



"AD MAJOREM DEI GLORIAM."

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

VOL. XII, No. 38.

ST. BONIFACE, MANITOBA, TUESDAY, APRIL 6, 1897.

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

## The Catholics' Claims

AS PRESENTED BY MR. PARE IN THE LEGISLATURE, March 12th.

Settlement would be the Burial of all Constitutional Rights of the Minority To Separate Schools.

It is with a feeling of regret that I rise to speak on the subject causing this debate. I would be more inclined to ignore the enactments of the bill under consideration, and receive silently this new denial of justice, but I consider it a duty imposed upon me to rise. The minority are not to be blamed for their position, they are the victims, but not the cause of the difficulty. You will grant that the attitude of your fellow-citizens, the Catholic minority, is not the attitude of men opposing the contention of others for the sake of contrariness, to affirm, as was said sometimes, that they have rights conferred by statute and wish to see those rights respected merely for the object of seeing their contention carry. You will grant that our attitude is conscientious and is dictated by religious convictions. It is to be regretted that the majority and the minority cannot agree to one system of schools, but such being the case, we should agree to respect the liberty of conscience of one another in the enactments of laws concerning education. A majority should not dictate to a minority in matters of this nature. Taking into consideration the policy of the government since the passing of the public schools act of 1890, I never entertained the idea that the government would recede from the attitude assumed and I never expected that the question would be raised in this house on a measure brought by the administration having in view the settlement of the vexed question. I was convinced that the local government would not come with an acceptable measure and I never imagined that the federal authorities, entrusted by the constitution with the care of protecting the minority, would accept a settlement on terms embodying no relief to our grievances. This settlement is worse than a policy of non-intervention, for it is a mere compromise in which the party aggrieved has not been consulted and its rights are absolutely ignored. Our case has been heard by the privy council and the present administration at Ottawa either disapproves or approves of the decision rendered on the 21st day of March 1895. If they disapprove, the people of the Dominion are anxious and have a right to know. If they approve of the conclusions we are entitled to what relief the constitution has placed in their power to afford, and the minority will not hold them responsible for not granting what is beyond their power. As to a compromise we contend that we have a right to be consulted, and we disclaim the one offered now. I see by the bill now before us, which I believe is precisely on the terms of the alleged settlement, that the Manitoba executive have not receded from their former stand and have made no concessions to the minority. We have claimed, and do claim, rights to a distinctly Catholic school with Catholicism permeating every part of the instruction. What does the bill give? It declares that at 330 secular teaching is over and the schools, when the conditions created by the act permit, could be used for teaching religion by clergymen of the different creeds, teachers or other persons authorized to teach religion.

A section of the bill provides for the employment of denominational school teachers. It is not judging in a pessimist manner to say that such a proviso may be productive of an-

tagonism and be a source of difficulties. This provision is not acceptable of the minority. Another section provides for bi-lingual system. I take this proceeding to be merely a necessity for teaching children a language which they do not understand. I believe teachers had already that latitude for the only reason of giving more efficiency to their teaching. On the whole the principle of the public schools act remains the same. You persist in imposing upon us as a condition precedent to the right of sharing in government grants towards education, conditions to which we cannot subscribe. From all I have heard said in this house on the subject of education I can infer that you are aware that our attitude is dictated by conscience from a Catholic standpoint. You are aware that we are obeying the dictation of conscience. Why not have due regard to our liberty? We could have looked at the amendments as containing some concessions, although insufficient, if you had exempted us from paying taxes for a system of schools, from which we cannot conscientiously derive any benefit, and had given us the means of taxing ourselves for the support of our schools. Although I affirm our right to public grants, for we contribute our share to the public revenue. Amendments in that direction would have been substantial concessions and a step taken in the right direction. We do not demand any money of yours, but we demand ours to go for the support of Catholic schools. Any one having respect for religious convictions should be respectful of our liberty of conscience in this matter of education. The result of the Public Schools' act has not been to promote the progress of instruction, if you take into consideration a large portion of the population. With fair and substantial concessions you could have without impairing the efficiency of the schools, satisfied the minority, and thereby restored harmony and reach the object of promoting the best interests of education. The government claims credit for giving large grants, for the expenditure has exceeded the revenue. They seem to claim that the best interest of education is the cause not only of the special grant towards education, but the grant for immigration is justified as a mean of promoting the interest of education by bringing in more contributors to the support of schools. Have we not a right to question when we consider how they have ignored the grievances of a minority which to say the least constitutes more than the eighth of the population of the province. Would it not be better to spend less for immigration and abandon a policy which hinders immigration? Why not accede to just demands and make content and happy the settlers living in the country? Is this not the best and the less expensive immigration advertisement? This settlement by virtue of the policy termed "Policy of Conciliation" is a mere surrender of all the rights of the minority. The school laws prior to 1890 were oppressive to no section of the community. The use of the powers embodied in the constitution safeguarding the maintenance of the acquired rights conferred upon the minority by the school system prior to 1890 were not oppressive to any section of the population, but the school legislative act of the year 1890 is an infringement on constitutional rights, on the liberty of conscience of an important section of the population and the so-called settlement, is a confirmation of the said school act, and I regret it is the abandonment of all the rights of the minority by those who under the constitution were entrusted with the care of safeguarding them. It would perhaps be interesting to give you the opinion of the Hon. Minister of public works at Ottawa, as to the rights of the

minority. The article I quote from appeared in Mr. Tarte's newspaper, "Le Canadien," in the issue, dated 2nd Sept., 1892. I translate—

"We know from good authority that desperate efforts are being made to induce the Catholics and the French-Canadians in Manitoba to yield more concessions. Those made in the past have all turned to our detriment, and it would be treachery as well as cowardice to recede one step.

Let some favor or dislike the system of separate schools, this is out of question: Their existence is part of our political, national and religious inheritance. If it has some wrongs, the duty and the right of amending the same rests upon us. It is only through coercion and the argument of numbers that we will be deprived of our rights to our schools, if there is a determination to make an attempt in that direction, and if there is power to give effect to the determination. The authors of the spoliation will be responsible for all the consequences. As to granting our assent, never!

Nevertheless this is the aim of the present hour. We are offered to truck our prerogatives for the access to power of a Catholic prime minister, Sir John Thompson. It is questionable whether it would be a true advantage to have a coreligionist occupying the position."

This is, or I should say, was the opinion of Mr. Tarte on our school question in 1892. The year 1896 saw on the one side Sir McKenzie Bowell a non-Catholic, then leader of the Conservative government acting in conformity with the decision of the privy council in England, manfully bringing forth a measure of relief, "The Remedial Bill," which admitted all the rights of the minority. On the other hand we have seen Mr. Laurier and M. Tarte sacrificing the minority under the fallacious pretence of better safeguarding their rights. The so-called settlement shows to evidence that there is no advantage in having a French and Catholic premier when the price of the honour is to be the sacrifice of the religious and constitutional liberties of his coreligionists.

The Hon. Mr. Tarte in 1892 drew lines which he has quite ignored when party and personal interests have been at stake. Our circumstances are not very attractive and only the feeling of the duty to be accomplished will uphold us in our attitude. We have heard the Hon. Mr. Tarte tell us in St. Boniface: You are not rich, you cannot afford to resist, surrender! For nearly seven years we have had the alternative of choosing between the abandonment of our duty with pecuniary assistance on one side, and on the other duty with the most unfair treatment, we have chosen the latter and are determined to maintain the same position. No matter how events may turn, whether we will or will not ever receive justice, we deem it our duty to protest against this new instance of denial of justice, and to oppose the passing of the act on the ground that it purports to be the burial of all the constitutional rights of the minority to separate schools. And for that reason I will vote for the amendment.

## Depew on Ireland

His address at the Annual Dinner of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick.

New York, March 17. To-night at the Waldorf the one hundred and thirteenth anniversary dinner of the Society of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick was marked by the largest attendance in its history, including men who have gained fame in almost every branch of the city's trades and professions. Judge Morgan, J. O'Brien presided. Rev. Dr.

D. J. Stafford, of Washington, delivered an especially eloquent address on the principal toast of the evening, that of "The Day We Celebrate." Among the other speakers was Chauncey M. Depew, whose popularity with the society seems to increase year by year. He spoke upon the theme of "Ireland."

Mr. Depew said: "Gentlemen of the St. Patrick's Society. It is a great pleasure to greet you once more on this festive day, as I have every year since the oldest of us was young. A weekly humorous paper advises me in its issue of to-day to stop talking. The advice is not new. I have been receiving it for thirty years. It comes, however, invariably from people who cannot talk or if they do nobody will listen. Certainly such advice has never been taken by Irishmen. The influence of the Irish at home and abroad has been and is due to the fact that they talk more and talk better than any other nation. Every man, almost, who has survived oblivion and is cherished by Irish patriots and the lovers of eloquence, owes the fame and the power of his name to his ability and brilliancy upon his feet in the forum, in the Senate or upon the platform....

"It has been the delusion of statesmen in all ages that bigness was power. If that were the case there would not be in every clime, in every country and among people civilized, barbarous and savage tonight, a company of Irishmen celebrating the glories of a little island inhabited by about five millions of people. China is big, with her four hundred million, but she is a cipher; Russia is big, with her territory almost as large as the rest of Europe and her hundred millions, but her influence is bounded by the site of her fortresses and the camps of her armies. Rome was big, but Athens, with a population and territory about the same as the Greater New-York, dominated her literature, her art and her jurisprudence, and to-day furnishes the models in art, literature and eloquence to the modern world.

"The secret of immortality and of influence is liberty. The power of Ireland in the British Parliament, the interest in Ireland among all peoples and the commanding position of the Irish wherever they settle are because the story of the Emerald Isle is one long and ceaseless battle for liberty. It is liberty which inspires every American to long for the success of the Cuban patriot. It is liberty voiced in Halleck's immortal "Marco Bozzaris" which stirs American manhood and womanhood for the success of Greece against the Powers of Europe. (Applause.)

"Grattan, O'Connell, Phillips and Cronin have filled the school books with the eloquence and the lessons of liberty. Every American boy learns them and is inspired by them. Irish poetry, Irish melody, Irish fiction, Irish oratory, all breathe the love of home, and that home under the flag of freedom. You, gentlemen, are temporarily out of power in this city, which you captured and held and governed so long. But every Irishman that I meet tells me that he is returning to power. He says we have had Yankee reform with Mayor Strong and Dutch reform with Brother Roosevelt and German reform with Sheriff Tamsen and Hebrew reform with Brother Einstein. Now he says let us have some up-to-date Irish reform.

"I stopped a few days in a rural N. England town last summer where several abandoned farms had been taken up by Irish and made to pay. I said to a Mayflower descendant in the village of the town:

"How are politics up here?" "Well," he said, "we have six offices in this village--the President of the village, the Justice of the Peace, the Tax Collector, the village Clerk and two Constables--and are all filled

by Irishmen." I said, "How many Irish voters have you in the village?" and he said "Six." (Laughter.)

"Well, friends, may I meet you in full vigor, health and hilarity for a quarter of a century to come, as I have for a quarter of a century past on each recurring St. Patrick's Day. "Never forgetting the old sod, you are always loyal to the land of your adoption. By the drop of Irish blood in my veins, which comes through one of my great-grandfathers, and by the common tie of human interest in that which deserves prosperity and success I join you in the sentiment, 'God bless and prosper Ireland.'"

## REV. BASIL W. MATURIN BECOMES A CATHOLIC.

Well-known Protestant Episcopal Minister Received into the Church in England. Philadelphia Cath. Standard & Times.

Protestant Episcopal circles in this city have been considerably disturbed by the news of the conversion to the Catholic faith of Rev. Basil W. Maturin, a former rector of St. Clement's P. E. Church. A cablegram to this effect was received here almost a week ago, and is now confirmed by letter from the convert himself to friends in this city.

Mr. Maturin is a descendant of a family well known in the Church of England, his father being a rector of Grange Gorman, a suburb of Dublin, Ireland, in which city Rev. Mr. Maturin was born over fifty years ago. He was educated at Trinity College, and at the age of twenty-four was ordained to the ministry and entered the Society of St. John the Evangelist about twenty-three years ago. This order is modeled somewhat on the organizations of the regular clergy of the Catholic Church, and its members are bound by vows of poverty, chastity and obedience.

Twenty-one years ago this month he came to St. Clement's Protestant Episcopal Church, of this city, as an assistant, and shortly after was ordered by Bishop Stevens to desist from preaching. He then went to New York, but three years later returned to St. Clement's. In 1881 he became rector. In the spring of 1888 he quit St. Clement's and sailed for England, and from there he shortly afterwards went to Africa, where he remained for a year and a half as a missionary. He then returned to England, where he continued to give missions up to the time of his entrance into the Church. Lately he has been giving a mission in the Diocese of St. Andrew's, Scotland, and at its close betook himself to the Jesuit College of Beaumont, at Old Windsor, Berkshire. It was here on the 4th of this month that he was received into the Church.

It is said that for about ten years past he was troubled with doubts as to the status of the Episcopalian Church, and as a result began an examination into the claims of the Catholic Church, with the logical result.

What course he shall pursue in the future has not as yet been decided, but he will remain with the Fathers of the Society of Jesus at Beaumont College until after Easter. Those who have heard him preach while in this city pronounce him a very powerful pulpit orator.