

EVENING: A CONTRAST.

PEACE.

Faint tinkling thro' the deep'ning dusk,
Soft bleatings from the folded lea,
Low lisplings by the Syren sea,
And fragrant whiffs of mint and musk.

A patch of crimson, sunset-left,
A thread of gold upon the rim,
The far horizon's distance dim,
Athwart the gloaming's warp and weft.

Gray shadows by the silent mill;
Cool fingers on the rushes' strings,
The daylight droops her wearied wings,
And all the world is dark and still.

STORM.

Ver'd waves that dash white thunder down
Upon a wreck-strawn, echoing beach;
Wild breakers hoarse, that rudely reach
To where the rough rocks beetling frown.

Tempestuous waves that fiercely tear
Loose shreds from ragged, tortured crests;
A thousand harried, heaving breasts
To mist and murk and midnight bare.

A driving hull—a flash—a boom,
Weird voicings neath the sullen sky;
A lightning-gleam—the petrels fly
Alone athwart the spectral gloom.

A. H. MORRISON.

MR. ROYAL'S PAMPHLET.—II.

VII.

We come at last to the subject that was the determining cause of the appearance of this pamphlet, namely the educational question. The long dissertation on the principles of justice, and the right of the minority to determine for themselves the question of whether religious instruction shall be given in schools supported by taxes, calls only for this observation. The great mass of the Protestant people do not recognize that it is just that money levied by the state should be employed in contributing to religious teaching, although they recognize that it is the duty of the state to furnish common school education. While, therefore, they will do nothing to prevent the teaching of religious doctrines to children or adults, they will not consent, where they are not obliged to, that this should be done with funds levied by the state. On the question of conscience, whether a Roman Catholic can permit his children to attend non-sectarian schools, it is too late to urge that pretension now. We have seen that the Pope, through Cardinal Gibbons, has given full liberty to Roman Catholic parents to send their children to public non-sectarian schools in the United States. What is right for Roman Catholics in the United States cannot be wrong for Roman Catholics in Canada. We have the right to exact from our citizens the same degree of conformity to national institutions that the American people are allowed to exact from the American Roman Catholic citizen. A new pastoral to the Canadian churches does lay down a different doctrine, but with what right does the church pretend to enjoin upon Canadians what it does not require from Americans? Protestants can see in this nothing but an attempt to coerce the public men of this country into granting political privileges to the church in Canada to which a church has no just claims. This cannot be a spiritual doctrine, or it could not vary from country to country. It affords an illustration of the political complexion of the Roman Catholic system.

The separate school question, however, requires special examination on its own

merits. Here we have to make a historical retrospect. And the question arises, What has been the attitude of the Mother Country towards the Roman Catholic inhabitants? If it has been just, and even generous, how do we find her spirit of justice and generosity required in the teachings of the Roman Catholic schools in Quebec? What are the sentiments towards the Mother Country that have been instilled into the minds of the children who attend the denominational schools of Quebec?

The special privileges enjoyed by the people of Quebec are often spoken of as Treaty Rights. This is a misnomer. They are secured by no treaty, but are the effect of legislation and toleration alone. The only thing in the nature of treaty rights is the promise contained in the Treaty of 1763, by which His Britannic Majesty agreed to grant the liberty of the Catholic religion to the inhabitants of Canada, and to give effective orders that his new Roman Catholic subjects may profess the worship of their religion according to the rites of the Romish Church, so far as the laws of Great Britain permit. There is nothing here about laws, language, education, or collection of tithes, or church assessments. The above is the full extent of the obligation to which either France, as a party to the treaty, or to which international good faith, can bind the British Government.

But the Quebec Act of 1774 goes a little further, and may be regarded as a species of treaty, not with France, not of an international character, but as between the British Sovereign and his Lower Canadian subjects. Giving this its most formidable character, it may be regarded as the Magna Charta of the French Roman Catholics in Quebec. But even this act contains no mention of language or of education. It introduces the civil laws formerly recognized in Canada for the determination of matters of property and civil rights. It also authorizes the Roman Catholic clergy to receive and enjoy their accustomed dues and rights with respect to such persons only as profess that religion. These provisions are not to affect those parts of the country in which the lands are granted in free and common socage.

Here, then, we find a voluntary concession by the Metropolis in favour of the Roman Catholics. Did it represent the views of the English Protestant inhabitants of the country at that time? On the contrary, it was protested against very emphatically by them and by the Protestants of the other American colonies. This, however, is not a treaty obligation. It is an Act of Parliament, which could have been changed or repealed by Imperial Parliament without any breach of international good faith. But it never was changed. Under its operation was allowed to grow up the system of church privileges that now exists in the Province of Quebec.

Upon the drawing up of the Confederation Act, the subjects referred to came under the jurisdiction of the Provincial Legislature, and the laws on these subjects therefore can be altered by the Provincial Legislature of Quebec, so soon as the majority of its members decide. The rights conferred upon the church are not likely to be greatly increased, at all events to the prejudice of the English-speaking inhabitants, because any law having that object directly and avowedly in view would be subject to the veto power of the Parliament of Canada, which is hardly likely to suffer

serious encroachment by law upon the rights of Protestants. If such encroachments take place, it is either by custom, or by incidental provisions of laws having other objects in view.

Now what has been the sentiment of the Protestant population of Canada upon these subjects? If the views of the English majority in old Canada had prevailed, how long would the privileges of the Roman Catholic Church have been maintained? If the Provincial Parliament, before confederation, had had full control of matters relating to religion and education, how long would these conditions have remained unaltered? Just so long as the French Roman Catholic representation was equal, or approximately equal, to the Protestant, and no longer. These privileges, then, are enjoyed by the grace of the Mother Country, and under their influence the whole educational system of the Catholics in Quebec has come under the control of the Roman Catholic priests and the religious orders. What are the sentiments with which the minds of the children educated in these schools have become imbued? Is it gratitude towards the Mother Country? Is unconditional allegiance to the British Crown a striking characteristic of the Roman Catholic population of Quebec? Is it not true that the two classes into which the French Canadians are divided are particularly these: First, the class of which Mr. Royal is a fair representative, with whom allegiance to the Roman Catholic Church is paramount; the other the Rouge, or liberal element, whose tendencies we shall discuss later. The outspoken declaration of the first of these schools is that the people are willing to remain loyal to the British Crown so long, and in so far only, as it guarantees them the enjoyment of their church privileges. The moment the claim of the church is denied, do they not hasten to declare their readiness to cast off British allegiance? Was not the whole population of Quebec aroused with an anti-British agitation after the Riel execution? Does not Mr. Royal himself, the moment Manitoba wishes to rid itself of church schools, proclaim himself an advocate of independence? Mr. Martineau is ready to secede from confederation to form an independent republic of Quebec. There are notable exceptions among the well-educated and enlightened French Canadians, but with the common people the sentiment is not loyalty to Britain but loyalty to the church. And in these democratic days it is the sentiment of the common people, not the culture of the educated and enlightened, that determines movements of public policy. It is the Merciers not the Angers, that arouse popular enthusiasm. In the opinion of Protestants, there seems to be something in the Roman Catholic system that tends to prevent the development of an undivided, unequivocal, allegiance to the state. We do not refer in the slightest degree to spiritual matters. The right of Roman Catholics to profess all their religious doctrines should be unquestioned. They should be at perfect liberty to worship God as they see fit. Protestants have no political right to object to the mass, to prayers to the Virgin Mary or to the Saints; or to object to the celibacy of the clergy, or to auricular confession, or even to the doctrine that regards the authority of the church as superior to the authority of the scriptures. But there is one feature of Roman Catholic teaching that seems to be inimical to true citizenship; and that is the