

Gould composite affair of stucco and washing day, a pavement artist and a High Church clergyman. But Sir Gilbert E. Campbell, Bart., evidently knows how to write for the public and I am sure we all wish him success.

Leigh Hunt thought the weather not too trite a subject to serve as a peg for essay, for he wrote a short paper "To Any One Whom Bad Weather Depresses." There are many such, I am sure, these bleak, damp, sunless days in which it seems as if it never could be May. And how dependent we are on weather in Canada? How often in London, "dear old London," as the Bostonians call it now, I believe, have I put on waterproof and rubbers and gone out, sure of seeing something beyond muddy streets and flaring gas lamps, draggled skirts and shivering newsboys? And I was always rewarded; there were always picture-galleries and lectures and concerts and old churches and all the architectural and historic wealth of the place to enjoy, and never so interesting did they appear as on wet days. But here when our bright sky deserts us, we feel utterly lost. We have long ago exhausted that collection of horrors, the Normal School Museum, and the Public Library is deficient in upholstery, and we confess to having made a mistake because we went out at all. It is a great weakness—this dependence upon weather—but it is an American feeling and we are indoors people. Grasp bad weather, says Hunt, as you do the nettle, and it will not hurt you. Go right out into the country for a tearing walk, splashing through foreign roads and overcoming lassitude and morbidity and you will be none the worse but find rest, pleasure, and even beauty asserting their lost selves on every side.

CORRESPONDENCE.

A REVIEW.

To the Editor of THE WEEK:

SIR,—It seems to me that your correspondent, Mr. Adams, is right and that our *litterateurs* must depend on their subscription lists until they produce something that will command the attention of the English or French-speaking world; their Canadian audience is necessarily small, and the Americans shut them out by denying copyright unless they print in the United States, which they cannot in general afford to risk doing. It would not do to put them into public offices requiring special qualifications which they do not possess. Dr. Bourinot and Mr. M. J. Griffin have such qualifications for the offices they fill. Our universities are bound to get the best men they can get for the subjects they are to teach, and they must do so regardless of the particular portion of the English-speaking world in which such men may have been born, for no such man is a foreigner in a literary or scholastic sense. In the world of letters *Tros, Tyriusve nullo discrimine habetur*, provided he has the qualifications required for the purpose for which he is engaged. Our Parliament shows no signs of prorogation, and if, as seems probable, Ministers consent to the investigation demanded by the Opposition in Sir Adolphe Caron's case, and on which it seems as if he himself should insist, the session may go into the hot weather. There is no *new boodling* case before Parliament; those of last session have been dealt with, and the offenders are undergoing or waiting to undergo their trial and their punishment if found guilty. We have had *boodlers* of all sorts, from those in the first degree, in which the offenders have pleaded good intentions and that the *boodle* was applied to some useful public purpose, down to those of smaller dimensions, without such extenuating circumstances and which the *boodle* was put into the boodler's own pockets; or smaller still, where it was obtained for work really done, but in violation of acknowledged official rules and by false pretences or concealment of the truth from those who had a right to know it. Is not much of the bribery and corruption of which each political party accuses the other, due to the laxity of public opinion on the subject? Would not *boodling*, bribery and corruption become rarer if *society* treated them as disgraceful, and those guilty of them as unfit for association with honourable men? as hard-drinking, profane swearing and open licentiousness did, when so treated: for these things were practised by men who called themselves gentlemen and were received as such, as are the vices of which honourable members accuse each other, in comparison with which the elder ones were venial sins, and the denial or concealment of which is a proof that their disgracefulness is felt. I have sometimes thought that useful as our ballot is in some respects the demand for it is an acknowledgment of weakness upon the part of the electors, whom it enables to accept a bribe and to add treachery to their offence by voting against the briber or the party he supports. What is your opinion? Mr. Ewart says very truly, that Government cannot teach religion; but Government could and should provide that in all schools supported by it, the last six of the ten commandments shall be taught, learnt and explained, and insisted on; they contain no dogma or any doctrine disputed by honest men of any race or creed, or command or forbid anything which is not equally commanded or forbidden in effect by Sir John Thompson's new Criminal Law Bill, though they do it in a much more condensed form and one more easily remembered and understood by those who are willing to understand and obey them, and those who deny them the sanction of revelation, cannot

refuse them that of the law. Our judges I hope are to be better paid, for no one can deny the importance of their services; but the argument founded on the very large incomes enjoyed by successful advocates is not that by which the increase is best supported, for, as Sergeant Balfantyne tells us, and as I believe many of the most successful advocates have said, the men who are best paid on account of their being best able in contested cases to make the worst appear the better reason—or to prevent the other side from doing so—do not make the best judges or the only good ones. W.

Ottawa, May 3, 1892.

THE MANITOBA SCHOOL LAW.

To the Editor of THE WEEK:

SIR,—Till I saw Mr. John S. Ewart's letter and your comments thereon in your number of April 15, I was not aware that he had published in pamphlet form his two letters on the Manitoba school question, which appeared originally in the *Free Press* of this city. It might have been thought that the stolid indifference with which these productions were received in Manitoba would have chilled somewhat Mr. Ewart's controversial ardour, or at least have induced him to revise his work and eliminate the more salient of the numerous absurd contentions and solecisms which it contained.

It may interest your readers to know that Mr. Ewart, who is a lawyer, is retained as counsel by the Roman Catholic Church in its litigation with the Province of Manitoba on the question of the latter's right to tax Catholics for the support of the public schools. While holding this brief, he wrote his first letter, professedly in his capacity of citizen, during an election campaign in which the main issue was this very school question. Mr. Ewart apparently feels that his utterances have an intrinsic value outside of any importance that may have attached to them as an electioneering manifesto. That this value has not been discerned in Manitoba, Mr. Ewart doubtless attributes to the fact that crude Western opinion is the product of perceptive faculties too rude and indiscriminating to be capable of appreciating the subtleties of his argument. In this Mr. Ewart is right. They have an instinctive feeling that a man who is in earnest in the discussion of a great public question will stick closely to the issues and will not use the subject merely as a peg from which to display the small sleight-of-hand smartnesses of the dialectician. You struck the key to Mr. Ewart's methods and his conception of the importance of public questions when you remarked that he seemed to be fond of syllogism. Here is a specimen of his method: "The true Protestant argument runs thus: 'the State ought to protect itself from vice by education. Religion is an indispensable factor in education every day in the week. Therefore it is the duty of the State to have nothing to do with religion.'" It is true that in your number of April 22 he has amended the conclusion by making it: "Therefore, it is the duty of the State to educate, but to have nothing to do with religion." It will be seen, however, that the amended is not the less a *reductio ad absurdum* than the original conclusion.

Mr. Ewart, with his overweening fondness for syllogism, which somewhat resembles that of a child for a new-found toy, not only assumes the premises for the "true Protestant," but also draws his conclusions for him as well. Thus, by the convenient process of manufacturing his opponents' arguments and making them of such a consistency that they can be easily demolished, he is enabled to achieve much of that satisfaction and success which is derived from the pastime of setting up men of straw for the glory of knocking them down. By the consistent adherence to this method, Mr. Ewart experiences no difficulty in showing that the view of the school question held by probably nine-tenths of the people of Manitoba is narrow, sordid, and irrational, while that of the Roman Catholic Church is broad, generous and wise.

Now, the "true Protestant" might not be quite satisfied with the logic which Mr. Ewart furnishes for him, and if he were afflicted with the syllogistic mania he would probably argue in this way: "The State ought to protect itself from vice by education. Religion is an indispensable factor in education every day in the week. The nature and functions of the State unfit it for the teaching of religion, particularly doctrinal religion. It has, however, unequalled facilities for the necessary degree of secular education, which involves incidentally a certain degree of development of the moral faculties. It is absolutely necessary that a popularly-governed State should undertake this work. Religion, in its commonly-accepted sense, can be effectively imparted elsewhere than in the schoolroom. Study of history would seem to show that it is more effectively taught where the teaching is given elsewhere than in the school. Therefore, it is the duty of the State to discharge those educational functions for which it is capable, and to have nothing to do with religion." It will be seen that the conclusion, which Mr. Ewart infers can only be reached by a *reductio ad absurdum*, is arrived at by a chain of perfectly valid reasoning. All the argument based on his inference, therefore, falls to the ground. Notwithstanding the palpable folly of such trifling with a serious and important public question, it is apparent that Mr. Ewart actually believes that in writing the effusions embraced in his pamphlet he has done something really worthy of consideration. He evidently fancies that the parade of the technic and the jargon of the logic class is of

greater moment than the conscientious and earnest exercise of the judgment with a view to arriving at truth.

Mr. Ewart himself admits the desirability of national schools, if such a system were practicable. Why is it impracticable? Because the Roman Catholic Church does not like it, will have none of it, and objects to have its communicants taxed for its support. Why does the Catholic Church abhor public schools? Because, it says, education without religious instruction is disastrous to the eternal welfare of the children. "Religious instruction" as imparted in the schools of the Church is largely devoted to inculcating the doctrine that all religious beliefs, including every form of Christianity outside of the Roman Catholic Church, are abominable heresies. It also teaches that as the Church is the sole repository of revealed truth, and as its head is the infallible arbiter in faith and morals, implicit obedience to the Church is a duty of the true Catholic. If there were any possibility of doubt as to what might be the effect on the government of a free community produced by the inculcation of such doctrines, we have only to look to history for convincing information. We do not need, moreover, to go back of the history of our own times, nor do we require to go out of Canada, although every country in Christendom can supply us with an illustration more or less emphatic of the practical operation of the doctrines in question. We find Roman Catholics prepared to drop all these differences and stand in "solid" phalanx when the political plans or exigencies of the Church demand it, to the endangerment of the very fundamental principles of constitutional government. All this in the interest of the eternal welfare of the followers of the Church! But, on looking at the moral, intellectual and material conditions of those communities in which the educational system of the Church is universally adopted, and comparing them with those in which other systems prevail, do we see anything to convince us that the "eternal welfare" of the children of the Church is more secure than that of the "heretics"? I think not, unless, indeed, we are to assume that the Church, holding the keys of heaven and hell, can look after the salvation of its devotees without any special regard to their individual deserts. We are then brought face to face with the conclusion that, as much at least as the eternal welfare of its children, the Church has in view the preservation of the hierarchic and sacerdotal power. Is this to be doubted? Look at the condition of Quebec. Mr. Goldwin Smith has well termed Quebec a theocracy. Indeed, a Catholic true democracy is a paradox and an impossibility. Now, Manitoba is a democracy and proposes to remain so. It extends to Catholics just the same privileges as it does to Protestants, but no more, and I should say from my knowledge of the people here that no ecclesiastico-political combination or no manipulation of a "solid" vote will change this determination. The Church would give the impression that Roman Catholics are being unfairly dealt with, and that this Province proposes to tax them for the benefit of the majority. This presentation of the case is altogether misleading. The situation is, that Catholics are claiming an exemption from a public burden for no other reason than that they are Catholics. Bearing in mind the character of the doctrines which impel them to make this claim, and the methods by which they endeavour to enforce its concession, what must we think of the mental condition of a Protestant advocate of such concession?

This school dispute is not a religious question at all. Our Roman Catholic friends choose to make it so. They evolve a grievance out of nothing, and then ask to have it redressed by a concession which entails the practical repudiation of the doctrine of separation of Church and State. This is a condition of things not peculiar to Manitoba by any means. We see it everywhere in freely-governed communities, and shall continue to see it till the Catholic Church abjures some of its most important pretensions, and gives up its rôle of civil politician. For the most powerful reasons, such a course on the part of the Church is not very imminent.

Quebec is a fair example of the best results of the Church's domination. But, although the institutions and conditions of Quebec may be admirable from certain points of view, they inspire no desire for imitation in the people who are in the overwhelming majority in this country. These people have been impelled to follow quite other models.

I have endeavoured to suggest rather than describe the real issues of the dispute and the relative positions of the disputants. But Mr. Ewart takes quite another view of what these issues are. He says: "In fact, the true Protestant is easily driven to admit that the question is merely one of money. Roman Catholics maintain that the economy would be false, and the divorce disastrous to the eternal welfare of the children." Notwithstanding the ease of compelling the true Protestant to admit the sordidness of his motives, Mr. Ewart does not take the trouble of showing how it is done.

The public school system of this Province is intelligent in its conception, fair in its operation, and satisfactory in its results. Those who oppose it are, in my belief, consciously or unconsciously opposing the best interests of the community. The Catholic enemy of public schools has the justification, such as it is, of his implicit obedience to the authority of his Church. Mr. Ewart, however, is a Protestant, and on what ground of patriotism or common sense he bases his opposition to the school system I am utterly at a loss to conceive, and in all his laboured argumentation he has failed to show it.

Winnipeg, April 27, 1892.

BORRAS.