

revolution can do this at any time, a nation's representatives in Parliament should surely be able to do it. And if a reigning Autocrat is a constitution in himself, surely the people's representatives who represent the wisdom and will of the entire nation should be the same. The justness of this position cannot, I think, be disputed. The makers of law should in their collective capacity, be above law, (all statutory enactments being by them subject to change,) and hence above Privy and all other Councils emanating from them. Human law, past and present, made by the representatives of the people, should always be subordinated to the people's will, and hence always subject to change as advancing knowledge and experience may dictate and changing circumstance may require.

But Protestantism, it is said, is tolerant. True, and right and proper that it should be, under reasonable restrictions. But should it be tolerant of intolerance? Rome's intolerance of all creeds but its own is still, as ever, by the decrees and universal teaching of Pope and Council, which constitute the authority of the "church," absolute. For Protestantism to be tolerant of such, therefore, is to go in direct opposition to its own foundation principles. And its willing permission of the existence and growth of an intolerant civil and religious hierarchy, by conceding to it Separate Schools and other training institutions to this end, is therefore manifestly inconsistent with its fundamental principle of anti-intolerance. To be consistent with its own principles of tolerance it must oppose, and as far as possible effectually oppose all intolerance, by weakening, and, as far as may be, destroying the power of avowedly intolerant institutions. The tiger or the lion, although chained, may break their chain; and hence are not safe animals for domestication. Moreover, the lion though but lying in its lair watching an opportunity, is as wicked and ravenous and bloodthirsty as though actually engaged in tearing its victim limb from limb. And if he can be surprised and taken and effectually manacled while crouching in his lair, it would be a valiant and a praiseworthy act. Partyism, politics, position, power, and worldly self-interests in general, however, are evidently before religion and duty with our Ottawa governing "powers that be." And although not personally a member of such, I will here add, that any purely "Protestant Protective Association" in a Protestant country, be it "Orange" and "secret" or otherwise, as necessity may dictate, is perfectly legitimate, and should be encouraged by every truly consistent and rightminded Protestant.

Furthermore, to favor or permit Roman Catholic Separate Schools in a Protestant country, the direct aim and tendency of which is the undermining of Protestantism, the dethroning of our Protestant sovereign, and the overthrow of our Protestant Government, civil and religious, is simply, whether for a Province or the Dominion, a policy of sheer madness! It is simply and purely the licensing of an institution by a Protestant Government for its own destruction! And for the Dominion Government to force Separate Schools upon Manitoba, is to prove itself covetously cringing to a despotic hierarchy, and hence utterly unworthy of the confidence of an intelligent people.

This tenacious adherence to party and partyism, also, both