

should be confined to rice powder, fans, umbrellas, scratching and the free use of the unruly member.

Colbert, though having the wealth of France at his feet, did not die rich. His three daughters were married to dukes, and his five sons had fortunes ever within their grasp, yet none were wealthy. Colbert's brother, however, died a millionaire, from his contract for coining the nation's *liards*, or farthings.

M. Leon Say intends to dedicate his encyclopædia on the Financial Administration of France to Mr. Gladstone.

The contractor who is charged for 47,000 frs. for the demolition and clearing away of the ruins of the Château of St. Cloud has been surveying his work. I accompanied one of the foremen through the ruins a few days ago to visit several of the historical rooms, where so many notable events occurred. It would pay to photo several of these apartments, whose walls are now covered with ivy instead of frescoes and Gobelein tapestry, and whose furniture now consists of dilapidated statuary, incapable of being cemented, wild briar, young chestnut trees and hazels. Hung alongside the photos, made of these pieces, before the bombardment of the castle, the looking upon this picture and on that might be added to "Volney's Ruins."

The correspondent of the *Temps* at Hyères writes that a "mass" was celebrated in the "Protestant church" of that town in memory of the Duke of Albany.

Officers are addressed not "monsieur," but "my lieutenant," "my colonel," etc. A lieutenant in hospital complained that the man-nurse did not address him as "my lieutenant." The nurse replied that he did not know the patient's rank, he not being in uniform, but in a night dress in bed.

Z.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE MANITOBA SCHOOL QUESTION.

To the Editor of THE WEEK :

SIR,—In the course of your courteous criticism of my recent pamphlets you object to my ascribing to Protestants less zeal for the combination of religious and secular education than I accord to Catholics. You say: "The true Protestant certainly attaches no less value to religion as an indispensable factor in all education, every day in the week, than the most devout Roman Catholic. The difference is that he, as a citizen of the State, recognizes the rights of all other citizens, and declines to force the teaching of his own religious views upon them or their children; and as both Christian and citizen he denies that it is within either the power or the duty of the state to provide for genuine religious teaching. . . . The secularization of the schools they (thoughtful Protestants) regard as a compromise growing out of the necessities of the situation and the only means of securing to the individual freedom of conscience in matters of faith."

My pamphlet dealt with the Manitoba aspect of the question. The distinction which I drew would, I admit, not hold in England. Perhaps it may not hold in Ontario, although my own opinion is that it would. That it exists in Manitoba there can be little question. Allow me to mention two out of many proofs.

1. From 1870 to 1890 our schools were divided into Protestant and Roman Catholic, each denomination having full control of its schools and *carte blanche* to make them exactly as they wanted them. The Protestant Board of Education consisted of five clergymen and two laymen. One of its first acts was "to exclude all distinctive religious teachings from its schools," and to enjoin "the reading of the Holy Scriptures and the prayers as published in the by-laws and regulations at the opening and closing of the school." The secularization ("with a vestige"), you will observe, was not decreed out of tender regard for Roman Catholics (for the schools were avowedly and by name Protestant, and Roman Catholics had no part or lot in them), but merely because the Protestants wanted to give their schools a secular character. Now, contrast the action of the Roman Catholic Board, but I need not tell you, sir, what that Board did.

2. Our School Act of 1890 abolished both Protestant and Catholic schools and established Public schools. It provides that religious exercises may ("at the option of the school trustees of the district") be conducted "just before the closing hour in the afternoon," and enacts that "no religious exercises shall be allowed therein except as above provided." The Act took away from both Protestants and Catholics the ample powers which they had as to religious education under the previous statute. We may test opinion by asking, how was this legislative divorce between secular and religious education received by the two bodies? The Rev. Prof. Bryce in an affidavit tells us that "The Presbyterian Synod of Manitoba and the North-West Territories, which represents the largest religious body in Manitoba, passed, in May, 1890, a resolution *heartily approving* of the Public School Act of this year; and I believe it is approved of by the great majority of the Presbyterians in Manitoba." Contrast the action of the Roman Catholics once more, sir; you need no information. The Protestants gave thanks for the final blow to all chance of religion in the schools and for the effacement of their power to provide it. The Roman Catholics are on their way to the Privy Council to try and get relief.

3. Allow me to forestall your reply to these points by the remark that your statement that Protestants regard a secular school system as an acceptable compromise (so I

understand you), of itself establishes my point. In Roman Catholic view there can be no compromise in the matter. Secular schools violate the dogmatic and historic position of their Church. That Protestants will for the sake of convenience or economy agree to the secularization of the schools; that they will dispense with "an indispensable factor in all education;" and that Roman Catholics will not, establishes the difference to which I referred.

Your criticism, moreover, is directed to a statement which, from your point of attack, is immaterial to the argument. I argued that Roman Catholics, as a matter of conscience (differing in this respect from Protestants), insisted "upon all education being permeated with religion;" therefore (other premisses now understood) they should be allowed to supply their children with that kind of education. You take issue upon the parenthesis, "differing in this respect from Protestants." My argument would have been as valid were the parenthesis left out, and if Catholics were represented by X. Let me show this clearly, and for that purpose assume that the true Protestant does, as you say, attach "no less value to religion as an indispensable factor, etc." Let me also assume your statement to be correct, that "the true Protestant . . . denies that it is within the power, or the duty of the State, to provide for genuine religious teaching." Protestant and Catholic are now agreed upon premisses and may both be included under X. The true Protestant argument now runs this way: *The State ought to protect itself from vice by education. Religion is "an indispensable factor in all education, every day in the week." Therefore it is the duty of the State to have nothing to do with religion.* The true Protestant should observe that his major premiss, "It is the duty of the State to educate," is contradicted, the moment he asserts that it is *not* the duty of the State to teach "an indispensable factor in all education." It is as though he said: It is the duty of the State to build warships, but it is not the business of the State to furnish them with rudders. A rudderless warship and an irreligious education are, to Roman Catholics, similar abominations—great capacities for evil.

The true Protestant, clearly, argues badly. I submit the alternative conclusion for his consideration: *The State ought to protect itself from vice by education. Religion is "an indispensable factor in all education every day in the week." Therefore it is the duty of the State in proceeding to protect itself, not to drop the indispensable, but to devise means by which it may be retained.* If means cannot be devised, then of course the indispensable must go, and education be truncated. But let us first be very sure that so fatal a step is absolutely necessary. Let us see.

The true Protestant makes his fundamental mistake when he skips from separation of Church and State to secularization of schools; and shuts out all other alternatives. He attributes to me the following: "The State has nothing to do with religion . . . therefore it should enter into a partnership with a professedly religious body." Therefore it should do something else I say.

As pointed out by John Stuart Mill there are two distinct methods by which the State can deal with education. It can establish schools of its own, or it can assist denominational or other schools. In the one case it undertakes the control of the schools and adopts a scheme of its own for their management—just as it establishes, owns and manages a navy. In the other case it observes merely the practical results of the management of schools by other bodies, and renders assistance according to such results. There are (1) State schools and (2) State-aided schools. Both of these systems are now in force in England. The Province of Ontario acts, to-day, upon both principles with reference to charitable institutions.

Now it is very clear that there is no breach of the principle of the separation of Church and State when the city of Toronto subscribes to the maintenance of some Roman Catholic charity. Good secular work is being done and the city is glad to help, even if the institution has a religious side to it. In the same way the principle is not violated in England where denominational schools are helped by public funds. Good work is being done, and as the State has no objection to religious education, there is no reason for refusing help which would otherwise be granted, merely because religion is taught there. While the State will not assist in the propagation of religion, it will not refuse to recognize an institution because of its religion. In other words, the State will neither patronize nor antagonize religion.

The way is now clear for the statement that there is no infringement of the principle if the State should incorporate all those who think alike on educational matters, and, instead of giving them public money (which the Government would draw from the people), should provide machinery by which they can pay their own money directly to their own trustees. All the State does, in this case, is to erect a corporation to which certain persons may pay their proportion of money necessary for education if they think fit so to do.

You admit that parents are primarily responsible for the education of their children, "and that the State's right to intervene is merely derived and inferential, arising out of its obligation to protect the State from the injurious effects of ignorance," etc. State-aided education is, therefore, more nearly right than State education. In both cases public money is used, but in the former the primary right and responsibility of the parents is preserved, while in the latter all individual choice of method is annulled,

and an indispensable part of education necessarily omitted. To put the matter syllogistically: *The State ought to protect itself from vice by education. Education can better be conducted by agencies other than the State, because of the latter's incapacity anent a certain indispensability, etc. Therefore the State ought to assist other agencies, rather than itself take the management.*

Now, sir, let me point out that separate schools are more nearly allied to State-aided, than to State schools. They are, in their essential characteristics, still less obnoxious to principle (if that were possible) than State-aided schools. For all that the State does is to organize Roman Catholics so that they may support themselves apart from the State. If their revenue be supplemented by a rateable contribution from the general fund, that is by no means a necessary part of the system. It might be an easily-answered argument for the stoppage of the supplement, but not for the abolition of the schools. It is clear then that we are not shut up to a choice between the two alternatives (1) Abandonment of separation between Church and State; and (2) Abandonment of an indispensable part of education. There is a *modus vivendi* to be found in (a) State-aided education, or (b) Separate schools with no State aid at all—only a charter.

In fact, the true Protestant is easily driven to admit that the question is merely one of money. He wants one set of schools because it is cheaper than a double set; and for the sake of economy he will forego religion in the schools. Roman Catholics maintain that the economy would be false, and the divorce disastrous to the eternal welfare of the children. I gave one answer to the economy argument when I pointed out in my pamphlet that at present in Manitoba the saving would be a bagatelle. But the best answer is not that, but this: that to Roman Catholics the matter is not one of money at all, but of conscience. In matters of conscience, Protestant denominations are wildly prodigal of their money; as witness the thousands of dollars which they annually spend in ungenerous competition with one another in every little village in Manitoba and the North-West Territories. They have a perfect right, no doubt, so to compete, and to urge subscriptions for the ruinous contest upon grounds of conscience; but let them not say to Catholics that in a very much more important matter *their* consciences must be sacrificed to economy.

For summary I ask you to reperuse the foregoing italicized sentences, and then consider the following: The State ought to protect itself from vice by education. The State ought not to interfere with religion. Yet religion is deemed by some "an indispensable factor in all education, every day in the week." State schools have advantages over State-aided or State-chartered schools, except (principally) in the matter of this indispensability. Protestants are either (a) not impressed with the importance of this "indispensability," or (b) are willing to waive it. Catholics make its retention a matter of conscience. For Protestants, therefore, State schools, and for Roman Catholics State-aided or State-chartered schools should be prescribed. If Protestants are impressed, etc., and are not willing to waive, then they also are entitled to separate schools.

Winnipeg, Man.

JOHN S. EWART.

SOME FORMS OF GAMBLING.

To the Editor of THE WEEK :

SIR,—There may be many anomalous things tolerated in this Dominion of ours, but the one to which I wish to call attention at present seems only equalled in rascality by the indifference with which the public endures the scheming villainy of the corrupt party politician. I refer to the various methods of gambling, which are disguised under many plausible titles. In Quebec it is a "colonization" fund, or for some charitable purpose; in Ontario it is some "prize competition," perhaps on some religious topic, which beguiles the unwary into parting with his dollar in the vain hope that he may be lucky enough to draw a fortune. I should like to know why the vice of gambling at horse races, etc., is a grave sin, and buying a ticket at a church lottery is a virtuous act? As a matter of fact, it is well known that those who invest in such lotteries are least able to bear the drain on their earnings. That the cover of religion should be sought and obtained to permit the open gambling of the "Quebec Colonization Company" is a disgrace. It doesn't make any difference whether the money obtained is devoted to charitable works or not, the principle is vicious and should be condemned. In Ontario several journals have adopted the "competition" game as a means of bringing money into their coffers. If these journals fill a public want, the public will buy without holding out the alluring bait of a possible fortune to each subscriber; if they do not fill a public want, or are not devoted to furthering public welfare, the sooner they cease to exist the better. It is true, these journals may not send out agents to sell tickets for a lottery, but they indulge in gambling none the less. I am not sure but their *modus operandi* is even worse than if they sold chances openly, because many people who would be deterred from buying a lottery ticket are willing to compete—as they think—for a prize, forgetting that these people are no more urged by philanthropic motives than is the circus fakir who gives one man a dollar prize that twenty others may be induced to give him fifty cents each for the chance of getting "the lucky number."

Now, is it the duty of the Government to interfere?