

as possible. The opportunities they desire may, without loss to the community, be given to them in two sets of cases: (1) where the population is dense, and yet mixed (in these cases there will be room for two sets of schools); (2) in districts where the population is sparse but entirely Roman Catholic. Against the propriety of granting facilities for separate schools in these cases, there can be nothing said without intolerance and the breach of our most cherished principles of liberty.

One word of application to the Manitoba schools. The Rev. Dr. Bryce, one of the bitterest opponents of the separate schools, has recently stated as follows:—"Out of 719 school districts in Manitoba, when the Act of 1890 was passed, 91 were Catholic. Of these *all but a very small percentage are in localities almost entirely French.*" I may add that of the "very small percentage" there were only four school districts in which the population, although mixed, was not large enough to support a school of each kind. Our principle of liberty applied to Manitoba therefore requires that in all but four out of the 91 schools the Catholics ought to be allowed to have their way, and to teach their religion to their children if they wish, provided only that the just requirements of the State with reference to secular learning are observed. Acting upon the very contrary doctrine, namely, that of intolerance, consciously or unconsciously having in view the hindrance of the teaching of the Catholic religion as something depraved, Manitoba has said to a large section of her people, unless you undertake to stop teaching your own religion, to your own children, in schools to which no one goes except those of your own faith, we will not permit you to organize yourselves together for the instruction of those in whose education the whole community has a decided interest. We would rather see them illiterate than Catholic, but

we hope to avoid illiteracy by driving them into adoption of secular schools, under stress of financial difficulties with which we shall surround them.

And so we have, even in the last decade of the 19th century, the spirit of intolerance as rampant and vigorous as ever; although with this difference principally, that whereas in the past the churches have had their innings, and the unbelievers have had to do much active fielding, the parsons are now out and are finding it tolerably difficult to keep within limits the scoring (they are receiving); for all of which, in my humble judgment, the churches have themselves to thank. Love your enemies was always their doctrine, but never their practice. And now their day has come, and while the Tudors would not have allowed any one to teach unless under license from the Bishop; modern regulations require the Bishop himself to have his certificate, and charge him straightly not to say a word concerning that which he believes to be the essence of all education. I do not mean to imply that unbelievers have now a monopoly of intolerance. What I would rather say is that, in my opinion, the *most* intolerant people of the day are the sceptics (I speak, of course, of the class); that it is they (not merely those so avowed, but that very much larger class that is practically unbelieving although still pronouncing the shibboleths) that are the most determined in their hostility to the Catholic religion being taught in the Catholic schools. Large numbers of believing Protestants, no doubt, agree with them, and the rancour of many individuals among these cannot be exceeded; but very many of this class would be glad to accord liberty to the Catholics could they but get a little of it for themselves. That they cannot do so is due, I believe, to those who deem religion not to be of the highest importance—that is, that scepticism avowed and unavowed (perhaps repudiated, but nevertheless domin-