribune, a letter signed by one James Stewart, of Prince Albert, in reference to the Separate School Question in Manitoba. He predicts that some trouble of a similar character may soon arise in the Territories and he indulges in a lot of the old abuse of "Rome" and the "hierarchy," etc. With so much of his letter we do not propose to deal. Mr. Stewart is entitled to his opinions and it matters very little anyway what they may be—but he has made reference to an application of some of the supporters of the separate school here asking to be changed to supporters of the public school. He has made, in this connection, several statements which are not true, and these we desire to point out.

We are the persons who applied to be so changed and may be supposed to know quite as much of the facts as Mr. Stewart. He says, in describing the system of Separate schools in the Northwest Territories, that "they are controlled by the Roman Catholic clergy." That is not so. By our school law, the minority, whether Catholic or Protestant, may establish separate schools and the law is precisely the same whatever the religion of the minority may be, e. g., at Duck Lake, the separate school is Protestant.

The same law applies to separate schools as to public schools—trustees elected in the same way—inspected by same government inspectors—teachers must have certificates and separate school teachers must pass the same examinations as public school teachers, and the teachers are chosen and hired by the trustees in all cases.

The clergy have no control over either public or separate schools except so far as their advice may be considered by the trustees.

His next statement is that these schools are "conducted chiefly by nuns and others who have no qualification recognized by the board of instruction." This is not true—every teacher must have a certificate—the nuns who teach here must have certificates of first and second class.

He next says that "they receive their appointment from the bishop or priests." That this statement is incorrect is obvious from what we have already said.

He then says "the whole trouble seems to be that the Roman Catholic bishop insists upon running the separate schools according to his own sweet will, having an eye to the handling of the funds and letting education look out for itself." This contains a shameful untruth.

It was never suggested by those appealing that the bishop interfered or thought of interfering with the funds. Under the law he could not if he wished, any more than the clergymen of Mr. Stewart's church could with the public school funds. The bishop was in favor of having the nuns retained as teachers; some of us thought that a male teacher would be the better, especially for the larger boys, and we are still of that opinion.

Now, why does Mr. Stewart interfere with what does not concern him? No one asks him to send his children to the nuns or to contribute to the separate schools; we have not asked him to champion us, we can take care of ourselves.

Hitches will take place in all schools; there have been troubles in the public schools here, followed by the discharge of two or three teachers yet no Catholics write to the papers about it—it was none of our business.

We trust that you will give this letter an insertion so that errors may not go uncontradicted.

As to Mr. Stewart's philosophical opinions we have nothing to say.

Yours respectfully,

(Signed.) C. DE LAGORGENDIERE.

H. LACROIX,

LOUIS VALADE,

ODILON ST. DENIS,

G. W. LACROIX.

Prince Albert, N. W. T., June 10, '96.

MR. J. S. EWART AND REV. JOSEPH HOGG.

The following letter was handed to the Free Press for publication simultaneously with the same letter sent to the Tribune. The Free Press did not insert it, upon the ground that it was a communication in another paper. But as the Tribune seems to have declined it, we give it publicity, in fairness to Mr. Ewart.—Editor Free Press.

To the Editor of the Free Press.

Sir,—Rev. Joseph Hogg has done well to allow more than two weeks to elapse since my criticism of his "Vote for Jesus" and Joe Martin sermon, and to make his reply in the columns of a newspaper in which the criticism did not appear. He has thus gained the immense advantage of speaking to persons who either never read, my letter, or who have probably forgotten the point taken in it.

In his sermon Mr. Hogg made certain statements as to the school law of Quebec, and added: "Let the Roman Catholic minority be treated in Manitoba as the Protestant minority are treated in Quebec, and even every true Orangeman in the province would espouse their cause."

In answer, I appended to each of his three statements of the Quebec law the phrase, "That is not true." I then, in nine paragraphs, summarized the Quebec law, giving the numbers of the sections of the code, to assist confirmation; and I offer on behalf of the minority in Manitoba, to accept less than the minority in Quebec enjoyed.

After two weeks Mr. Hogg replies. He does not attempt to support a single one of his statements—not one; and he does not attempt to deny a single one of mine. He says nothing about any of them. That is the advantage gained by delay.

But he has to say something, so he changes the issue, and makes further assertions as to the Quebec school law.

He says, first: "In the case of industries whose stockholders are Protestants, and this is said to be the case with nine-tenths of the industries of Montreal, the taxes are not divided between Protestants and Catholics, but go wholly to the support of Roman Catholic schools." Once more, I reply, That is not true. Such taxes are divided "in the same proportion as the government grant for the same year is divided." See the Code, Sec. 2143.

He says, secondly: "Why should the bishop alone have the power without consulting other denominations, to rearrange the boundaries of the parish, so that one in which there was enough to support a dissentient school, may be so divided that such a school cannot be maintained, according to law, and the Protestants are obliged to support the

public schools in reality the Roman Catholic schools." Again, I say, that is not true. The lieutenant-governor-in-council alone has the power to "alter the limits of existing municipalities, or erect new ones." See the code, section 1973. Further, there are provisions by which the dissentients in two adjoining municipalities may unite (1989, 1990, 2083, 2085), and by which a dissentient in one municipality may subscribe to a school in a neighboring municipality (1993, 1995).

He says, thirdly: "Surely those cannot mean what they say, who affirm that the minority in Manitoba would be perfectly satisfied with the educational privileges that the Protestant minority have accorded to them in Quebec." Can the force of contradiction go further. Mr. Hogg does pretty well when he asserts the law to be that which the statutes say it is not (that may be a foolish oversight, and I am glad to believe that it is) but when he takes to affirm that the Catholics will not accept that which they unconditionally assert they will accept, he utters mere foolishness without the oversight.

To my charge that Mr. Hogg objected to the appropriation of any public money to sectarian purposes, and yet raised no objection to the Presbyterian church getting thousands of dollars annually, he replies that I do not seem to have read what "the Tribune reported me as saying further, viz., that public funds should not be given to one denomination, when the same could not be extended to all denominations." I read in the Tribune the following: "See to it as God will enlighten you, that the money of the province is never appropriated to sectarian purposes"; and I said that the Presbyterian church took thousands of dollars annually (\$15,000 for one school alone), to help it to instruct Indian children, not only in secular subjects, but in Presbyterian dogma! Mr. Hogg now defends this. He says:

1. "The government employs these denominations to carry on the schools which it is bound by treaty to provide for the Indian children." That is not true. There is no such treaty.

2. Again, he says: "The work of carrying on those schools as undertaken by the government was a comparative failure," and so the Presbyterians were asked to conduct them. In Manitoba denominational schools are an abomination—inefficient, extravagant, tending to division and disintegration, and so on; but a little further west, what an untold blessing? East of the boundary, let the government abolish the Catholic schools, and itself control education; but west of it cannot we see the Protestant schools are the only thing possible—that government there is a mere stupidity? Surely "none but the wilfully blind can fail to see the vast difference," as Mr. Hogg says, between such cases!

Now, Mr. Hogg, we may, and we do, differ as to the school question. Do we differ, also, as to the moral duty of a man who has publicly misstated many facts relating to it, to acknowledge his error, and to make such redress as he can? In my former letter I asked you to state that your assertions as to the school law were entirely wrong—that you had "utterly misled your congregation." A city newspaper urged you in the same direction. You take no notice of these appeals, although your silence as to every one of such assertions shows that you are convinced that you had fallen into mistake. You have now added two further statements, and can easily satisfy yourself, with the help I have given you, that these are also untrue. Give us an example, may I not ask you, of the way a Christian minister ought to act under such circumstances. Do not be more ashamed to "vote for Jesus," than for Joe Martin!

JOHN S. EWART.

—Free Press, June 11.

A Chance to Make Money.

I have berries, grapes and peaches, a year old, fresh as when picked. I use the California Cold process, do not heat or seal the fruit, just put it up cold, keeps perfectly fresh and costs almost nothing; can put up a bushel in ten minutes. Last week I sold directions to over 120 families; any one will pay a dollar for directions, when they see the beautiful samples of fruit. As there are many people poor like myself, I consider it my duty to give my experience to such, and feel confident any one can make one or two hundred dollars round home in a few days. I will mail sample of fruit and complete directions, to any of your readers, for eight-cent two-cent stamps, which is only the actual cost of the samples, postage, etc., to me.

FRANCIS CASEY, St. Louis, Mo.

Senate Reading Room Jan 7