

Waukenphast Boots. LADIES', \$3.50. MEN'S, \$4.00. Honest Shoes, rightly made from Best Materials, by intelligent workmen. That's all. It's considerable too. New Styles. Low prices. Is what tells.

A. C. MORGAN, 412 Main St.

CALENDAR FOR NEXT WEEK.

- MAY. 12, Sunday—Fourth Sunday after Easter, Octave of the Patronage of St. Joseph. 13, Monday—St. Anselm, bishop and doctor (transferred from April 21st). 14, Tuesday—Votive office of the Apostles. 15, Wednesday—St. Isidore, the husbandman. 16, Thursday—St. John Nepomucene, martyr. 17, Friday—St. Paschal Baylon, confessor. 18, Saturday—St. Venantius, martyr.

CITY AND ELSEWHERE.

The number of patients treated at the St. Boniface hospital last week was 86, of whom 45 were males, and 41 females. Large congregations are assisting at the May devotions in each of the city churches. St. Mary's Court No. 276 Catholic order of Foresters will meet in Unity hall on Friday evening. REV. FATHER O'DWYER took the east train on Saturday and officiated at White-mouth on Sunday.

There was some exceptionally fine music at the church of the Immaculate Conception on Sunday, the feast of the Patronage of St. Joseph.

Our young friend, Mr. Walter Walsh, of Ottawa University, contributes a brilliant article on "Confederation and its Founders" to the April Owl.

We regret to say that there has not as yet been much improvement in the condition of Mr. A. McGillis, the victim of the street car accident last week.

We are glad to see that Mrs. Cherrier, mother of the pastor of the Immaculate Conception, has, apparently, recovered from her recent severe illness.

We extend to Mr. Jeremiah Russell, our heartfelt sympathy in the bereavement he has sustained by the death of his mother who departed this life one day last week.

To Enjoy Life the physical machine must be in good running order. A little care—the use of Ripan's Tablets—will give you every morning the feeling that you are "glad to be alive."

Mr. D. F. COYLE entertained the members of the Catholic Truth society on Monday night with a most interesting reading from Father Young's new book, "Catholic and Protestant Countries Compared."

A Bright Eye is the sign of good health and an alert mind. Strange that it should almost always depend on the state of the digestion, but it does. A Ripan's Tablets taken after meals gives the little artificial help most grown people need.

The members of the St. Jean Baptiste society of Winnipeg held their annual meeting on Sunday when there was a large attendance of members and most satisfactory reports were presented. The following officers were elected for the ensuing year: President, Geo. Germain; vice-president, J. A. Richard; treasurer, N. Bergeron; secretary, A. Prendergast; committee of management, L. O. Genest, J. T. Dumouchell and C. A. Lemieux.

Consumption and Lung Difficulties Always arise from particles of corrupt matter deposited in the air-cells, by impure blood. Purify that stream of life and it will very soon carry off and destroy the poisonous matter, and like a crystal river flowing through a desert, will bring with it and leave throughout the body the elements of health and strength. As the river, leaving the elements of fertility in its course, causes the before barren waste to bloom with flowers and fruit, so pure blood causes the frame to rejoice in strength and health, and bloom with unending beauty. All Medicine Dealers sell Dr. Morse's Indian Root Pills.

RIO HARD & CO WINE MERCHANTS, 365 Main Street, - WINNIPEG.

25 Royal Crown Soap Wrappers Mailed to the ROYAL CROWN SOAP CO. WINNIPEG, MANITOBA. GIVES YOU FREE BY MAIL YOUR CHOICE OF THE FOLLOWING BOOKS AND PICTURES: - Modern Home Cook Book, - Ladies' Fancy Work Book, - Large List Standard Novels, - Six Beautiful New Pictures. List of Books and Pictures mailed free on application. NONE BUT ROYAL CROWN SOAP WRAPPERS RECEIVED.

Loyal Lawyer's Logical Lecture.

(Continued from page two.)

rights are sacred to-day, and education a purely local affair but that is only because provincial rights are now on their side, and to how is not at present senseless. But when provincial rights were against them, as they were six short years ago, it was the Dominion rights that wore, in their eyes, the robes of sanctity, and the howl would have been extremely senseless. There must be discrimination in howls, if they are to do any good.

I refer to the Jesuit Estate act in Quebec, which was passed by the local legislature without a dissentient voice. Forthwith the Rev. Principal Cayen, the Rev. Principal Austin, the Rev. D. J. Macdonnell, and many other ministers; together with Mr. Dalton McCarthy, and many laymen, formed, not in Quebec, but in Ontario, the Equal Rights association, in order primarily to attack the statute. You know what the act was about. The Province of Quebec agreed to purchase all interest, real or pretended, of the Jesuits in certain estates, which had been set apart for education, for \$400,000; and, for fear of seeming to do the Protestants an injustice, an equal amount (in proportion to the population) was set apart for Protestant education. This was a question in no sense less of a local character than the Manitoba School Act. But some Protestants wanted it disallowed and appealed from, so they took down the sacrificial robes, and they clapped them on Dominion rights, waived the constitution vigorously, and quite sensibly clapped the howl in a cupboard. In an address issued by the association in 1890, and signed by the Rev. Principal Cayen, as chairman, and Mr. E. Douglas Armour as honorary secretary, there was the following: "The right of appeal to the Governor-General which minorities at present have must—must what? must be abolished? must never be used? Not at all; that would have been to howl at the wrong time—must remain; nay the entire Dominion is the proper guarantee for equality of dealing on the part of provinces with the adherents of the various churches, and nothing beyond this should be sought." I fancy I hear from the locked cupboard that melancholy howl trying to make itself heard—perhaps it is nothing but some minister in the audience sighing.

Mr. Dalton McCarthy was the chief speaker in the Equal Rights association. In his address in the house of commons on the Jesuit Estate matter he said: (Let us apply it to our own case as he proceeds.) "I venture Sir, to ask the house seriously to consider the position in which we stand. The worship of what was called local autonomy, which some gentlemen have become addicted to, is fraught, I venture to say, with great evils to this Dominion. Our allegiance is due to the Dominion of Canada. The separation into provinces, the right of local self-government which we possess, is not to make us less citizens of the Dominion, is not to make us less anxious for the promotion and welfare of the Dominion; and it is no argument to say that because a certain piece of legislation is within the power of a local parliament, therefore the legislation is not to be disturbed. By the same act of parliament by which power is conferred upon the local legislature, the duty and power—because where there is a power there is a corresponding duty—are cast upon the governor-in-council to revise and review the acts of the legislative bodies. If you are to say that because a law has been passed within the legislative authority of the province, therefore it must remain, we can easily see, Sir, that before long these provinces instead of coming nearer together, will go further and further apart. We can see that the only way of making a united Canada, and building up a national life and sentiment in the Dominion, is by seeing that the laws of one province are not offensive to the laws and institutions, and it may be to the feelings of another—I will go so far as to say that they must be to some extent taken into consideration." Did I hear another sigh? Let us clear this matter up a little, and stop, if possible, this robe borrowing. What are Dominion and provincial rights? Are they not as Mr. McCarthy says those given by the constitution? If so what then says the constitution? Does it say that all local matters are to be controlled by the province, and all others by the Dominion? Not at all, although to listen to most of the sermons one would think so. Marriage and divorce are surely local matters. Mr. Peley would say that they have to do with people inside our own province, these and these only; and yet the provincial legislature have only limited jurisdiction as to one of these subjects, and no jurisdiction at all as to the other. Agriculture is surely local, but again the local jurisdiction is limited. I could proceed with the enumeration, but it is not necessary. Now what does the constitution say as to education? Mr. Peley says, "to obey the order is to resign provincial autonomy." But what said the privy council? "Before leaving this part of the case it may be well to notice the argument urged by the respondent, that the construction which their lordships have put upon the second and third sub-sections of 22 of the Manitoba act, is inconsistent with the power conferred upon the legislature of the province to 'exclusively make laws in relation to education.' The argument is fallacious. The power conferred is not absolute, but limited. It is exercisable only 'subject and according to the following provisions.' The sub-sections which follow, therefore, whatever be their true construction define the conditions under which alone the provincial legislature may legislate in relation to education; and indicate the limitations imposed on, and the exceptions from, their power of exclusive legislation. Their right to legislate is not indeed properly speaking exclusive, for in the case specified in subsection 3 the parliament of Canada is authorized to legislate on the same subject. There is, therefore, no such inconsistency as was suggested." How then do we resign provincial autonomy? If we had by the constitution sole control over education the case would be different; but when we have not got it, how can we resign it? How as we please, with or without discretion, or discrimination, we have no such power, and therefore can neither resign or abandon it. There is no state in the union that could have passed the act of 1890, interfering as it does with vested rights. There would not even be an appeal to any constituted authority, the law would be absolutely void as ultra vires. Nevertheless, each state is autonomous to the extent of its constitution. The province of Manitoba has greater power than any state in the union in this regard, and has it therefore

no autonomy? Let us, I say, as British subjects, be governed by our constitution, and not raise howls, senseless or otherwise, when a right of appeal, given by the constitution, is put in exercise.

Before closing I would like to point out that the opinions of Canada's leading statesmen have been in favor of separate schools. Let me read to you an extract from Mr. Pope's "Life of Sir John A. Macdonald," the man who was the first to introduce the separate school system into Canada—the man who, therefore, according to Dr. Bryce, was no patriot.

"There remains but one question of practical politics in relation to which I propose to outline Sir John Macdonald's attitude. I refer to those of race and religion, which periodically threaten the peace of Canada. It must be apparent to the most careless student of Sir John Macdonald's career, that British and Protestant though he was, at no time in his career had he any sympathy with that fierce intolerance of everything French or Roman Catholic which at the present time is abroad in the province of Ontario. As far back as 1854 we find him counting on his 'friendly relations with the French.' In 1855 he introduced and carried a bill in the interests of separate schools against the bitter opposition of George Brown. In 1863 the senator Scott's act establishing a system of separate schools. In 1867 he perpetuated this right to the Roman Catholics of Ontario, and at the same time provided the French Canadians with liberal guarantees for the security of their language, institutions and laws. In 1870 he secured, or thought he secured, like privileges to the Roman Catholics of Manitoba. We are not left in doubt as to his view of what was intended by the operation of the Manitoba act. In the very beginning of the present agitation in that province, he thus addressed a member of the local legislature, who had applied to him for counsel: 'You ask me for advice as to the course you should take upon the vexed question of separate schools in your province. There is it seems to me but one course open to you. By the Manitoba act the provisions of the B. N. A. act (section 93), respecting law passed for the protection of minorities in educational matters, are made applicable to Manitoba, and cannot be changed, for by the imperial act conferring the establishment of the new provinces, 34-35 vic., section 6, it is provided that it shall not be competent for the parliament of Canada to alter the provisions of the Manitoba act in so far as it relates to the province of Manitoba. Obviously, therefore, the separate school system of Manitoba is beyond the reach of the legislature, or of the Dominion parliament.'

"It is true," Mr. Pope continues, "that the highest tribunal in the empire has put a different interpretation on the Manitoba act, but with the merits of the question we are in no wise concerned here. My object is merely to show what were the views of him who had by far the greatest share in the framing of this piece of legislation, as to its scope and effect."

Mr. Alexander McKenzie, in the debate on the New Brunswick school case, said: "I believe in free schools in the non-denominational system; and if I could persuade my fellow-countrymen in Ontario and Quebec, or any other province, to adopt that principle, it is the one I would give preference to above all others. For many years after I had a seat in the parliament of Canada, I waged war against the principle of separate schools. I hoped to be able, young and inexperienced as I then was, to establish a system to which all would yield their assent. Sir, it was found to be impracticable in operation, and impossible in political contingencies."

Sir George Cartier, Sir John Thompson, Sir Oliver Mowat's and Mr. Edward Blake's opinions are too well known to need citation. These are opinions of men well informed upon this question of separate schools, men who were through the fierce lights in the 60's; men well able to judge whether the separate school system is baneful or injurious. Let us give heed to them.

From great statesmen let us pass to two smaller ones—Mr. Greenway and Mr. Martin. In 1872 the New Brunswick school question was debated in the House of Commons, and Mr. Greenway was there. Canada had jurisdiction to interfere with New Brunswick, because there never had been separate schools there; but Canada did all that she could, and the House of Commons passed an address to Her Majesty asking her to use her influence with the legislature of New Brunswick to procure relief for the Catholics. Mr. Greenway was there, and Mr. Greenway voted for that address. And Mr. Greenway after Mr. Martin's Portage la Prairie speech in August of 1889, in favor of abolishing separate schools. Mr. Greenway made no secret of his disapproval of this speech; and to his friends denounced it as stupidity and madness. But Mr. Martin always had the means of controlling Mr. Greenway. He had only to tender his resignation, and he had his way. Mr. Greenway swallowed the nauseous dose, but no one believes that the nasty taste has yet left his lips.

And now for Mr. Martin. In 1890 he passed the 1890 act—he was then in provincial politics. In 1894 he denounced the act—he was then in Dominion politics. In an address to the Winnipeg Liberal club (20 Feb. 1894) he said: "He himself was not satisfied with the School act, and never had been so. He had made a strong effort to have public schools, controlled by the government, really made national schools, with religion obliterated; and he was now more convinced than ever that was the only school which could be justified as constitutional. They said that the state had no right to interfere with the different denominations, but had the right to interfere in the matter of religion; but he contended that they would not do the one without the other. It has been urged by satisfied supporters of the Act, that none could complain of the devotional element introduced as it was of the broadest nature. But they found that the Roman Catholics had the very greatest objections to this provision of the Act, and he was himself dissatisfied with it, and was glad many Protestants shared his objections—The Roman Catholics had honestly stated that in their behalf the two forms of education should go together. The Protestants admitted on the other hand that it was impossible to have religious training in the schools, and only asked that it be recognized—insisting however on imposing their views on others in that respect; rather than that small amount of religious training should be done away with in the schools, the Protestants said they would prefer the old state of affairs. He would leave it to his audience to determine which was the most honest stand of the two."

Need I go further in citing authority of great statesmen, and little politicians. I wish I had time to give you further testimony, but I must hurry to a finish.

THE PRIVY COUNCIL DECISION. If, ladies and gentlemen, you decline to adopt the arguments which I have advanced in favor of separate schools; if you decline to be bound by agreement of 1870; and if you decline to give heed to opinions of eminent men, what is there left that I can urge upon you? Well, if argument, agreement and opinions fail I can still urge upon you submission to the law, and to the constitution, as interpreted by the highest judicial tribunal—the privy council. It is unfortunate that the decision has not been published so as to be accessible to all. Let me give you some extracts from it.

"The terms upon which Manitoba was to become a Province of the Dominion were negotiated between the governing representatives of the Province of Manitoba, and of the Dominion Government." "Those who were stipulating for the provision of section 22 as a condition of union, and those who gave their legislative assent to the Act by which it was brought about, had in view the perils then apprehended." "It was not doubted that the object of the first sub-section of section 22 was to afford protection to denominational schools." "There is no doubt either what the points of difference were, and it is in the light of these that the 22nd section of the Manitoba Act of 1870, which was in truth a parliamentary compact, must be read."

"The sole question to be determined is whether a right or privilege which the Roman Catholic minority previously enjoyed has been affected by the legislation of 1890. Their Lordships are unable to see how this question can receive any but an affirmative answer."

"Bearing in mind the circumstances which existed in 1870, it does not appear to their Lordships an extravagant notion that in granting a right to the Protestant minority limited powers it should have been thought expedient, in case either Catholics or Protestants became preponderant, and rights which had come into existence under different circumstances were interfered with, to give the Dominion parliament power to legislate upon matters of education, so far as was necessary to protect the Protestant or Catholic minority as the case might be."

What blasphemy and sacrilege! Did these judges never hear of the sacredness of provincial rights, or listen to that howl which under properly selected circumstances plays such an important part in Canadian politics? Let me request your special attention to the next extract dealing with the Catholic petition to the Governor General asking for relief: "Their Lordships have decided that the appeal is well founded, but the particular course to be pursued must be determined by the authorities to whom it has been committed. It is not for this tribunal to intimate the precise steps to be taken. Their general character is sufficiently defined by the third sub-section of section 22 of the Manitoba Act."

"All legitimate ground of complaint would be removed if that system (the system of 1890) were implemented by provisions which would remove the grievance upon which the appeal is founded and were modified so far as might be necessary to give effect to these provisions."

What is here said: 1. That the Catholics have a grievance; 2. That their appeal is well founded; 3. That the general character of the proper course to be taken is clear, namely that the act of 1890 ought to be supplemented by provisions which would remove the grievance and 4. That the precise steps to be taken ought to be determined by the governor-general-in-council.

This seems plain enough for any unprejudiced mind, but Mr. McCarthy makes two remarks about it. He said at Ottawa: 1. That the privy council went beyond the record and had no right to say what it did. As to the power and duty of the privy council I fancy that we will be content to take its opinion and not that of Mr. McCarthy; and 2. to use his own language "I say that is going a long way because they have obtained a solemn decision of the highest tribunal but there is a constitutional power with this council to say, notwithstanding the decision of a court of law upon this point, that they will not act upon that opinion." Then what are we to act upon if not upon the decisions of the highest possible constitutional and judicial authority, upon what then? Ladies and gentlemen, may I not fairly ask you to stand by our constitution and our courts assured that in no other way can endless anarchy and confusion be avoided.

CONCLUSION.

And now in conclusion I beg to bring before you an object lesson. In 1890 there were in the city of Winnipeg five Catholic schools, with 576 scholars. Today those schools are still there, but the scholars have increased to 704. During these five years the Catholics have paid their share of taxes for the other schools, and have, with great difficulty, and much self-denial, maintained their own schools as well. They have done this quietly and patiently, to the law submissively, but it must be added somewhat grudgingly, for they are for the most part of the less affluent classes, and as Mr. Peley says "they feel that faith with them has not been kept." Nevertheless, Protestants, you have heard nothing of their complaining, although some of you, feeling the injustice that was being done, have generously helped them. The taxes for schools purposes in the city of Winnipeg meanwhile have been increasing, until Protestants themselves are finding them hard to pay. How would you like it besides paying for your own schools you had to support others as well? Why do the Winnipeg Catholics make the double payment? Well, they say for conscience sake. They keep their separate schools for the same reason that Protestants keep up their separate churches—for conscience sake. And are these schools inefficient? No such charge has ever been made, but in the name of the Roman Catholics of this city, and with their sanction, I invite you to go and see for yourself—see their work and see how much of their time is given to catechism. I could not bring the children here; but I have done what I can, I have brought here samples of their work, and specimens of their books, and their time tables, and I ask you at the close of the proceedings to come forward and inspect them.

What then? Will Winnipeg Protestants continue to make profit out of the Catholic conscience, and to diminish their taxes by enforced contributions from those who can make no use of the present schools? Is that fair, is it just, is it reasonable, is it honest? Which of Mr. Peley's reasons will he offer for the continuation of this crying inequality? Protestants of Winnipeg, the best of you, are you not ashamed of the result to which intolerance has brought us, as well as of the faith-broken path by which it has come? Are you not ashamed to make money out of the religious convictions of your Roman Catholic fellow citizens?

Are you not willing to pay for your own schools? and to let the Catholics keep their money which under the present system they have to contribute to your support? I leave it to your judgment, trusting that my effort to place the matter fairly before you may prove of some assistance in your reflections.

When Mr. Ewart had concluded the chairman announced that any question that might be asked would be answered. A few were asked, the chief one being as to similarity of the Manitoba schools act and the Quebec Jesuits estate act; as to Mr. McCarthy's explanation of the Jesuits estate act; if separate schools had not been established in 1871 would there now be any ground for the Catholic appeal; if all denominations should be given separate schools if they desire them, how could a semblance of a state school be maintained.

Mr. Ewart replied that the proceedings of the Jesuit estates act were similar to those in the school act in so far as they went, but the appeal to the governor general was abandoned and an arrangement made between the Protestant representatives and the Quebec government. As to the next question, Mr. McCarthy's only explanation of the Jesuit estates act was that it did not refer to education. As to the third question no appeal could lie if separate schools had not been established in 1871. As to the next question, Mr. Ewart said that if all the people in the province were deaf and blind, it would be harder to educate them and so it would be schools; but happily such a state of things did not exist, and it would be time to consider the situation when other denominations began to ask for separate schools.

Rev. Mr. Grant, who asked the last question, contended that his question had not been answered and insisted that the proposition was a most vital one.

Rev. Hugh Podley rose to make a reply to some of the points of Mr. Ewart's address. He said that no promise had been made by the legislature to safeguard separate schools and therefore the people of Manitoba could not justly be charged with breaking faith with the Catholic minority. And again the Dominion government had no right to make a bargain settling for all time to come the separate school system on this province. The 12,000 who were in Manitoba at the union should not be in a position to prevent the 150,000 people now here from inquiring into the merits of the system under which they live. It was not right to say that which was not Protestant was Catholic and vice versa. He had never claimed to be a Protestant. "I believe in the holy Catholic church," was a part of the declaration made by a person when being received as a member of the Congregational church. If there was anything objectionable in the religious exercises used in the schools let it be expunged. As there would be Catholic teachers in the public schools, Presbyterian children would be in as much danger of having their religious faith perverted as Catholic children would be, no one could have any advantage over the other. The chief objection to Catholics attending the public schools appeared to be the matter of conscience.

Mr. Ewart—No, no. Mr. Ewart—Then that is not so? That is the most vital point in this whole question. That was the one point that kept him on the fence for some time until he had read the decrees of the Catholic church affecting the subject. If it is right for one denomination to have separate schools then let all have it. If one part of the community have their taxes set aside for their particular use, let all the different parts be treated similarly. There are private schools in this city that should have the benefits of the school taxes paid by the parents of the children who attend them, if it is right that the Catholics should have their taxes set apart for themselves. It was not right that there should be a double board of education, double school boards, double normal schools, double expense just because a fraction of the population want to teach their own particular religion half an hour each day; it was unjust to the people of the province as a whole. He hoped the difficulty would be settled; but if the Catholics wanted their old schools it would never be settled in this province.

Canon O'Meara rose and said it was not the intention of the Archbishop of Rupert's land to interfere with the present school system, by establishing parochial schools. A little cross firing occurred which gave zest to the proceedings.

The meeting dispersed after a vote of thanks had been tendered to Mr. Ewart and the chairman.

A FINE PORTRAIT. We have had prepared a magnificent portrait of HIS GRACE THE ARCHBISHOP. It is acknowledged by everyone to be life-like, and we are offering it at the very low PRICE of \$1.00. THE FERGUSON CO'Y. W. J. MITCHELL, CHEMIST & DRUGGIST. Removed for a few months to Queen's Hotel Block. PORTAGE AVE., NEAR MAIN STREET. Your Esteemed Patronage Solicited. Catholic Book Store ST. BONIFACE. Books, Stationery, Pictures and Picture Frames, Religious Articles and School requisites. FRENCH INKS a specialty. Wholesale and Retail. Correspondence solicited. M. A. KEROACK. SPRING HAS COME. Use MRS. LUIER'S WONDERFUL COUGH SYRUP. Will not only cure Colds and Coughs, La Grippe, all affections of the throat and lungs, but will prevent all these diseases. On Sale at 181 and 183 Lombard street, (opposite Canada Hotel) Winnipeg.

J. A. ROGERS & CO'S HAT STOCK \$3,000 WORTH At 35 and 50 cts. on the Dollar

THE BLUESTORE Sign—"The Blue Star," 434 MAIN STREET, "Always the Cheapest."

PRICES: Stetson's ..... \$5 00 for ..... \$2 50 Christy's ..... \$7 00 for ..... \$3 50 Fedora's ..... \$8 50 for ..... \$1 50 Beautiful Range of ..... \$3 00 for ..... \$1 00

The BLUE STORE Sign—"The Blue Star," 434 MAIN STREET, A. CHEVRIER. P. O. Box. 339. TELEPHONE 279.

W. J. BAWLF, Produce & Grain MERCHANT AND DEALER IN Flour, Feed, Bran, Oats, Hay, Coal and Wood. 158 Princess Street, WINNIPEG.

HATS Our Stock of Spring Hats are Now Complete

White & Manahan's 496 Main Street. CHAMPION SHOEMING FORGE

Trotters, Runners & Roadsters A SPECIALTY. ALL PECULIARITIES OF GAIT TREATED WITH SUCCESS. C. J. M'NERNEY 'PHONE 723. Cor. Fort and Graham Streets.

(Established 1879.) M. HUGHES & SON, Undertakers, Embalmers, 212 Bannatyne Street, Opp. Ashdown's Telephone 413. Telegraph Orders, Given Prompt attention. Subscribe for THE REVIEW.