

The Catholic Register,

PUBLISHED EVERY THURSDAY,
AT THE
OFFICE, 40, LOMBARD STREET, TORONTO.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION
TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM.

FOR ADVERTISING RATES APPLY AT OFFICE.

TRAVELLING AGENTS
Messrs. Patrick Mungovan, C. N. Murphy,
John P. Mallon and L. O'Byrne.

THURSDAY, MARCH 7, 1895.

Calendar for the Week.

Mar. 8—Holy Lance and Nails.
9—St. Frances.
10—The 40 Martyrs of Sebaste.
11—St. Sophronius.
12—St. Gregory.
13—St. Nicephorus.
14—St. Matilda.

The Globe's Attitude.

In its leading editorial article of Monday, March 4th, the Globe breaks the silence on the Manitoba Schools Question. Last week it was remarked in these columns that no statesmanlike proposition had yet been made on the subject, but that the public was being deceived and permitted itself to be deceived by utterances which no one regarded as genuine expressions of opinion. The Globe has altered that condition.

In effect the article points out that the provisions of the Manitoba Act are troublesome because conferring upon a responsible party government a certain judicial function; that ministers whose continuance in power may depend upon their act will be likely to take advantage of such opportunity as is afforded them rather than give their decision in a true judicial spirit; that the public should remove the possibility of such an expedient by themselves conducting the discussion fully, frankly and dispassionately in the light of the known circumstances of the case and the two judgments of the Privy Council. Notwithstanding the admittedly explicit decision of the Privy Council, the Globe is of the opinion that the question can be better solved without federal interference; that any compulsory measures would lead to desperate resistance on the part of Manitoba and give rise to a renewal of those dissensions on race and religious lines which would become a menace to the peace and progress of the whole Dominion; that in the Maritime Provinces the majority recognizes the responsibilities incident to its authority in so far as its obligations to the minority are concerned; that Parliamentary legislation is necessary to make the Privy Council's decision operative, and that members will be quite as much influenced by their constituents as by the judgment. The Globe then argues that the people of Manitoba are most called upon to study the judgment. Seeming disagreements in the two judgments are quoted as indicating the confusion inevitable if the question is to be considered together with momentous questions concerning trade and other subjects of controversy. Catholics and Protestants in Quebec and Ontario are not yet sufficiently tolerant to give lessons to

Manitoba. The conclusion reached is that the question should be decided by the people of Manitoba in the light of justice and of the best interests of the Provinces. In making this proposition, the Globe is confident that the Manitoba majority will be not only just but generous.

The bare fact that this stand has been taken by the Globe gives a different aspect to the situation. It will not be soon forgotten that the Globe maimed and rendered powerless that formidable underground society of hate and intolerance which twelve months ago seemed to have Ontario in its evil grasp. The paper has still many lessons of toleration to teach. We may rejoice that such is the temper of its advice in the present crisis. It is quite possible that Protestant Ontario would allow its anti-Catholic prejudice to outweigh its sense of the justice of the claims of Manitoba Catholics. The directing tone in the Globe's voice rings with the consciousness that the majority have done wrong. There is no longer the contention that the province has acted within the limit of the powers deputed to it. But it is advocated as the greater wisdom that even though wrong the Province should yet be left to its own sense of generosity.

It is important to notice here the divergence from the claim made on former occasions when interference by the federal authority was either actual or imminent. The several victories gained by Sir Oliver Mowat before the Privy Council all hinged upon the question as to whether certain powers were delegated to the Provinces or to the Dominion. The present crisis is one where there is at stake a principle the recognition of which had as powerful an influence in the accomplishment of Confederation as this deprecation of the interference of one Province in the local affairs of another. The Dominion could never have become an actuality had there not been satisfactory provisions for securing respect for the natural rights of religious minorities. Speaking in 1890, Mr. Laurier made this happy summary of the case: "What they want and what we want is that the rights of the minorities should be respected, that the constitutional guarantees be safeguarded, the Provinces sovereign in their authority and Canada united in its diversity. Such, from my point of view, are the only theories on which the existence of the Canadian Confederation can be maintained." This, it will be observed, is very different from the bold proposition that the Province is supreme in all things, a doctrine advocated with astonishing pertinacity by certain journals concerned only for the triumph of Protestant prejudice. To their credit be it said, the reputable, recognized organs of the denominations are treating the difficulty in such a manner as proves their deep sense of the responsibilities involved.

A strong point in the argument in favor of the matter being settled in Manitoba is the fact that all previous decisions of the Privy Council dealing with disputes between Dominion and Province, with one ex-

ception, have been of the nature of final pronouncements which settled the questions involved and removed them from the field of politics. In this way we have been passing through a period of interpretation of the constitution similar to that experienced by the United States when Marshall was Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. The disputes over the Streams' Bill, the Boundary Award, the Licensing question, were at an end when judgment was pronounced. In the New Brunswick school case there was a difference. After adverse judgment had been given, the question came up for Parliamentary consideration. A resolution was carried in favor of granting remedial legislation to the minority. Party necessities intervening, however, no law was ever passed in support of the principle. This is the difficulty; the rights of the minorities are of equal importance with the rights of the Provinces, yet a decision defining the latter is absolute, while a decision affecting the former is seemingly subject to the exigencies of a political party seeking power in the Dominion. Such a condition is indeed unfortunate. Truly, as the Globe points out, Manitoba should take heed of its position, of the opportunity it has to cement Confederation yet more strongly by apportioning justice according to Mr. Blake's advice, of measure full up and running over.

Unfortunately, while editorially the Globe expresses "confidence that the majority of the people of Manitoba will be just, will regard their very strength as an obligation to be scrupulously just, will be generous rather than be in peril of falling short of complete justice," its own news columns of the same day give cause for doubting its appreciation of the case. The whole case for removing the issue from the Federal arena hinges upon the assumption that the majority will be not only just but generous, yet in the same issue we are informed that in the Manitoba Legislature a motion which would have accomplished everything desired has been rejected by 22 to 10 and that Mr. Greenway thinks of appealing at once to the country confident that a majority will sustain him in his persistent injustice to Catholics.

But leaving probability aside, the sorry fact is that the whole history of Manitoba gives the lie to the assumption of fair treatment. From 1857, Archbishop Tache trembled for the blow that fell at last when his strength was spent and his hair silvered, when his years were heavy upon him and sickness crushed all but his inimitable saintly spirit. The history of the last five years spells, not generosity, but treachery. Guarantees of security have been over-ridden by enactments of confiscation. A stand and deliver order to hand over something more than \$18,000 was the precursor of a law confiscating Catholic school property. Does this inspire confidence? The Manitoba Government defies the Dominion in advance. Does this inspire confidence? Greenway's school law was a violation of unsolicited promises by which he attained power.

Does this inspire confidence? A great church body insists upon the schools being conducted as they are, and holds up its vote as a threat against interference from any source. Does this inspire confidence? Where is there anything to inspire that lofty confidence?

The News makes a mistake which arises either from intention or from carelessness. It interprets the Globe as calling for non-interference on the part of the Dominion and the absolute relegation of the whole question back to Manitoba. Such is not the case. Nowhere in the whole article of more than two columns is the propriety of Federal legislation evaded. The entire argument is simply an admission that the Catholics are right in their claim, and that inasmuch as Manitoba can do justice with less disarrangement of her own plans than would be inevitable under any enactment of an outside authority, Manitoba is enjoined to read the pronouncement of the Privy Council and set about applying the remedy for her own misdeeds. Undeniably this is sound reasoning. Beyond question Manitoba could, if she would, place the whole matter outside controversy. Beyond question, too, any measure favorable to Catholics, put into operation in defiance of the local authorities could be operated only with difficulty and with no end of heart-burning and recrimination. But if Manitoba persists in her present attitude there is nothing in the Globe's article that can be interpreted as accepting that persistence as a finality. What would the Catholics of Ontario, what would the Protestants of Quebec think of their chances for future security if such a policy in regard to Manitoba were to be seriously upheld? If a Protestant triumph in Manitoba is for a moment admissible in spite of the adverse judgment of the Privy Council, why not in Ontario? Quebec is probably above such a trick, but who can see the end of such a quarrel?

There is good ground for the statement that in advising the reference of the question back to Manitoba, even in this way, the Globe speaks for itself and not for the party to which it is attached. In that party as among its opponents there is a practical unity of disposition to do right by the Catholics in order that constitutional guarantees may be respected and, if need be, enforced. It is indeed wise that Manitoba should be appealed to in the name of justice. Her span of grace is however but a brief time. By recognizing her responsibilities and obligations as they are pointed out she may prevent her local affairs becoming a hindrance to the solution of problems pressing for truly national settlement. Otherwise, at whatever present cost to the progress of the country, the terms of the Confederation compact must be enforced.

Opposition to the re-establishment of Manitoba Schools is becoming small by degrees every day and beautifully less. The *Arnprior Chronicle* has the following: The forces of the 'Independents' are made up of Patrons of Industry, McCartys, Prohibitionists, and Manitoba School Law soreheads.