

real injustice can take place without its being reversed by the Federal Government." Hon. Wm. Rose: "Now, sir! I believe that the rights of both minorities, the French minority in the General Legislature and the English-speaking minority in the Local Legislature of Lower Canada, are properly guarded. I would admit at once that without this protection Confederation would be open to the gravest objection."

Hon. George Brown: "I admit that from my point of view this is a blot on the scheme before the House. It is confessedly one of the concessions from our side that had to be made to secure this great measure of reform. But assuredly I for one have not the slightest hesitation in accepting it as a necessary condition of the schemes of union."

Alexander MacKenzie: "Though I am against the Separate School System, I am willing to accept this confederation even though it perpetuates a small number of Separate Schools."

Surely if we consider this question in the light of these discussions, we can come to no other conclusion but that, in spite of everything that can be urged against Separate Schools, the much disputed clause referring to education in the Manitoba Act was intended to be a part of the compact admitting Manitoba into Confederation and that it was intended to be acted upon.

If these arguments hold good, and they never have been really answered, so far as an outsider can form an opinion, we seem to be driven to the logical conclusion that either the constitution of the Orange Order is not binding upon all its members, or that any Orangeman who is opposed to all remedial legislation is in honour bound to resign from the Associations. The action of the Grand Master of the Orange Order naturally suggests a query as to what is the real significance which is to be attributed to his utterances. Are they to be taken as the deliberate utterances of a man who is conscious of being the constitutional leader and adviser of a powerful organization, or do they merely voice the sentiments of a number of his supporters, some of whom, in a difficult and involved matter, like the Manitoba School question, might naturally be supposed to be not fully informed and to a certain extent swayed by sectarian tendencies? Can it be that men cannot in these days retain the position of leaders of the people by leading, that in order to be popular it is necessary to pander to unintelligent prejudice? Mr. Clarke Wallace has lost his opportunity. His resignation from the Government was perhaps the only logical sequel of his remarks on the twelfth of July, made to raise an hurrah from "the boys," presumably without any deep study or research made beforehand, but it has undoubtedly largely contributed to the difficulties attending the settlement of this question.

In the late bye-elections the matter has been thrown into the arena of public politics and, as usual, "catch cries" with their half truths have played a prominent part. It is said that the Dominion Government are infringing upon Provincial rights and we must not "muzzle Manitoba." But Provincial rights have a limit. The limit in this case is defined by The Manitoba Act. He might point out that there are other matters in which the Provincial Government has only a partial jurisdiction, e. g., in Railway legislation and marriage laws. No objection has been raised to Dominion Acts which have been passed in these matters over-riding Provincial legislation. Stress has been laid upon the contention that the judgment of the Privy Council is in fact nothing more than the expression of an opinion and that it has no mandatory effect upon the Dominion Parliament. But what difference does it make if we admit that Parliament is bound by this Constitution? Objection has been taken to the Roman Catholic Separate Schools on account of their inefficiency. But the remedy lies in the hands of the Manitoba Government, for by the judgment in the Attorney-General of Manitoba it has been held that they have jurisdiction in such matters and regulations as to the efficiency of the schools could hardly be interpreted as an interference with vested rights. Again it is said we must not force the majority in Manitoba. That is the very object of the Act. Where would be the protection of the Roman Catholic minority in Ontario or the Protestant minority in Quebec if all questions of law and the constitution of the Country were thrown to the winds, and this principle was to hold good? The clauses in question in the Manitoba Act and the British North America Act would in that case be no more than so much waste paper. Each Province would then be left open to a constant change of the law in educa-

tion by varying majorities, a condition of things which must result in never-ending religious feuds and animosities.

The Liberals may admire Sir Mackenzie Bowell's honest and straight forward course, but that they should chuckle in their sleeves is human—or, let us say, party—nature. All parties, however, will agree that it would be nothing short of a national disaster if the Manitoba School question played any prominent part at the general elections. A commission might be a farce and a useless expense, but it would at any rate take the wind out of the sails of Mr. Greenway and Mr. Laurier, and it might be wise to postpone principle to expediency, in order that such a contingency may be avoided.

ERNEST HEATON.

The Revival of Interest in Carlyle.

"Age to age succeeds,
Blowing a noise of tongues and deeds
A dust of systems and of creeds."

OUR attention has been recently called in a special manner to the life and writings of Thomas Carlyle. A little over a month ago Mr. John Morley gave a splendid address in connection with the formal handing over of Carlyle's house in Chelsea to the trustees, and on that occasion Mr. Frederic Harrison and Mr. Birrell contributed their share to the celebration. In a recent able sermon the Rev. Dr. G. A. Smith compared Carlyle to the prophet Amos and to John the Baptist, while contrasting him with such men as Marzzini, Maurice, Kingsley and Shaftsbury. At the same time popular lectures have been delivered throughout the country on this subject by able though less known men. The result of this, so far as England and Scotland are concerned, will, no doubt, be a revival of interest in the life and writings of a man who has played a great part in the literature of the present century. It is to be hoped that something of this influence will be felt here, for, while no one proposes to set up Carlyle as a correct theologian or as a perfect philosopher, we think that he has many things to say which are still worthy of our careful consideration. We pity the youth who does not feel something of Carlyle's impatience with conventionalities, and is not aroused by his fierce denunciations of shams. In these days when there is such a strong tendency to magnify circumstances at the expense of manhood and to regard character as the product of "environment," the life of Carlyle is full both of instruction and inspiration. The difficulties that he met, the doubts that he fought, the criticisms that he endured, were such as would have killed any man who did not possess strong faith in himself and in his destiny. And although Carlyle fought with heroic courage and gained a brilliant victory, we need not be surprised that all through life he felt both in body and soul the effects of the great struggle.

We cannot now attempt a review of his life and work with an elaborate analysis of his teaching and the criticism that it has evoked; our task is more modest. We desire simply to join in the general tribute to this great thinker and "man of letters." As "man of letters," he lived a heroic life, dealing in his own way with religious, political and social questions, following no beaten track, and relying on no small formulas, yet, in all things, proclaiming the need of unflinching courage and downright honesty. One thing is certain, that in his time he exerted a powerful influence for good or ill, and that while some of his work was ephemeral in its character, much of it still lives and speaks with a powerful voice to the heart and the imagination. While there is something of the cynic in his tone and of the despot in his manner, we believe that, on the whole, his testimony is on the side of truth and righteousness. The settlement of the question that Mr. Morley has raised as to the appropriateness of the name "sage" in reference to Carlyle, would demand a definition of the word and a complete analysis of the man, which we are not prepared now to attempt. It is perhaps difficult to describe him better than in his own phrase as "man of letters," in whom there was something philosophic, poetic and almost prophetic.

The style of Carlyle has provoked great discussion and given rise to a great variety of criticism, some regarding it as a barbarous jargon full of useless extravagancies, while others maintain that it is a fair expression of his individual-