

Catholics. It is impossible for the wit of man to devise a scheme of religious instruction which shall not infringe upon the rights of certain persons. It is said that we can all agree upon the Sermon on the Mount and the Ten Commandments. But there are multitudes of persons who hold that the Sermon on the Mount is poor philosophy, and who do not believe in all the Commandments. We may think these persons mistaken. But they are free citizens who pay taxes and have as much right to have their views respected as we have to have ours.

No! the only solution of the problem is the complete separation of Church and State. Such separation will help both—yes, help the Church, in freeing it from the reproach that it cannot stand by itself. It will also be carrying out Christ's words, "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and unto God the things that are God's."

J. H. LONG.

Religion Now.

Many the Churches are : little the charity—
Pope, Pagan, Protestant, zealous and grim :
SELF, universal God : LOVE, what a rarity !
Wrangle and Wrath the one world-wide hymn.

Protestants fighting the Pope and each other, too,—
Each to himself an infallible pope :
Infidel clamour, and Atheist pother, too,
Drowning the voices, Faith, Charity, Hope

Romanist dealing out prayers with a rosary,—
Opening, shutting, at so much a head :
Scaring poor beggars with solemn imposery
While they are living, and when they are dead !

Children of Abraham, griping and grinding :
Preacher and Priest hitting hard at each other,
Save when on Platform hugging, and blinding
The crowd, by embracing each other as "brother."

Lastly, your tambourine piety, hammering,—
Scaring Old Nick with a cymbal and drum :
And the "saved" man (the latest) persistently clamouring
Into your ears that you're going to—*nuum*.

Oh ! how the sickening pother is thickening !—
Anglican, Methodist, Puritan grim
Fighting for "fads" with ferocity sickening,
With a stray shot for the poor little "Plym."

Anglican—look at him ! broad his phylactery !
Praying in printers' ink—grinding out thanks !
Plymouthite, Methodist, as from a factory
Turning out saints by a twist of the cranks !

Calvinist floundering deeply ; yet thundering
Doom to that sinner, the infant unborn !
All of them blundering ; most of them wondering
Whether the empty *hush* isn't the *corn*.

Faugh ! I am sick of it, here in the thick of it !—
Shall I away to my wilderness cave ?
Far from this brotherly War, and the prick of it,
Slaying the souls it professes to save !

Nay, let me fight it out, trying to right it out :
Better and braver to stand than to flee :
SHAM and HYPOCRISY rolling their waves on me,
I, Mrs. Partington, *brooming* the Sea.

BALD EAGLE.

Mr. Ewart's Dialectics.

IT is not my intention to say anything in regard to the controversy between Mr. Ewart and Mr. Armour. But I wish to accept an invitation which Mr. Ewart extended to Mr. Armour. I trust, in view of the fact that the subject is one of public importance, that my acceptance will not be looked upon as an intrusion, either by Mr. Ewart or Mr. Armour.

Mr. Ewart is entirely convinced of the purely patriotic and lofty character of the motives which animated the Dominion Government in issuing the Remedial Order. Mr. Armour apparently believes, either that the members of that Government are imperfectly acquainted with the facts in the question, and completely fail to comprehend their duties and responsibilities, or that if they have a clear conception of the facts and of their duties, they are acting under the influence of unworthy considerations of a selfish or partisan nature. He contends that the Dominion Government were

determined to interpret the judgment of the Judicial Committee as a mandate, and that in pursuance of this determination "matters of fact were completely ignored," and that "matters of assumed and alleged fact were made the basis of the argument and decision." Mr. Ewart takes exception to this and says : "Let Mr. Armour mention a fact which was ignored." Mr. Armour will promptly comply, but as a good many of your readers will more readily apprehend the meaning and bearing of the fact, or facts, when stated by a "layman," I take the liberty of mentioning one or two which, as will be seen, are of the most essential importance, but which have, nevertheless, been persistently ignored or evaded not only by the Dominion Government, but by Mr. Ewart himself in his multitudinous deliverances on this question.

It is a fact that the Judicial Committee had not the power to issue any mandate to the Dominion Government, and that the issuance of such a mandate was entirely outside of the scope of the questions referred to them for decision. This can be proven from passages in the judgment itself. It may be said that it is not, of course, contended that the Governor-General-in-Council was bound to carry out any directions which the Judicial Committee might have given, but that the mere fact that the Judicial Committee had declared that the minority had a "grievance," imposed on the Governor-in-Council a moral obligation to remove that grievance or to do what he could to that end. Now, the expression "grievance" suggests ethical considerations, and it is contended that the use of the word indicates that their Lordships believed that the Manitoba School legislation of 1890 had affected the minority harshly or unjustly. But in their judgment their Lordships make it clear that the ethical character of the enactments is not a question for them to pass upon. Their functions, as they explain, and as was shown in the proceedings, were very limited. In the judgment they say : "The function of a tribunal is limited to construing the words employed." Again, referring to a remark of Justice Taschereau to the effect that the legislation of 1890, having been held to be *intra vires*, could not have illegally affected the rights and privileges of the minority, their Lordships say : "But the word 'illegally' has no place in the subsection in question. The appeal is given if the rights are in fact affected." With the question of the origin or the nature of the "rights" their Lordships have nothing, and take nothing to do. It could be easily shown from their Lordships' judgment in the first appeal, in which the constitutionality of the Act was in question, that they were of the opinion that the Manitoba legislation was sound and just, both morally and economically, as well as legally. Their use of the term "grievance," then, must be an entirely legal, technical one. If it were otherwise they would not only be inconsistent with themselves, but with the facts, and would be exceeding their functions as defined by themselves. If, in the face of all the facts, and of their definition of their functions, and of their own previous judgment, they had actually gone so far as to declare that the Roman Catholic minority had suffered any actual wrong or injustice by the Manitoba legislation of 1890, the uneasiness created in some quarters by the sinister suggestions contained in the communication of Bishop Gravel, would have a very much stronger ground than mere anti-Romanist frenzy. Indeed, a very plausible reason for suspicion that their judgment was as much a political as a judicial deliverance, might be extracted from the fact that, while they expressly declare that the Governor-General in Council has the fullest discretion in the exercise of his functions, they yet suggest a course for him to follow, which it was most improper for them to do, if their own definition of their functions is an accurate one. Yet this palpably obiter suggestion which is inconsistent with even their own expressed opinions, is accepted in the most humble, unreasoning, and unquestioning manner by the Dominion Government as their rule of action.

It is a fact that, it having been decided that they must hear the appeal, the Canadian Government should have investigated the facts on which the prayer of the petitioners was based, and also have considered the nature of the political doctrines involved in the claims of the Separate School party.

It is a fact that the "rights and privileges" which the minority claim, are unjust to, and discriminated against, all other sections of the community.

It is a fact that under the present laws the Roman