

## LOYAL LAWYER'S LOGICAL LECTURE.

MR. EWART ANSWERS MR. PEDLEY.

He Begins By Praising Him, Then Proves His Principles False And Shameful, Shows That The Only Points On Which Protestants Agree Are Those Which Antagonize Catholic Doctrine Even With Regard To The Ten Commandments, And That They Cannot Agree As To The Fundamentals Of Morality.

### An Undercurrent Of Vivid Humor And Polished Satire.

My first word upon this occasion must be one of thanks to Mr. Pedley and his congregation, for their almost unprecedented kindness in permitting me, from their platform, to make reply to the pastor of their own church. If anyone had ever doubted Mr. Pedley's honest endeavor after impartiality (and I do not think that anyone did) my appearance here to-night will remove his doubt in the most satisfactory manner possible. No one can refrain from admiration for the painstaking and conscientious method in which Mr. Pedley approached the subject. It is one filled with difficulties. It is complicated by legal subtleties that have puzzled some of the ablest judges in Canada; by questions of disputed facts; by problems of morality and religion, of tolerance and freedom, of enlightenment and patriotism. Under these circumstances Mr. Pedley did not rush into the pulpit praying God to send down enlightenment and ready-made wisdom; but getting his books around him he sat down patiently to enlighten himself. And I must congratulate him upon the result of his labors. With one or two almost trifling exceptions he stated the material facts with almost complete exactness. With his reasonings and conclusions from those facts I entirely disagree; and I am here to-night to state why I do so, and to endeavor (with I hope as much fairness and moderation as he showed), to convince you that I am right.

And first let me see what the trouble is all about. One reverend gentleman preached a most vigorous sermon against control of schools by the Roman Catholic church. He abused the church and its management in fine Reformation phraseology, and in ringing tone, whilst poor Rome sat on her seven hills howling with pain and up and down the spiny Apennines ran cold shivers and hot earthquakes. When I informed him through the newspapers that nobody was contending for church control, he naively replied that if that were so there was no use in the sermon. I beg his pardon—the controversy. He should have said no use in the sermon. The Catholics then do not ask for church control. If they did I would not be their advocate. I do not say that it would not be well done. In England their schools are well up to the standard. But I am democratic enough to want to see the people manage their own affairs. I believe it is good for the people, and in the long run good for their affairs.

What then is the trouble all about? To understand the matter we must classify the different kinds of schools. The broadest division of them is into National schools, and Church, and Denominational schools. National schools are those governed by the nation. Church schools are those governed by churches. Separate schools are sometimes national schools, and sometimes church schools, that is, sometimes governed by the nation and sometimes governed by the churches. For our purposes these are the four kinds of schools, and two national schools. (1) Church schools pure and simple, with no assistance from government (St. John's college is an example of this kind); (2) church schools which comply with certain government requirements, and in consideration of their secular work share in the government grant (the English denominational schools are examples of this class); (3) national separate schools which are governed and controlled directly by department of the government (such as the Ontario separate schools); and (4) national separate schools which are governed and controlled indirectly by government, that is, they are governed through a board of education appointed by government. It was to this class that both the Protestant and Catholic schools in Manitoba belonged prior to 1890. They were national and separate.

It is often assumed that if schools are to be called national they must be all EXACTLY ALIKE.

Scotchmen have a national costume, but the tartans differ. There may be national railways, but with different gauges suiting to locality. There are separate waiting rooms at railway stations, but they are all public. If all the schools in Manitoba were governed by the same body, and were identically alike except that in some of them there were certain religious exercises, and in others there were none, would one of these classes cease to be national? If so the act of 1890 provides for schools which may be national. If not then the separate schools of Ontario to-day are national schools. I advocate then the national schools, but I do not propose length, and that peoples' consciences shall be lopped or lengthened to suit the schools. I believe that schools are made

for the people, and not people for the schools, and that the system should be so flexible (to use Dr. Bryce's commendatory word), that all can take advantage of it. I advocate national schools and I oppose church schools. The most obvious criticism of Mr. Pedley's lecture is that he never defined the controversy. Let me endeavor to state the point clearly, for I have always found in conversation that when that was done almost all opposition ceased—that there was no use in the sermon—I mean the controversy.

Let us see what is admitted between Mr. Pedley and me. In the first place we admit that there must be religious teaching in the schools. That I may not do Mr. Pedley wrong I shall quote his words: "Is it the business of the state to provide religious teaching? Is that the conclusion? Yes, but with this qualification that this be done without partiality or injustice." We may judge of the extent to which religion ought to be taught by Mr. Pedley's contention that "it is the business of the state to provide moral training. But moral training will be ineffective unless supported by the sentiments and sanctions of religion." Therefore he says religion must be taught; and therefore religious "sentiments and sanctions" must be taught. He concludes his paragraph in this way: "What then is the duty of the state? First to teach religion in so far as it can do that without violating the fundamental principles of religion; and second to extend all hospitality and encouragement consistent with justice to the agencies whose business it is to teach religion."—not excluding, I suppose, the Catholic church. To my mind it is not far from this to separate schools.

I am quite aware that this may be thought by many here to be an unsatisfactory point from which to start the debate, and many may think that Mr. Pedley has admitted too much—that purely secular schools are the only remedy for the religious question. And I quite admit that it is harder to answer such persons, although it can be done, and done satisfactorily. But I think that there is no difficulty whatever in answering Mr. Pedley, and those who take the stand that he does; and it is for that purpose that I am here to-night.

Let us see how far we have got: (1) The schools are not to be under church control; and (2) there must be teaching in them of religious "sentiments and sanctions." Is there any thing else we can agree about? Yes. We can agree (3) that all schools are to work up to the same secular standard; (4) that the teachers in all the schools shall pass the same examinations and be certificated in the same way, because of the same qualifications; (5) that all schools shall use the same books, with this almost unnecessary proviso that there shall be nothing in them offensive to any religious body; (6) that all schools shall be subject to state inspection; (7) and that by these, or other means which can be devised, the education of all the children in Manitoba shall be as general, and as efficient as it is possible to make it.

Now, am I right as to this? Let me see. As counsel for the Roman Catholic minority in this province, and with their authority, in addressing His Excellency the Governor-General-in-Council, I said, and I repeat it here to-night: "They do not ask that their church should in any way control the schools. They are perfectly willing to work up to any STATE-PRESCRIBED STANDARD of secular instruction, to be subjected to inspection, and to use school books not at variance with their religious doctrines." I put it to this audience if that is not reasonable. Catholics are perfectly willing to be bound by, and are anxious to co-operate in, every arrangement necessary for the secular, if thought well the compulsory, education of all the children in Manitoba.

Then what is the fight all about? Well, from a Protestant standpoint it is about almost nothing at all—it is little more than this: First: Given that there ought to be religion in the schools, and answering Mr. Pedley I assume (that point), ought the Protestants or the Catholics have the right to prescribe its kind and its quality, in schools to which none but Catholics attend? and second, if this be decided in favor of the Catholics, ought Protestants to endeavor to force Catholics to attend schools at which Protestant children may also be present, in order that Protestants may thus acquire a standing ground from which to dictate the kind and quantity of religion the Catholic are to have?

The trouble is that same old difficulty of getting people to agree about religion. The Protestants (so far as represented by Mr. Pedley), agree that there ought to be religion ("the sentiments and sanction" of it), in the schools, and they cut off a portion, and say: "This much ought to be satisfactory to everybody. The Catholics on the other hand say: 'It is not satisfactory to us.'"

Would anyone think that there could

be agreement upon such a question? One would have thought that after all the centuries of effort to make people agree upon the most trifling points in religion that it would long ago have been given up as wholly impracticable. But no, here it is again, Mr. Pedley says: "Here is some religion that everybody ought to agree to," and here is the eternal answer, that they won't.

One of the best known efforts to get everybody to agree was the English church service. In the preface we find the following account of itself: "It is more profitable, because here are left out many things, whereof some are untrue, some uncertain, some vain and superstitious; and nothing is ordained to be read but the very pure word of God, the Holy Scriptures, or that which is agreeable to the same; and that in such a language, and order, as is most easy and plain for the understanding, both of the readers and hearers. It is also more commodious, both for the shortness thereof and for the plainness of the order; and for that the rules be few and easy; and whereas heretofore there hath been great diversity in saying and singing in churches within the realm, now from henceforth all the whole realm shall have but one use." "But one use" throughout the whole realm! That was a grand and inspiring idea, but what has come of it? We go from a high church to a low one, and we cannot tell that they even belonged to the same denomination, each having its own use as before.

Queen Elizabeth's parliament over 300 years ago passed an act to establish uniformity. It proposed to "obliterate all lines of demarcation in the state that distinguish creeds, to establish uniformity, to promote harmony and good fellowship, by dint of statutory pressure. When the Emperor Ferdinand interceded on behalf of the Catholics he was told: "The Queen declares that she cannot grant churches to those who disagree from her religion, being against the law of her parliament, and highly dangerous to the state of her kingdom, as it would sow various opinions in the nation, to distract the minds of honest men, and would cherish parties and factions that might disturb the present tranquillity of the commonwealth." (Hallam's Hist. of Eng., Cap. III.) The author adds: "Yet enough had already occurred in France to lead observing men to suspect that severities and restrictions are by no means an infallible specific to prevent, or subdue, religious factions."

Of course the statute failed in its object, as have always, and in every place failed all similar ordinances. With such experience to aid our judgments, I would hardly have imagined that any one now living believed that unity and good fellowship could be brought about in that way, and would argue in all seriousness what Lowell wrote in satire:

I do believe wotever trash  
"I'll keep the peace and blindness—  
That we the Mexicans can thrash  
Right in brotherly kindness.  
Knock down the grape, an powder 'n ball  
Air good-will's strongest magic,  
That peace, to make it stick at all,  
Must be drawn in with bagnets."

If Mr. Greenway really is moved by kindly feeling towards the Catholics, and is legislating for their good, does he not, by confiscating all their schools, furniture, apparatus, money and all else, at least leave himself open to the question: "Perhaps you did right to dismember your love, but why did you kick us down stairs?" Mr. Pedley would have us send the bill to Ottawa, so he tells us!

But we need not go back to the Tudors and Stuarts for examples of the stiffness of religious views, and the tenderness of conscience in what to others seem to be small matters. At a stone's throw from this church I can throw others on to Grace church, Westminster church, and send a golf ball to Holy Trinity. Tell me the difference in doctrine between a Congregationalist, a Methodist, a Presbyterian, an Episcopalian, and a post-nominalist a Baptist? What keeps do they spend thousands of dollars annually in competition with one another in the little villages of the west? If you ask them they will tell you conscience. To one somewhat free from theological prejudices this seems very extraordinary, but I cannot and do not question their sincerity.

With history behind us then, and all these rival churches around us, what ought we to expect from an attempt to get Protestant and Catholic to agree upon the character and quantity of religious "sentiments and sanctions" to be taught in our schools? To my mind it is as clear as the sun at noon-day that the task is one impossible of performance, and that the attempt is one of utter foolishness. I can understand that man who says, well, if they can't agree then we must have none at all; but with great deference to Mr. Pedley, I cannot understand the man who says, there must be religion in the schools, but Mr. Greenway and Mr. Martin (although under no charge of theological prejudice) are to cut off the quantity to be used by everybody. This to my mind is requiring people to fit the school act, and not making a school act.

TO FIT THE PEOPLE.

What then do we want? We are willing to work up to secular standard prescribed by the state; to employ state certificated teachers; to use state selected books (if not antagonistic to Catholic religion); to be subjected to state inspection, and to be free from church control. That I think, is all that the state can require of us, and ought to be a sufficient answer to suggestions of inefficiency and illiteracy; and in return we ask that in schools in which there are none but Roman Catholics, the religious "sentiments and sanctions" to be taught shall be such as we choose, and not those selected by others, however

free from theological prejudice. Is this reasonable or is it not? To test it let me answer some of the objections made to it.

First objection—There is nothing in (1) the religious exercises or (2) instruction which have been prescribed that Catholics can reasonably find fault with. There is the old trouble, one man telling another what he would think if he were only reasonable. To my mind if the Protestant denominations were only reasonable they would unite. But they won't, and what can I do? Legislate for them, as though they ought to, and pass an act of uniformity, with a magnificent ideal of one use throughout the whole realm, or recognize the fact that they differ and have a perfect right to, if it pleases them, of if they are built that way?

Let us see how the Privy Council met this point, for the same thing was argued before them. Their Lordships said: "There may be many too who share the view expressed in one of the affidavits in Barrett's case, that there should not be any conscientious objections on the part of Roman Catholics to attend such schools, if adequate means be provided elsewhere of giving such moral and religious training as may be desired. But all this is not to the purpose. As a matter of fact the objection of Roman Catholics to schools such as alone receive state aid under the act of 1890 is conscientious and deeply rooted."

During the argument one good Irish judge said of Dr. Bryce who made the affidavit: "This gentleman gives it as his individual opinion that the Catholic religion ought to be something entirely different from what it is."

Ought I have to go any further upon this point? In a British colony and speaking to law abiding Canadians, are we not to well submitted to submitting our personal opinions to the final arbitration of courts of law, too well accustomed to recognize that for disputes, constitutional as well as private, there must be some method of peaceful solution, to make it necessary for me to prove that this judgment of the Privy Council is correct? It is unnecessary, and yet that the Catholic position may be shown to be reasonable, as well as legal, I shall pursue the subject a little further.

What then is there in the religious exercises (first) that we object to? Nothing; but suppose I complain of my porridge, that there is no salt in it, ought I to be roughly put down with the statement that there was nothing in it that I objected to?

Let me apply this method of reasoning to the Protestants and see if they will follow it. In the prayer prescribed for the schools I find these words: "For the sake of Jesus Christ, thy Son, our Lord." Now upon the principle that the schools should be (as Mr. Pedley contends) non-sectarian and for Jew and Gentile alike, those words ought to be struck out of the prayer, for no Jew would use them, nor would any Unitarian. But if the words were eliminated no Protestant would use the prayer. I then might say to him, What do you object to? There is nothing in the prayer that you can complain of. And he would say, No, but there is something left out, the same way. I say that the present religious exercises are Protestant. Any one acquainted with the differences between Protestant and Catholic would at once say so and not because of anything in them but because of what is left out.

Then as to the instruction prescribed we object not only to its quantity but to its quality, when in the hands of Protestant teachers. The regulations say: "To establish the habit of right doing, instruction in moral principles must be accompanied by training in moral practices. The teacher's influence and example, current incidents, stories, memorization, didactic talks, teaching the ten commandments, etc., are means to be employed." Am I wrong in saying that that programme sounds very like one for a Sunday school? And are Catholics unreasonable in saying that in the hands of Protestant teachers the flavor of the memory gems, didactic talks, etc., would be Protestant? It could not possibly be otherwise. I defy any Presbyterian to instance who believes his catechism to conscientiously teach the ten commandments without coming in direct conflict with Roman Catholic doctrine. And if we are to assume that the teachers are non-sectarian too—gentlemen without theological prejudices—what reason is he to give to the children why the Protestant divide the Catholics' first commandment into two, making up for it by adding their ninth and tenth together. When he is teaching the Protestants' second commandment is he to state that it is a special commandment aimed at Roman Catholic images and relics? or is he to explain, "Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image," as the Catholics explain that language? And when he comes to the Protestants' fourth commandment enjoining the keeping of Sunday (it is the Catholic third), shall he inculcate Protestant or Catholic belief as to the lawfulness of recreation, and works of liberal, and artistic, character? Let Protestants tell me that they are willing to have their children taught the Ten Commandments by Roman Catholics, and I shall then, but not till then, acknowledge that the present schools are unsectarian. I pray Mr. Pedley to make a note of this for his reply.

I have with me the Presbyterian and the Roman Catholic methods of teaching the decalogue. According to the Presbyterian, one of the sins forbidden by the first commandment is "Praying to saints, making men lords of our faith and conscience," etc.; one of the sins forbidden by the second is "the making of any representation of God, of all, or any of these persons, either inwardly in our mind, or outwardly in any kind

of image or likeness of any creature whatsoever; all worshipping of it, or God in it or by it," etc.; one of the sins forbidden by the third is "the maintaining of false doctrines, etc.; one of the sins prohibited by the fourth is "all profaning the day by..... recreations," and so on. Does any one tell me that for a Presbyterian believing that these are sins, and that they are prohibited by the ten commandments, to teach the decalogue and say nothing about them? I need not stay to contrast the lesson drawn by the Roman Catholics from the same Commandments. Suffice it to say that they are such as are anathematized by all Protestants.

It is sometimes said that the apostles' creed is non-sectarian and could be taught to all children alike. Not to mention the children without theological prejudices, and the Jews who do not believe the creed, what would the non-sectarian teacher tell the children was the explanation of "He descended into hell?" Catholics have one view and Protestants various others. Without dwelling further upon this point I am prepared to say, after a careful study of the question that it is not within the wit of man to devise a means of co-education in religion which shall be satisfactory to Protestants and Catholics alike.

You will observe that I have been showing that Protestants and Catholics

upon very simple matters connected with religion—not even the decalogue which is taught in the 1890 schools. But even if they could agree on these rudimentary points such quantity of religion would fall far short of the allowance which Mr. Pedley has agreed ought to be provided by the state; according to his view, and the Roman Catholic view, the foundations of morality—the religious "sentiments and sanctions" of it must be taught. Now, Mr. Pedley, I have a conundrum for you. Morality is based upon religion, but upon what religion? Is it the Christian religion? Then it must be taught in the schools, is it not? And then what becomes of the Jews and Unitarians? and what of our boasted non-sectarian schools—schools open to every one and providing for every one, Jew and Gentile alike? And another conundrum: Morality is based, shall we say, on the Christian religion (and the Jews and Unitarians can go to where and what parts of it, and what are the essentials of it? Does Mr. Pedley really propose that everybody is under penalty of paying for two sets of schools, to have to agree upon these points? I beg that he will not in reply say: Surely Protestants and Catholics can agree upon the broad fundamentals of religion. I say in advance while broadly they do agree, particularly if you must teach that way they do not; that if you are going to teach religion you do not teach it in a lump, but specifically, and there is no possibility of agreement. I make the audience this offer: Let as many as like write down specifically the religious sentiments and religious sanctions which they think are the foundations of morality. If Mr. Pedley's reply we shall see if any one in this audience agrees with him. If any single individual does agree with him I will pay \$25 to the Children's Home.

Second objection—That it is necessary to the upbuilding of national unity that all children should go to the same schools. Is it? Then how comes it that England to-day is probably the highest type of national unity on the face of the earth? Did English boys all go to the same schools when Crecy and Agincourt, Salamanca and Waterloo were fought? Not at all. The idea then was individually rather than similarity. Moreover this idea of putting boys into the same mould, and turning them out exactly alike, is the most mistaken of all ideas relating to education. The world has made more progress on the principle of diversity, than of similarity, a thousand times over. The principle of similarity is in many respects the principle of intolerance and stagnation, whereas the principle of individual liberty is the principle of good fellowship and progress.

This objection is sometimes put in this way: That in common schools children of different denominations will cease to have theological prejudices, I suppose. I do not think so. If we are to get rid of theological prejudices we need not commence at the schools, for there are none there. It is, I am sorry to say, at the pulpits that we must work—the pulpits of Protestants and Catholics alike—at some very little, but still to some extent, the Protestant and Catholic pulpits respectively deserved, to the extent that they respectively deserved, the congregation would not be behind. The antagonism is, to my mind, largely professional, for in business and social intercourse we know nothing of it, we never hear of it.

Let me give you an example. A short time ago the Methodist ministers of this city passed the following resolution and directed it to be sent to every Methodist minister with a request that he should preach upon it: "The Methodist Ministerial Association of Winnipeg, to the Dominion Cabinet, Ottawa, Sir McKenzie Bowell, premier—Fearing lest silence be construed as indifference, we respectfully, but firmly, protest against interference with the school system of Manitoba as established by law. First, because by this law no injustice is done to any individual; secondly, because such interference would infringe upon provincial rights which are sacred, having been uniformly recognized since confederation, notably in dealing with the Jesuits' estates question." (Sgd.) Geo. R. Turk, president; F. S. Fletcher, sec-

Country.	Catholics.	Protestants.	Schools to which Catholics go.
Switzerland.....	1,084,400	1,577,700	505
German Empire.....	14,887,500	25,690,700	162
Luxembourg.....	197,000	400	142
Norway.....	3	1,704,800	138
Sweden.....	600	4,203,500	138
Netherlands.....	1,313,000	2,188,000	138
Denmark.....	1,900	1,865,000	135
Belgium.....	35,283,000	610,800	151
Austria.....	4,980,000	15,000	123
Great Britain.....	27,904,300	3,571,000	100
Spain.....	4,900,000	25,900,000	83
Italy.....	16,500,000	85,000	52
.....	26,750,000	85,000	70

But all these statistics prove nothing to us. The ethnological differences of the people must be taken into account; and this fact also that the figures of years ago would be very different. England is doing very well now, but prior to 1870 her standing was deplorable. Italy's spurt came a few years later, but as you may see from the report of the United States commissioners of education of 1888-9, p. xlv.: "In no state of Europe have more strenuous efforts been made to provide for education by public schools. The expenditure for 1886 amounted to \$20,000,000, of which the national government furnished nearly one-third. Over 10 per cent. of the entire population are enrolled in schools." Italy was one of Mr. Pedley's horrible examples! Statistics are also quoted from our own province. It is said that only 25 per cent. of the French halfbreeds can read or write. I am assured that it is much greater than that, but am surprised to hear that it is so great. Dr. Bryce has compared the French halfbreeds to roadsters, and the English to the tongue of many of those called French is Cree, and their habits until recent years have been those of the roving hunter and voyageur. Why then charge their illiteracy to the Catholic schools? Why not as well charge it to the Protestant schools? Of this 25 per cent. of illiterates how many owe their education to others than Catholics? Credit the Catholics, I say, with 75 per cent. Do not debit them with 45 (even were Catholics responsible), to ask the same results from wild mustangs as from patient roadsters? In the United States educational census there is a separate column for civilized Indians, colored people, etc. It is not the best column!

Perhaps the best means of ascertaining whether the separate schools system is injurious is to ascertain how it works in Ontario. There the supporters of both schools are much the same, and the conditions are identical. How does it operate there illiterate? If you will turn to the Canadian statistical year book for 1894, at page 851, you will find the statement: "The average attendances at the separate schools, being 57 per cent. of the total number of pupils; while the average cost per pupil both on total attendance, and on average attendance, was less than the public schools." I commend this as a text for the Methodist sermons in substitution for their bad-fact resolution. Fourth objection—The objection of defective education is better put by Mr. Pedley when he says that in cases where the population is sparse and mixed, so that there are not enough make two good schools. This is a valid objection and must be met.

First let us see the extent of the difficulty. Dr. Bryce has said: "Out of 719 school districts in Manitoba when the act of 1890 was passed 91 were Catholic. Of these all but a very small percentage are in localities almost entirely French." This small percentage must be in cities and towns where there are enough Protestants and Catholics to form two efficient schools. So when we look vanishes. For the few remaining cases the co-vent school in this city would answer the objection. In that school seeking the benefit of defective education and illiteracy. There while the Catholic children for half an hour learn their catechism other employment is provided for the Protestants. But whether or not that would be satisfactory, I do say that it is not a reason for abolishing a whole system, that there are a few cases in which special arrangements ought to be made.

The Northwest Review

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY WEDNESDAY IN WINNIPEG, WITH THE APPROVAL OF THE ECCLESIASTICAL AUTHORITY. Northwest Review Office, No. 40 Mary Street. P. KLINKHAMMER, Business-Manager.

THE REVIEW is on sale at the following places: Hart & McPherson's, Booksellers, 36 1/2 Main street; and the Ferguson's Co., Bookellers, 408 Main St.

ADVERTISING RATES. Made known on application. Orders to discontinue advertisements must be sent to this office in writing. Advertisements unaccompanied by specific instructions inserted until ordered out.

Subscription Rates. All Postage is paid by the Publishers. The Northwest Review \$2 a year, \$1 for six months. Single Copies. Six copies of the Northwest Review for \$10. In ordering for clubs, the full number of subscriptions, with the cash must be sent at one time.

Agents wanted to canvass for the Northwest Review, in every town in the Northwest, written for terms. A Catholic correspondent wanted in every important town. The Northwest Review is the official organ for Manitoba and the Northwest of the Catholic Mutual Benefit Association.

NOTICE.

The editor will always gladly receive (1) Articles on Catholic matters, matters of general or local importance, even political if not of a party character. (2) Letters on similar subjects, whether conveying or asking information or controversial. (3) News Notes, especially such as are of a Catholic character, from every district in North Western Ontario, Manitoba, the Territories and British Columbia. (4) Notes of the proceedings of every Catholic society throughout the city or country. Such notes will prove of much benefit to the society themselves by making their work known to the public.

The Northwest Review

WEDNESDAY, MAY 8.

EDITORIAL COMMENT.

One excellent point made by Mr. Ewart was his defying a Protestant audience to produce two persons among them who should agree upon what are the foundations of morality. He offered to pay \$25 to the Children's Home if any one of the vast audience in the Congregational Church could be found to agree on this question with the Reverend Hugh Pedley. Of course no one answered the challenge.

The fact that the Rev. Hugh Pedley, pastor of the Congregational church, consented to let Mr. Ewart, our counsel in the school case, reply to him from his own pulpit, affords strong presumptive evidence that the Congregational minister was convinced of the justice of his views. Else, we can hardly understand how, after Mr. Ewart's past achievements and in the teeth of his known ability, Mr. Pedley could have exposed himself to so crushing a defeat as that which fell to his lot Monday of last week.

Mr. Fisher has published an able letter in favor of the Ontario system of separate schools. Mr. Fisher's intentions are excellent; but we think he grants too much as to the inefficiency of our Catholic schools before 1890. Of course we cannot expect him to see, as we very clearly do, that, however backward a Catholic school may be in secular subjects, the mere fact of the religious training imparted therein makes it superior to the most scholarly Protestant school. A child that knows its Catholic catechism has a grasp on intellectual and moral truths which the most learned non-Catholic lacks. But, even apart from that religious training which runs through all the exercises of a Catholic school, it is not true to say that the majority of Protestant schools were better taught than the majority of Catholic schools. Some Catholic schools were more scholarly than any Protestant schools; some Protestant schools were more accurate and thorough than some Catholic schools; a few Protestant schools in the remote country parts, with only six months' teaching by a teacher whose only object was money-making, were inferior to any Catholic schools.

WHAT THE MEETING WAS LIKE.

In this issue we give up the greater part of our columns to Mr. Ewart's lecture on the school question delivered in the Congregational Church of this city on Monday evening of last week. It was such an important contribution to the controversy which has been carried on since the issue of the "Remedial Order," and was so complete and crushing a reply to the Rev. Mr. Pedley (and, we may add to the other ministers who have of late so freely expressed their views) that we feel our readers would not forgive us if we failed to present them with a verbatim report, even though in doing so we are compelled to leave out a great deal of other interesting matter which would otherwise have found a place in this number. But besides the lecture itself there were many points about this unique meeting which will interest our readers and we will therefore here endeavour in a few words to present them as they appeared to us. It was the second time in our experience that we found ourselves in the Congregational Church. We were there for the first time when Mr. Pedley lectured, and as our readers know we

were on that occasion greatly disappointed both with what we heard and what we saw. Mr. Pedley did not come up to our expectations as a lecturer; we soon discovered that he was not at all what his reputation had led us to think he was; and we liked neither his style nor his tone. Again, the audience was not as large as one nor so representative as we had looked for, and speaking generally all the incidents of the evening showed that the whole institution—pastor, church and people—had been in many respects greatly overrated. Let us compare this with our feelings and experience at the meeting on Monday evening last. On arriving at the church some half hour before the lecture was to commence we found a large number already assembled, and by the time Mr. W. B. Scarth advanced to the rostrum to take the chair there was certainly not a vacant seat on either the ground floor or in the galleries, and many were standing. By far the greater part of those present were men, and Winnipeg's best and most intelligent citizens of all creeds and classes were fully represented. Then, well we were going to compare the two lecturers, but we won't be so hard as that on poor Mr. Pedley, for we must confess that it would indeed be too cruel to contrast his undignified address, abounding as it did in unpleasant mannerisms, cheap claptrap, and flimsy humbug, with the calm, judicial, learned, logical and convincing statement of facts, interspersed with flashes of wit and sarcasm, to which we were treated by the earnest Queen's counsel. We would add that the last lecture was evidently hugely enjoyed by the bulk of those present, and although it may be that the applause which greeted Mr. Ewart was not so boisterous as that which Mr. Pedley received we can easily account for this when we consider that "empty kettles make most sound," and that the audience was largely made up of those who whilst able to appreciate to the full the real point at issue would not be likely to make a noisy demonstration of their feeling.

At the close of the lecture various questions were put to Mr. Ewart from the audience, and satisfactorily answered. Indeed we may say that one or two of the questioners after Mr. Ewart had got through with them and their queries would have been very glad of a convenient hole into which to crawl and to hide themselves from the public gaze.

The interesting feature of the meeting concluded, Mr. Pedley stepped to the front avowedly for the purpose of replying to the lecture, but if his speech was remarkable for anything it was for the careful manner in which he seemed to avoid touching in the slightest degree on Mr. Ewart's argument. He had evidently prepared his remarks beforehand—for they were entirely made up of a rehash of the sophistries, special pleading and pandering to popular prejudice which characterized his lecture. One of the most noticeable things he said, and so far as we could see the only one in which he really attempted to reply to Mr. Ewart, was regarding the danger in the public school of Presbyterian or other Protestant teachers teaching the ten commandments from a sectarian point of view. Mr. Pedley seemed to admit this was true, for said he: "suppose this is so haven't the Catholics the same chance? Can't Catholics take positions as teachers in the public schools, and teach the same commandments from their point of view, and thus even things up?" We must confess that when Mr. Pedley made this statement he was apparently rather badly "rattled"; he had wandered away from his prepared speech, and was evidently confused and not quite aware of what he was really saying or whether he was drifting.

After Mr. Pedley was through came the most amusing scene of the whole evening, being nothing less than a battle royal between two Protestant divines, viz. the Anglican canon O'Meara and the Baptist minister Grant. The latter had stated positively that the archbishop of Rupert's Land had definitely said it was his intention soon to start Church of England separate schools. Canon O'Meara flatly denied this. Mr. Grant attempted to support his assertions by reading from a book the utterances of the archbishop, but the canon charged that he was only reading a garbled extract wrenched from its context, and that if he wished to be fair he must, in order that the people could judge properly, read the whole matter. Mr. Grant apparently objected to do this, and there was quite a scene during which the chairman of the meeting had to exercise his authority in keeping order between the two reverend gentlemen, and the whole episode finished in, to our mind, a complete victory for the Canon, who certainly succeeded in placing the Rev. Mr. Grant in a most unenviable position. We have, however, a word of praise for Dr. Grant, for he is one of the few Protestant ministers who apparently appreciate the real point at issue. During the squabble he distinctly told the audience that it was nonsense to talk of maintaining the existing school system under our present constitution, and that if they wanted to abolish separate schools, they must set to work to have the constitution changed.

It will be seen from this brief statement that three ministers figured prominently in Monday night's meeting. They each hold a different opinion regarding education and our present school law. Mr. Pedley says religion must have a place in the school and that the amount now there is just enough; Canon O'Meara

says religion must have a place in the school, but that there is not sufficient present, in fact there should be much more; Mr. Grant says there should be no religion in the schools but they should be purely secular. The audience thoroughly enjoyed the spectacle, and for a time whistled the difficulty between Canon O'Meara and Mr. Grant was at its height there was a perfect babel of sounds and confusion. Each of the contestants received the hearty approbation of a section of the audience which encouraged them with cheers of approval on the one hand and shouts of derision on the other, but the bulk of the crowd took no side in the dispute evidently looking upon the matter as the comedy element in the evening's entertainment which gave them the opportunity of enjoying a hearty laugh at the expense of the principals. When order had been again restored Mr. Pedley, evidently anxious to finally put an end to the disturbance, hastily moved a vote of thanks to the chairman, which was seconded by Mr. Ewart and carried unanimously. Mr. Scarth in reply tendered the thanks of the meeting to both Mr. Ewart and Mr. Pedley and "God Save the Queen" having been sung the gathering dispersed, many, however, staying behind for some time to examine the exhibition of separate school work and books which Mr. Ewart had had arranged on the rostrum.

ARCHBISHOP LANGEVIN.

Addresses a Large Congregation in Montreal on the Past and Present Aspect of the Manitoba School Question.

MONTREAL, April 28.—Archbishop Langevin, of St. Boniface, delivered a memorable address before fully five thousand people in the church of Notre Dame, in this city, this afternoon. It was the occasion of a special service for the blessing of a number of statues for the Colonization society, and the Archbishop of St. Boniface officiated with Archbishop Fabre. The church was crowded with a large congregation anxious to hear the first public utterance of the new archbishop in his native city since his consecration as Archbishop Tache's successor. It was a great opportunity and His Grace took advantage of it to deliver a strong address in which he placed the attitude of the Catholics in Manitoba on the school question before the public in the clearest possible light. He said, in substance: "There is one question to which I wish specially to refer, on this first occasion of my addressing the people of this great city of Montreal since my consecration as the successor of my illustrious predecessor, Mgr. Tache. I refer to the Manitoba school question, which is now occupying the public mind and engaging the attention of all patriots. It is a question of the first importance, and we, Catholics of Manitoba, require and expect the assistance and support of all our compatriots in this struggle that we are making against persecution and oppression. It has been claimed by our enemies that by the policy pursued towards our schools we, the French-Canadians and Catholics of Manitoba, had been conquered. Oh, no. We have not been conquered; we have been persecuted. We have been oppressed, but we are not conquered, and will not be conquered. As long as the memory of that sainted man, Mgr. Tache, survives, and as long as Heaven gives me force and vigor to continue the struggle, we will not be conquered. The Catholics of Manitoba know their rights, and they demand that they shall be respected. They have been recognized by that dear mother who has ever accorded us justice, Great Britain, to whom we owe a deep debt of gratitude, and by the voice of our illustrious queen and sovereign herself it has been decreed that our just rights must be respected. We are entitled to have our schools free, not only in justice, not only by sacred guarantees and the constitution, but they are recognized by the highest authority in the empire. When that decision was given our schools emerged from the tomb. They lived; the cause of liberty and justice was won; they lived by the voice of the highest constitutional body in the empire. The cause was won and the Catholic schools of Manitoba must continue to have their freedom. And why should the Catholics of Manitoba not enjoy equal rights to those accorded to the Protestant minority of the Province of Quebec? Have the French-Canadians and Catholics not shed their blood for the empire as well as the maintenance of the race? Why should they, any more than other people, be deprived of rights guaranteed to them by the constitution and by most sacred pledges? It has been said that there might be a compromise on this question. There can be no compromise. Those who proposed a compromise do not understand the Catholics of Manitoba, and are not their friends. There can be no compromise, I wish to be perfectly plain. The Catholics of Manitoba are entitled to the full liberty of their schools, and there can be no retreat from that position. There can be no compromise as long as the ashes of that sainted man, Mgr. Tache, who gave his life to this work, rest by the banks of the Red river. As long as the British flag floats over this Dominion we shall maintain the rights guaranteed by the constitution—the right to the freedom of our schools. The struggle will be continued until full and complete justice is rendered to the Catholics of Manitoba. It has been stated that the Catholics of the North West are not united on this question—that some are in favor of separate schools. It is false. There is but one feeling amongst our people, and that is that our rights must be respected." Archbishop Langevin said that an effort had been made through the local school inspectors to create a division between the Metis and the Manitoba Catholics, but it had failed. "We are one on this question," continued the speaker. "There is but one feeling, one conviction, amongst the whole Catholic population of the North West, and that is that our schools must be guarded free and inviolate. I earnestly appeal to you, our brethren in the province of Quebec, for succour. Aid us by your efforts and your prayers. Our public men have a duty to perform—a national, patriotic, religious duty. It is not a party question, it is a question of right and justice. There can be no compromise. Those who are not for us are against us. Let our public men do their duty until full justice is rendered."

Loyal Lawyer's Logical Lecture.

(Continued from page one.)

Those who want more religion than there now is, and of a different character; and (3) those who want none at all. Now upon the principle of equal rights to all and special privileges to none, what are we to do? Make all the schools of one pattern so as to suit one of these parties; or have a flexible system, to fit so far as possible, the desires of all? There can be but one answer to that question. Prior to 1890 when Protestants had complete control of their schools they made them similar to the schools under the 1890 act—they made them I assume, as they wanted to have them, for they had power to do as they pleased. Protestants then have their way in the schools which they attend. If, too, those who do not want religion at all in the schools have liberty to withdraw, everybody is satisfied; everybody, as far as practicable, has his way, and no one has any special privileges.

If I am told that the distinctive principles of Congregationalism, Presbyterianism, etc., are not taught, I answer that there is no distinctive principle in those portions of their religion upon which morality is founded. There is no distinction in any part of their religion, as practically held, as far as I have ever been able to make out.

Many here, as I have said, probably think that Mr. Pedley gave away his whole case when he admitted that it was "the business of the state to provide religious teaching." I think so, too, but I do not require his admission. I have never contended that such is the business of the state. All that I have ever urged is that the state should not interfere to prevent it. Our schools are managed by school trustees. Now if the trustees were not prohibited, as they are by statute, from teaching the children the religion of the denomination to which they all belong, much that I contend they would be granted. Why should not the trustees have power to teach the religion which the parents of all the children in the school desire? And why should they be bound down to the doses prescribed by people who do not agree with them? I take my stand upon liberty and freedom in matters pertaining to religion.

I have said that from a Protestant standpoint the fight is about almost nothing at all.

I shall proceed to prove that, 1, by reference to New Brunswick and Nova Scotia; 2, by the action of the Greenway government; and 3, by Mr. Dalton McCarthy.

1. In New Brunswick and Nova Scotia there are by law no separate schools. Nevertheless they are there in full operation as a matter of practice. In the rural districts, where there are none but Catholics, the schools are Catholic schools; and in the cities, where there are enough to form two schools, Catholics go to one and the Protestants go to the other. Now this is done by the consent of everybody, and is found to be such a small matter that no one thinks of objecting to it.

2. The same system is in operation in our province in some thirty rural districts, with the direct sanction of the Greenway government. I say that although it is quite illegal, yet that the government has made such arrangements as have enabled about thirty schools that were formerly called Catholic schools, now to be called public schools. The same trustees are there, the same teachers, the same scholars, the same religious exercises and teaching, but with this difference, that the children are kept in half an hour longer than they used to be—the religious teaching used to be at sometime between 9 and 4 o'clock, and now it is between 4 and 4.30. Now that is quite a proper arrangement, and sometimes a necessary one, when the children are of mixed religions; but when they are all Catholic, I can see no necessity for it, but, on the contrary, some useless annoyance, and possibly, physical injury to the children. Then what is the effect of these arrangements? Why are they abolished by law they are set up again by general consent. Is not that a small matter?

3. Now what is the answer to what I have said? Well I do not know if there is any other, but I shall give you the one offered by Mr. Dalton McCarthy in the recent debate in Ottawa. He said: "In the provinces that are free we are told, and it is the best possible argument that can be urged, that so tolerant are the majority, so willing are they to yield rights which could not be legally claimed, that, to adopt the language of my learned friend, we wink at infractions of the public school law, so that it almost becomes a separate school system. And they do it willingly. But it is one thing to compel people to do a thing and it is another thing to leave it to their free choice. It is a strong argument in favor of allowing the people of Manitoba to work out their own salvation without interference."

Then what is the small thing being fought for? Verily, nothing but this that the law may be one way so that Protestants may have a chance to wink at the practice which they are quite willing should be the other way. If that is not a small thing it is at any rate a very curious thing. Mr. Pedley said to me as did McCarthy: Why do you complain if you practically have your separate schools? And I should answer him as I did Mr. McCarthy: "With such a government as we have to-day, or with such a government as we may have from time to time, we are not sure that the winking will be carried on as steadily, as before. Or I might adopt Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper's remark to me: 'I suppose that what you are afraid of is that it may be a long time between winks.'"

THE UNION COMPACT.

In 1869 Canada desired to acquire Rupert's Land; and the inhabitants there, having indicated that they would like to be advised of the proposed methods of government, Canada sent to them three commissioners. At their instance a mass meeting was held at Fort Garry on the 19th of January, 1870. It was held in the open air, although the thermometer stood at 20 below zero, because of the number present. It was there unanimously resolved (1) that forty representatives should be elected, with the object of considering the subject of Mr. Smith's commission, and to decide what would be best for the welfare of the country; and (2) that a committee consisting of

Thos. Bunn, the Rev. J. Black, the Bishop of Rupert's Land, John Sutherland and John Fraser, be appointed to meet and apportion the English representatives for the different parishes in the settlement, and to determine the mode of election.

The elections were held, and on the 26th January the convention met for business. Lord Dufferin says that it "was composed of a number of French and English delegates fairly elected from the population at large; that persons of very great respectability were members of it and took part in its proceedings. Amongst a lot of business transacted the following resolution, moved by Mr. Fraser, and seconded by Mr. Dunn (both English representatives) was carried without a dissenting voice: "That the committee previously appointed to draw up the list of rights be reappointed, to discuss and decide on the basis of details of the provincial government, which we have agreed is to be formed for Rupert's Land and the Northwest Territories."

Subsequently, and upon the report of this committee, it was resolved that the new government should consist of twenty-four members and that a general election for membership should be held. The election was held, the legislative assembly met, and without dissent from any body proceeded to make laws for the community. Mr. Pedley says of these proceedings: "They had a right to organize. They had a right to elect their provincial government. They had a right to insist upon an arrangement that would secure to them their property, rights, and a system of government, etc." This Provincial government negotiated a bargain with Canada, and that bargain was embodied, or intended so to be, in the Manitoba act. They had a right to do all this, and further the Imperial authorities required that Canada should make terms satisfactory to the settlers before the union was consummated. Of the bargain made Mr. Pedley says that: "No doubt the French Catholic population of the country understood that in 1870 the Dominion guaranteed them separate schools. They feel that faith with them has not been kept." What does Mr. Pedley admit? 1, That the settlers were quite right in organizing a bargain; and 2, that that part of the bargain was separate schools, or at least that the French Catholics so understood. That bargain having been broken Mr. Pedley naively says: "They feel that faith with them has not been kept." Well, I for one do not wonder that they have some notion of that sort. I should think that the most illiterate of them could see that, even if there are some scores of Protestant ministers who can not. But let me be quite fair to Mr. Pedley. What reason does he give for disregarding the compact?

First reason—"We absolutely refuse to be bound by any compact in which as a province we had no part." From the facts admitted we see that if when known as the province of Manitoba, we had no part in it, (which would have been impossible), at the least the legislative assembly of this same territory did have a part in it, and a very prominent part. Is a change of name a reason for a breach of contract? I take the liberty of putting to Mr. Pedley a question. At confederation it was agreed that the province of Quebec should be limited in its powers to rearrange its own constituencies (a very local matter one would think) that there should remain twelve English constituencies unaltered, unless these constituencies themselves wanted a change. Now Quebec, as the Province of Quebec, had no part in that arrangement, but it voted for it through its representatives in the old provincial government. Now I ask Mr. Pedley to note it, and tell us whether he thinks that Quebec ought to be bound by the compact or not—whether she may properly wriggle out of it if she can, and gerrymander all English representatives out of the local legislature in Quebec.

Second objection. "I say that these 12,000 people have no right to dictate, nor the Dominion government to grant the final measurement for a province capable of maintaining and destined to have a population of at least a million." Softly a little. No one argues for a final measurement in everything, but for this only, in a matter relative to religious belief. Out of the 12,000 one half were Protestants and the other half Roman Catholics. No one knew which one was going to be in the majority in years to come. If Protestants, then the Catholics desired protection for the schools, and if Catholics (as was then thought most likely) then Protestants desired protection. What was fair under the circumstances was done, and it was agreed that whichever party should constitute the future minority it should be protected. Fate has given to the Protestants the majority and the use they make of their power, is to break the agreement, which, had they been in the minority, they would have loudly claimed the benefit of. To my mind that is nearly as bad as St. Francois Xavier. "No doubt the French Catholic population of this country understood that in 1870 the Dominion guaranteed them separate schools. They feel that faith with them has been broken." And has it not?

Third objection. "I for one might hold up my hands as a Canadian for compensation in some form to be given to the Dominion in satisfaction for the falling through of a compact, to which the Dominion was the party of the first part; but I certainly would hold up both my hands against this province, as a province, being chained for all time to come, that the Dominion might have the satisfaction of seeing its bargain kept." In other words, there was a compact; it has been broken; as a Canadian I think that was wrong and I would like to have had the satisfaction of seeing the bargain kept; but as a Manitoban I am glad it was broken. As a Canadian and a minister of the gospel, I must deplore all deviations from morality, included in which are all breaches of agreements, and I think that as that has happened in this case there ought to be some compensation; but as a Manitoban I say that I am glad in breaking the bargain, and am glad that there was a loop-hole through which to crawl. With all respect for Mr. Pedley I have no sympathy whatever with such hair-splitting, or rather man-splitting, subtleties. They are absolutely unworthy of him, and would never have been offered by him, in any controversy other than one between Protestant and Catholic, in which struggle as he may, his mental vision is dulled. Mr. Pedley is a man I believe of the very highest honor, and it is to

me simply amazing that he can be so blinded as to make the distinction upon a point of agreement and morality, between himself as a Canadian, and himself as a Manitoban, in order that as a Manitoban he may do that for which as a Canadian he is willing to pay damages. Morality as my mind is the same for a Manitoban as for a Canadian, and agreements ought to bind both alike. Mr. Pedley reminds me of the quarrel between two owners of an elephant, which resulted in one of them shooting his half with the remark that his partner could do as he liked with his share. To listen to Mr. Pedley one would think that it was not only possible, but quite right, at the same time, to feed the Manitoban in him with sugar plums for breaking the agreement and to spank the Canadian of him for identically the same reason.

REMEDIATION ORDER.

I must try and remove some of the misapprehensions surrounding the legal proceedings, but I am aware of my difficulty in speaking to those not familiar with legal matters. The misapprehensions have largely arisen, 1, from the name given to the document, "Remedial Order," and 2, from the language of the Manitoba act. The act speaks of an appeal to the governor-general-in-council. This is wrong; the appeal is from the legislative assembly of Manitoba to the parliament of Canada, from the representatives of the people of Manitoba to the representatives of the people (including those of Manitoba) of Canada.

Then what has the governor-general to do with the matter? Let me explain. You are all familiar with the functions of the grand jury. It is not thought proper that any person ought to be put upon trial for a serious offence, until there has been a preliminary inquiry as to whether there is any ground for trial. The grand jury does not decide, whether a man is guilty, but it has power to send him to trial. In the same way it was not thought right by the framers of our constitution that any one of his own mere motion should be able to institute an appeal from the local legislature to the Dominion parliament upon matters of education; and so it was provided that there should be a preliminary inquiry as to whether there were any grounds for such an appeal. This inquiry is made by the governor general and if he thinks that the petitioners have a case, he allows them to carry it before parliament. How such permission could have been refused in the present case, after the decision of the privy council, it passes my comprehension to understand.

As to the form of the remedial order, it was necessary that it should conform to the statute. A grand jury's indictment says that the prisoner did on a certain day commit a crime. Who ever abused the grand jury for using that language although the man had never been tried? It is the language of the law.

It is often asserted that the remedial order commands the restoration of the old system, and Mr. Pedley finds fault with that old system without observing that the principal feature that was objectionable has been omitted. It undoubtedly was a very practical objection to the old act, that it worked badly in sparsely settled and mixed communities. I quite agree with what Mr. Pedley says upon that subject. If there were too few Catholics in a district to form a school for themselves they escaped taxation altogether, for they could not be compelled to support the schools of the majority. But the remedial order does not require the continuation of this state of things. It asks merely: "The right of exemption of such Roman Catholics as contribute to the Roman Catholic schools from all payment of contribution to the support of any other schools." Every one ought to pay his share of taxes for education; and, may I not add, not more than his share.

Another objection to the old system was that the Catholic church had the right to disapprove of books used in Catholic schools relating to morals and religion. This was a sentimental objection, but nevertheless, to Protestants, a real one; so at Ottawa I offered to remove the objectionable reference to the church.

Further, I used at Ottawa this language, and I here repeat it: "There are various points, regarding details, upon which we would be very willing to make some compromise or agreement with the Manitoba government; but we are at present in this difficulty, that we are not in a position to ask that any compromise, however fair, should be enacted by the Dominion government without the assent to it of the local legislature. We can ask only for that which we had before, and must be careful, not even by concessions, to change in any material respect the position which we formerly occupied. If we did, any statute that the Dominion might pass might be ultra vires."

I do not know if that is quite clear to laymen, but it is the legal justification of the remedial order; and it is the reason why no compromise arrangement was suggested in it. It could not legally do so. It could and did, as I have said, give up some rights, but it could not suggest a different system.

As to the defects in the old act, then I say that we are willing and anxious to remove them. We recognize that the old act was not absolute perfection, but we say it is no ground for pulling down a church that it is in need of repairs.

PROVINCIAL RIGHTS.

Upon this subject Mr. Pedley said: "Let us remember that this cry about the sacredness of provincial rights is not a senseless howl, but it is based upon the principles of common sense."

Rights are supposed to be of three kinds: 1, Sacred. They are sacred when, for the moment, they are on your side; and you must therefore not howl senselessly, but with discrimination; 2, Secular. They are secular when you have no present use for them; 3, Profane. They are profane when they are against you. For example to Mr. Pedley at the present time Provincial Rights, although opposed to the constitution, are sacred; Dominion rights, although based on the constitution, are secular; and Catholic rights, guaranteed by constitutional compact, are profane. Do not misunderstand me. I do not mean that Mr. Pedley has ever apostrophised Catholic rights in the key of D; but merely this, that while he is prepared to worship provincial rights (as applied to this question) he treats Catholic rights as something to be lightly tossed about and played with; and to be disregarded as a Manitoban, and to be paid for in damages "as a Canadian." To many Protestant preachers provincial

(Continued on page 4.)



Waukenphast Boots. Ladies' \$3.50. Men's \$4.00. A. C. MORGAN, 412 Main St.

CALENDAR FOR NEXT WEEK. MAY. 12, Sunday—Fourth Sunday after Easter...

CITY AND ELSEWHERE. THE number of patients treated at the St. Boniface hospital last week was 86...

REV. FATHER O'DWYER took the east train on Saturday and officiated at White-mouth on Sunday.

THERE was some exceptionally fine music at the church of the Immaculate Conception on Sunday...

Our young friend, Mr. Walter Walsh, of Ottawa University, contributes a brilliant article on "Confederation and its Founders" to the April Owl.

WE regret to say that there has not as yet been much improvement in the condition of Mr. A. McGillis, the victim of the street car accident last week.

WE are glad to see that Mrs. Cherrier, mother of the pastor of the Immaculate Conception, has, apparently, recovered from her recent severe illness.

WE extend to Mr. Jeremiah Russell, our heartfelt sympathy in the bereavement he has sustained by the death of his mother who departed this life one day last week.

To Enjoy Life the physical machine must be in good running order. A little care—the use of Ripan's Tablets—will give you every morning the feeling that you are "glad to be alive."

MR. D. F. COYLE entertained the members of the Catholic Truth Society on Monday night with a most interesting reading from Father Young's new book, "Catholic and Protestant Countries Compared."

A Bright Eye is the sign of good health and an alert mind. Strange that it should almost always depend on the state of the digestion, but it does. A Ripan's Tablets taken after meals gives the little artificial help most grown people need.

THE members of the St. Jean Baptiste society of Winnipeg held their annual meeting on Sunday when there was a large attendance of members and most satisfactory reports were presented.

Consumption and Lung Difficulties. Always arise from particles of corrupt matter deposited in the air-cells, by impure blood. Purify that stream of life and it will very soon carry off and destroy the poisonous matter, and like a crystal river flowing through a desert, will bring with it and leave throughout the body the elements of health and strength.

RIO HARD & CO. WINE MERCHANTS. 365 Main Street, - WINNIPEG.

25 Royal Crown Soap Wrappers. Mailed to the ROYAL CROWN SOAP CO. WINNIPEG, MANITOBA. GIVES YOU FREE BY MAIL YOUR CHOICE OF THE FOLLOWING BOOKS AND PICTURES:

Loyal Lawyer's Logical Lecture. (Continued from page two.) rights are sacred to-day, and education a purely local affair but that is only because provincial rights are now on their side...

I refer to the Jesuit Estate act in Quebec, which was passed by the local legislature without a dissentient voice. Forthwith the Rev. Principal Cayen, the Rev. Principal Austin, the Rev. D. J. Macdonnell, and many other ministers...

Mr. Dalton McCarthy was the chief speaker in the Equal Rights Association. In his address in the house of commons on the Jesuit Estate matter he said: (Let us apply it to our own case as he proceeds.)

"I venture Sir, to ask the house seriously to consider the position in which we stand. The worship of what was called local autonomy, which some gentlemen have become addicted to, is fraught, I venture to say, with great evils to this Dominion. Our allegiance is due to the Dominion of Canada."

Mr. D. F. Coyle entertained the members of the Catholic Truth Society on Monday night with a most interesting reading from Father Young's new book, "Catholic and Protestant Countries Compared."

Consumption and Lung Difficulties. Always arise from particles of corrupt matter deposited in the air-cells, by impure blood. Purify that stream of life and it will very soon carry off and destroy the poisonous matter...

RIO HARD & CO. WINE MERCHANTS. 365 Main Street, - WINNIPEG.

Need I go further in citing authority of great statesmen, and little politicians. I wish I had time to give you further testimony, but I must hurry to a finish.

THE PRIVY COUNCIL DECISION. If, ladies and gentlemen, you decline to adopt the arguments which I have advanced in favor of separate schools...

What blasphemy and sacrilege! Did these judges never hear of the sacredness of provincial rights, or listen to that howl which under properly selected circumstances plays such an important part in Canadian politics?

What is here said: 1. That the Catholics have a grievance; 2. That their appeal is well founded; 3. That the general character of the proper course to be taken is clear...

And now in conclusion I beg to bring before you an object lesson. In 1890 there were in the city of Winnipeg five Catholic schools, with 576 scholars.

CONCLUSION. And now in conclusion I beg to bring before you an object lesson. In 1890 there were in the city of Winnipeg five Catholic schools, with 576 scholars.

Removed for a few months to Queen's Hotel Block. PORTAGE AVE., NEAR MAIN STREET. Your Esteemed Patronage Solicited.

When Mr. Ewart had concluded the chairman announced that any question that might be asked would be answered. A few were asked, the chief one being as to similarity of the Manitoba schools act and the Quebec Jesuits estate act...

Mr. Ewart replied that the proceedings of the Jesuit estates act were similar to those in the school act in so far as they went, but the appeal to the governor general was abandoned and an arrangement made between the Protestant representatives and the Quebec government.

Rev. Hugh Podley rose to make a reply to some of the points of Mr. Ewart's address. He said that no promise had been made by the legislature to safeguard separate schools and therefore the people of Manitoba could not justly be charged with breaking faith with the Catholic minority.

Mr. Ewart—No, no. Mr. Ewart—Then that is not so? That is the most vital point in this whole question. That was the one point that kept him on the fence for some time until he had read the decrees of the Catholic church affecting the subject.

THE FERGUSON CO'Y. W. J. MITCHELL, CHEMIST & DRUGGIST. Removed for a few months to Queen's Hotel Block.

Catholic Book Store. ST. BONIFACE. Books, Stationery, Pictures and Picture Frames, Religious Articles and School requisites. FRENCH INKS a specialty.

SPRING HAS COME. Use MRS. LUIER'S WONDERFUL COUGH SYRUP. Will not only cure Colds and Coughs, La Grippe, all affections of the throat and lungs, but will prevent all these diseases.

J. A. ROGERS & CO'S HAT STOCK. \$3,000 WORTH. At 35 and 50 cts. on the Dollar.

THE BLUE STORE. Sign—"The Blue Star," 434 MAIN STREET. "Always the Cheapest."

THE BLUE STORE. Sign—"The Blue Star," 434 MAIN STREET. A. CHEVRIER.

W. J. BAWLF, Produce & Grain MERCHANT AND DEALER IN Flour, Feed, Bran, Oats, Hay, Coal and Wood.

158 Princess Street. WINNIPEG.

HATS. Our Stock of Spring Hats are now Complete.

White & Manahan's. 496 Main Street.

CHAMPION SHOEING FORGE. Trotters, Runners & Roadsters. A SPECIALTY.

C. J. M'NERNEY. PHONE 723. Cor. Fort and Graham Streets.

M. HUGHES & SON. Undertakers, Embalmers, 212 Bannatyne Street, Opp. Ashdown's. Telephone 413.

J. A. ROGERS & CO'S HAT STOCK. \$3,000 WORTH. At 35 and 50 cts. on the Dollar.

THE BLUE STORE. Sign—"The Blue Star," 434 MAIN STREET. "Always the Cheapest."

THE BLUE STORE. Sign—"The Blue Star," 434 MAIN STREET. A. CHEVRIER.

W. J. BAWLF, Produce & Grain MERCHANT AND DEALER IN Flour, Feed, Bran, Oats, Hay, Coal and Wood.

158 Princess Street. WINNIPEG.

HATS. Our Stock of Spring Hats are now Complete.

White & Manahan's. 496 Main Street.

CHAMPION SHOEING FORGE. Trotters, Runners & Roadsters. A SPECIALTY.

C. J. M'NERNEY. PHONE 723. Cor. Fort and Graham Streets.

M. HUGHES & SON. Undertakers, Embalmers, 212 Bannatyne Street, Opp. Ashdown's. Telephone 413.

Subscribe for THE REVIEW.