



"AD MAJOREM DEI GLORIAM."

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

VOL. XII, No. 46.

ST. BONIFACE, MANITOBA, TUESDAY, JUNE 1, 1897.

{ \$2.00 per year.
{ Single Copies, 5 cents.

Hon. Senator Bernier's GREAT SPEECH

as reported in THE SENATE DEBATES
(Continued.)

In the second place, the people is not the tribunal to which such questions are to be referred. It was never contemplated by the framers of the constitution that such questions should be at the mercy of prejudices, of partisanship, or of a misled public opinion. These matters were wisely committed to a calmer tribunal. It was referred to the Governor General in Council, whose decision must be executed by parliament. See subsection 2 and 3 of section 22, Manitoba Act. What would be the result if the electorate was to decide as to such fundamental questions? The result would be that under certain circumstances, the constitution would be torn to pieces, the people would in fact reject the constitution that has been given us by the Imperial parliament, and frame one of its own against the authority and the dignity of the Crown. Substantially and practically the school legislation of 1890, and the stand subsequently taken by the local government, are the striking out of the limitations imposed upon them in relation to education; it is an encroachment upon the rights of others, it is really an amendment to the constitution, an amendment to an Imperial Act. Provincial legislatures and this parliament have not the right of so amending the constitution, and in assuming such right, they practically declare that they do not want to be bound by the authority of the Imperial parliament, that they do not want to receive their constitution from England, but that they want to be free from such fetters. What is this if not disloyalty in disguise?

We must be reminded that England can make such alterations to its constitution as she may choose through parliament, because she is an independent power; but a colony, whose parliament, and still more the local legislatures, have but a delegated power, cannot constitutionally evolve in the same way. They must obey in every particular the constitution that they have received from the Imperial parliament, or else they put themselves in antagonism with the metropolitan power. That would be in the end the result of the interference of the electorate in such matters, that is, the substitution of another constitution of their own make for the constitution that we have received from England. The rights of the minority exist by virtue of the constitution independently of the views of the electorate, and as it has been said with so much force, so justly and so generously by the leader of the opposition in this House, were the whole of the country to cast their votes against us, that would not change in the least our claims before the Dominion. Right is right, and none but the Imperial parliament can, in our case, impair that right. And it is well to call to mind here that whatever may be our respective views as to the merit or demerit of the denominational school system, the question is not here whether, as a matter of expediency, we must adhere to it or not, but whether the constitution is to be maintained or not.

We have heard a good deal

about the advisability of making a trial of the present settlement. In fact, it seems to be almost the only argument now offered by this government in its favour. In response to such an invitation we must say at the outset, that no trial can be made of a negative enactment. We consider that this settlement does not improve our position, very far from it. It is the re-enactment of the law of 1890, in different words. Under certain circumstances, a trial may be given to something having an existence, but no trial can be given to an imaginary situation.

In the next place, to make a trial of the so-called settlement would be an expression of belief in it. To believe in it would mean an adherence to it, and to adhere to it would be a consent on our part to all the principles it involves, and an abandonment of all the rights it rejects. Our adherence to that settlement, even for the sake of a trial, would be an admission on our part that from the beginning we have not been sincere in our fight.

It would be an admission that such an important question can be settled without our consent, and against our wishes; that we must have in fact no voice in the matter.

It would be an admission that our rights and privileges can be encroached upon at the will and pleasure of a majority whose hostility is so manifest.

It would be an admission that the constitution can be abused, and that the parties thus abusing the constitution cannot be checked by the proper authorities.

It would be an admission of the unconstitutional doctrine that the federal authorities must not interfere to protect the minorities in matters of education, a doctrine which Mr. Cameron has set forth in the local house as arising precisely out of the negotiations held between the two governments, and of the result of these negotiations. Here are his words:

A matter of very considerable importance was they had preserved the principle of provincial autonomy in matters of education * * * The principle of federal interference in our provincial education is forever abandoned; it can never again happen that any political party will endeavour to force on the province educational legislation which it does not want.

This doctrine is unsound, unconstitutional, and opens the door to all sorts of injustice, leaving to those whose rights might be injured, no possibility of redress. Our adherence to that settlement would be an admission that the youth should be educated in unchristian schools. That would be a moral sacrifice that we have not the right to make.

It would be a withdrawal from the position we hold now. We have made an appeal; we have succeeded in getting a judgment from the Privy Council which says that our appeal is well founded; we have succeeded in getting a remedial order from the Governor General in Council which upholds our rights; the matter has been brought up to that point where the jurisdiction of this parliament cannot be questioned. All this would be lost to us. Our consent to make a trial of the settlement would carry us back to the position we were in at the commencement of all these

contentions. We would lose the benefit of our past struggles and sacrifices, we would lose the legal position we are holding at present. These are some of the consequences that would ensue from our consent to give a trial to that settlement.

There are some others. It would more specially cut the ground from under our feet in view of any other course that we might think proper to adopt at some future time; it would shut the door to our appeal to some as yet untried jurisdiction. It would do so even if we were to give that trial under protest. To recede from an unassailable position in such matters is always an error, and a cause of future weakness. Now that the battle is fairly engaged, it is better for all parties that it should go on; we intend to make our way onward, and let no fetters such as that settlement impair our energy. We will not give our hands to a settlement which is nothing but a complete, lamentable and disgraceful surrender. We will not consent to the substitution of mere tolerance for right. The responsibility which rests upon our shoulders, does not allow us to do so.

It is all very well to talk of Mr. Greenway's good dispositions. Mr. Greenway made pledges to us in former days, pledges of the most solemn and important character in connection with these matters. He has violated all his pledges. He has no more right to our confidence, and nobody has a right to ask the minority to place itself at the mercy of the present government of Manitoba. We will treat you with justice say they to us. Before confiding ourselves to that promise, we must ascertain what the word "Justice" means in their mind and in their heart. "Justice" for them is that they have right a to dispossess the Catholic population of Manitoba of their well-earned properties and of their vested rights, that we should have no objection to let our children be educated outside the pale of our Catholic belief; that they have a right to ignore all the advantages conferred upon us by the constitution. That is what they contended during the last seven years; that is what they proclaim still to be justice. In that kind of justice we do not believe.

But let us suppose that the present government, harassed by the past seven years of agitation, would in fact carry on this agreement in a liberal and generous way, we cannot foretell what a subsequent administration would do; or, rather we can do it. It is as clear as daylight that at a not very distant day a new agitation would make it hot for us anew. It would be argued with great force that, after all, that half hour of religious instruction does not amount to much, that it would be just as well to do away with it, and have purely and simply secular or neutral school all over the province. We would try to have our voice heard again, but in vain. Again that appeal to peace and harmony, which is made to us to-day, would resound all through the land. We would be told that since, in 1897, we were willing to forfeit much more important rights, we should again give way and let the last vestige of such privileges vanish entirely.

In dealing with that question one cannot refrain from taking a view of the progressive move-

ment of public opinion and of the weariness by which the latter is finally overcome. In such crises public opinion generally gets accustomed to the existing situation. It becomes impossible to move it up once it has gone down. Weariness sets in, there is a want of adequate energy to get back to an old situation, even if it is admittedly better than the existing one. That is what would take place in Manitoba before long, the Catholic minority would be sacrificed, and the remainder of its rights buried for ever. This disposes of the suggestion sometimes made that with time we might improve the settlement itself. This disposes also of the argument that this settlement is only an instalment on what we have a right to get. Mr. Cameron, the Attorney General for Manitoba, has conclusively set this matter clearly before the provincial legislature. He said in explanation of section 7 of the settlement;

That rejects the system of separate schools, and shows that the intention of the settlement is to discard it for ever.

Surely, that is clear enough. We have nothing more to expect in the future, and we have everything to apprehend.

To be continued.

BRIEFLETS.

The congregation of the Oblates of Mary Immaculate mourns the loss of one of its most distinguished members, the Reverend Father L. J. Delpeuch, who died lately in Paris. He was a brilliant orator and one of the most devoted chaplains of the celebrated basilica of the Sacred Heart at Montmartre.

A few weeks ago in the chapel of Kilruane, Ireland, Sir Mark Anthony Henry Tuite, Bart. of Kilruane House, County Tipperary, was publicly received into the Church by the Reverend John Scanlon, P.P., Cloughjordan. Sir Mark had a very distinguished military career, but since his retirement from the army, has given himself entirely to scientific pursuits. It may be interesting to know that Sir Mark's nephew, Count Salamis, is now serving as Colonel of Engineers in the Greek army at the seat of war. The Tuites came to Ireland with the Earl of Pembroke, in 1172, and the baronetcy dates back to the year 1622.

All Good Protestants.

For some weeks past a correspondence has been going on in one of the English Catholic papers on the subject of the belief of Protestant Anglicans regarding the Holy Eucharist. The Duke of Newcastle, the Rev. J. R. Lunn and the Rev. R. C. Fillingham, the two last-named being Anglican ministers, have been the chief contributors to the correspondence. The Duke of Newcastle declares that

"thousands of Anglicans worship Our Blessed Lord in His Holy Sacrament. In a great number of churches the Holy Eucharist is made the central figure of worship, and is adored by devout congregations."

The Rev. Mr. Fillingham declares that there is "no such thing as a sacrificing priesthood", while the Rev. Dr. Lunn declares that there is a sacrificing priesthood, and that there are altars in the Church of England. Mr.

Fillingham proceeds to reveal in the fact that he differs from his brother clergyman, and remains a good Protestant. He says the fact is that all kinds of different doctrines have been tolerated in the Church of England.

"We have no living voice. We are not members of a teaching church (ecclesia docens) like the Church of Rome. We are left to believe what we like."

But to this the Rev. Dr. Lunn retorts that are not left to believe what they like, and he points out that there have been such things in the Church of England as persecutions of ministers for believing what they liked.

So here we have two ministering Protestant clergymen, both supposed to be teaching Christ's truth: the one teaching the direct opposite from the other. — Truth is one. Clearly Protestantism is not one. — Preston "Catholic News."

A SWIFT SAVING SACRAMENT.

Patrick Flanagan, a ticket-seller on the elevated road in this city was struck by an engine on the 3rd inst. and pinned to the track. All efforts to dislodge him were fruitless. Although Flanagan was horribly crushed he was still conscious and almost his first words were a request for a priest. A boy was dispatched to the Church of Our Lady of Good Counsel in East Ninetieth street, and Father Cooney came back with him. The priest went down to the tracks, and crawling under the engine, he spoke to the dying man. "Are you a priest?" asked Flanagan. "I am," replied Father Cooney, but Flanagan was unable to say any more. The last rites of the Church were administered, and the priest withdrew. A few minutes later the unfortunate man died. — New York Catholic Review.

CAUSES OF STRIKES.

Preston "Catholic News."

Some of the Trade Unions seem to be doing their best to make themselves ridiculous. In one case, joiners struck because certain work was given to carpenters! Both bodies are trades unionists. In another big strike, it was a struggle between plumbers and engineers, as to which body should get certain work! In yet another case two unions quarreled over a similar point, and as a result, a strike!

A new strike has been threatened in a Lancashire mill because the employers would not dismiss a man who refused to pay the "levy" of his union.

Out of 11,000,000 of so workers in Great Britain, only about 1½ millions are trade unionists. All the others are in no unions. Yet some people seem to think that nobody ought to get work or be employed at all, if he or she is not in a union!

Freedom and fairplay demand that a man shall be at liberty to do as he thinks best in such matters, and when unions take to fighting each other and striking against each other, we can easily see there are two sides to the union question. We think it fair to employ both unionists and non-unionists, and pay them alike — at least until all workers join unions, which they have a perfect right to do.