

Public school board 'desecrating everything traditional'

The following is the second of a two part letter on 'Renaissance' which stands for the right of parents to choose schools to educate their children according to their philosophy of life. Part one appeared in the Free Press on Dec. 11, Page 33, under the heading '4 Rs woefully neglected.'

If in reality, there is a dictatorship in publicly-financed education, then what kind of sham democracy do we have?

When there is no choice within this ever-more expensive public school system as to what type of school (i.e. which of the two philosophies) Manitobans may send their children, then this is indeed totalitarianism.

Why should the highly-organized, small, pushy, minority of free-thinking modernists (who are so allergic to any and every spiritual idea related to the eternal verities) have it all their own

way, at the public's expense, forcing their evil-producing, pornographic, erotic, destructive way of life on vulnerable youth?

Who shall dare say that all this flagrant laxity of morals, this institutionalized encouragement of self-centred self-indulgence (no matter the pain, and the cost to others) does not have a direct influence on the quality of education; does not lead to an alarming increase in the loss of self respect, promiscuity, drunkenness, drugs, despair, murder and suicide?

These are the dread symptoms of the anti-God toxins poisoning our schools and taking their awful human toll. And all this because of the lack of an honest challenge to naturally idealistic, generous creative youth!

Who gave the public school board the mandate to set up this sterile new religion of monolithic secularism

which so ruthlessly desecrates everything that is traditional?

Where and when did this brainwashing on behalf of the first philosophy at the expense of the other begin and by whom?

Why do the three governments all along the line support these few who harbor such an unnatural abhorrence for the obvious sanity of the moral code? In spite of the differing party labels, are they not all birds of a feather when it comes to the second philosophy?

So make no mistake about it, it is these few (always working secretly behind the scenes) who play fast and loose with the Ten Commandments of God to the extent that society in general is encouraged overpoweringly through the mass media to lose all sense of the innate dignity and sacredness of:

(1) The human person born or otherwise (abortion is murder.)

(2) The family, the basic and stabilizing unit of a nation.

(3) The heritage of the laws of the land and its constitution which in any true democracy are the guaranteed safeguards of all human life and private property, plus all the other inalienable rights and freedoms.

Giving parents a choice in either one philosophy or the other re schools, does not mean forcing religion down the over-sensitive leftists' throats. Far from it.

In a true democracy they would just naturally have the right to choose their permissive, godless teachers for their godless schools for their godless offspring within the system.

But the vast majority of grassroots Canadians are of the other philosophy. They most firmly believe the good life

is based on the wholesome fear and love of God as the Creator of this ordered guideline for a disciplined existence here on earth in preparation for an eternal and perfect happiness.

Who, then, is to say these have not an equal right in this day and age, in Manitoba, to choose their like-minded teachers, any number of whom would be only too happy to act as an extension of parental authority, right within the public school system. They are their children. They also foot the bill for the public schools.

This ideological harmony of parent and teacher would cut out, like a surgeon's scalpel, the source of all the treacherous alienation that is sneakily separating child from parent, sacrificing the rich mosaic of Canadian culture for an alien one not in keeping at all with the Canadian character and personality.

To deny the vast segment of taxpaying parents this choice of moral values, schools run democratically in accordance with their particular philosophy of life is a flagrant coercion of conscience on the part of the few wrongfully wielding a power that does not rightfully belong to them, nor any government at any level, in a true democracy.

Renaissance, which simply stands for the right of parents to choose a school which would educate their children according to their philosophy of life, is an idea whose time has come.

The alternative? Orwell's '1984' or Huxley's so-called 'Brave New World' just around the corner. Re-man-made shortages of the bare necessities; the sufferings and chaos; the crime and violence; brother — we ain't seen nothing yet!

Mary-Ellen Doyle

Winnipeg

Un-confederated Canada? So what!

Following the Quebec election the broadcast media was saying, in their usual know-it-all manner, that the voters of Canada were astounded and shocked by Rene Levesque's victory.

How wrong that was. Many people in other provinces, and including this writer, were pulling for Levesque from the day Bourassa announced the election.

The victory may very well hail the end of a confederated Canada, but what is really wrong with that?

Europe is a continent of many countries, all of them far better off financially than any one province of Canada. Why? Because their money for taxes, etc. is not going to a central European government to keep the bureaucrats living in a field of clover; it is not going to a central government to be used by a very clever manipulator... a manipulator who said in his book, 'Federalism and the French-Canadians,' "Just how much reform can the majority of the people be brought to desire at the present time." He is a manipulator who sees himself as just that, rather than as a prime minister representing and re-

sponding to the wishes of the people of Canada.

Let's show Pierre 'just how much reform' we can take, and see if he can take it!

There is absolutely no reason why the same thing that applies to Europe cannot apply to Canada. Canada, too, could become a Canada of many countries, including a French Quebec, just as Europe includes, French, German, Italian, Dutch, Belgique countries, etc.

Rene Levesque has the right idea, and the sooner the rest of the premiers of Canada take the same step, the sooner each of our provinces will find themselves financially able to cope with their own countries' (provinces') problems, and plan their own priorities.

Canadians seem to be awakening from their "blissful sleep of ignorance," to quote F. Paul Fromm. Yes, finally they are awake to the corruption, the influence-peddling, and the socialist schemes for tinkering with the economy, which is being done at the present time by the central government at Ottawa.

On the evening of Dec. 14, during the news, Pierre Trudeau said, "the provinces are big enough now to tax for themselves — they can tax and we can tax." Big deal, eh? Let's tell Pierre we are not only big enough to do our own taxing, we are also big enough to stand on our own two feet, and no longer see any reason why he, or Ottawa, should tax us or use us to forward their socialist policies.

He couldn't have made the above statement at a better time — just when I was trying my best to tell you we are big enough, now, to forget Ottawa. The start, and for a few years, may not be easy, but what a challenge it will be! The rewards will be well worth the struggle.

In closing I must comment on the fact that I have yet to hear Rene Levesque speak French on radio or TV when addressing the people of Canada. In my opinion this is telling Pierre something. At any rate, Mr. Levesque must be commended for this.

(Mrs.) Ruth E. Kauback
R.R. 3, Lower Sackville, N.S.

Funding problems plague Osborne House

In a recent article entitled 'Wife Beaters' (Free Press, December 14, 1976) the financial situation of Osborne House was discussed.

The YWCA sees no indication that the financial problems of Winnipeg's only retreat for battered women may soon end despite statements made by the deputy minister of health and social development.

The funding for this project has been uncertain and sporadic since its inception and still continues to be. At various times through the two and one years it has been in operation the YWCA has received money from the United Way, women's organizations, private donors and the City of Winnipeg.

Because the YWCA itself operated under a very limited budget, we have no excess revenue to divert to Osborne House. The departments of city and provincial welfare support only their clients on a per diem basis. However, as the article pointed out, this problem is not solely a welfare problem and the YWCA provides the service for ALL women.

By the province suggesting that all our financial problems would be solved by an increased per diem for provincial welfare recipients is unrealistic. Only 20 per cent of women using the Osborne House are on provincial welfare. No consideration has been given to women who are not on welfare and do not wish to be. Should they not have the service available to them as well?

At the end of the fiscal year 1976, we find ourselves with an operating deficit of \$10,000. We had allowed the deficit to accumulate in full anticipation that the provincial government would accept a heavier financial commitment.

The YWCA is very committed to the service, and will continue as presently constituted (accepting all women) while pursuing as we have for the past two and one half years sound financial backing.

Shopping

Several weeks ago I went shopping at a large grocery store which advertises "You can depend on our prices!" I have since found out that not only are their prices questionable but also their bakery and their public relations are questionable.

My complaint is that I bought a cake from their store, a cake which is baked by this store and on the first bite discovered foreign matter in the cake. I then wrote the head office in Winnipeg asking for my money back plus postage. I enclosed the bill which also had the date of purchase on it and the foreign matter was also taped to my letter.

Since this was three weeks ago I must assume my complaint is not important. For me this is unthinkable as I could have broken a tooth on this foreign matter.

I certainly can live without the 99c owed to me but I cannot understand a large grocery chain store not replying to my letter.

George Dawson

Winnipeg, Man.

The outlook for 1977 is not a very optimistic one at this point.

To continue we must seek larger quarters immediately to broaden the financial base. We presently can accommodate only 10 women. A large number are turned away because of lack of space. We have asked the City of Winnipeg, service clubs, to consider providing us with a larger home, but we have not had a definite word from

any of our sources.

The time and effort involved in keeping the house operating on a day-to-day basis has been an enormous undertaking for the YWCA. To open the paper and read that our problems were finally over was very enlightening to us, but unfortunately not true at all.

Jane Jones,
President, YWCA

Winnipeg

Muslim beliefs upheld

A letter written by the president of the Manitoba Islamic Association (Free Press, December 7) 1976 has prompted me to write to Letters to the Editor.

I'm specifically referring to his remarks that the Muslims believe in one and only one God Who is worshipped universally by Muslims, Christians and Jews. The implication that the Muslims have a God (Allah) Who is different from the God known to everybody is not true.

Fully agreeing with the president of the Islamic Association, I simply wish to expand what he has said on this point and I'm doing this with the belief that my explanation will benefit a great many of your readers.

In non-Islamic countries (and maybe in others as well), there is a great deal of misunderstanding and misconception about God and whether God of Jews, Christians and Muslims is different or the same.

Probably one difficulty arises from the fact that it is pretty difficult to translate the terms and specific words of one language to another. For a person wishing to translate an Arabic word into English the object in mind is often to provide an equivalent word. The word Allah in Arabic always denotes supreme being and the English word God has the same meaning.

By this we can infer that basically the two words are synonymous. If I'm not wrong, in the Hebrew language Elohim is used both for a true God and for a false god while Jehovah is used solely for a true God. In Aramaic (Syria) the word Eloah is used and in ancient Greek, Deity is used for a Supreme Being.

One may argue that there are serious conceptual differences between Allah and God, i.e., Allah for Muslims is completely different from the God of Jews and Christians. The God of Jews is only looking after the house of Israel and He is there for that race or religious group, so that Eloah is the symbol of Jews' national aspirations.

As for the Christians, God is comprised of three persons yet they are one (doctrine of Trinity). These conceptual differences might be true but it does not affect the reality of God.

The important thing is to see whether the Holy Quran (the Book of Allah), refers to Allah as God or not? If it does, then the question is squarely answered by this Scripture (Quran) regarding the truth of which there is no doubt in Muslims' minds.

The important thing to remember is that Allah is not the invention of Islam. All that Islam did in this regard was to give this word strictly a monotheistic color. Islam did not take into account the nature but the personal position of God (Allah). Once we comprehend the fact of God before the advent of Islam it is lot easier to perceive His concept after the advent of Islam.

I as a Muslim believe that we do not have any authentic, reliable and unaltered book other than the Holy Quran which can provide us with conclusive evidence that all of us have the same God. That the inhabitants of Arabia before the Holy Prophet Mohammad's time worshipped a Supreme God called Allah seems absolutely certain.

Ijaz Ahmad

Winnipeg

Outdoor atrocities continue

In reply to comments on Dec. 15, 1976 by C. R. Grieves, Whiteshell, Manitoba, on previous interview "Naturalists try to prove their point?"

Thank you, Mr. Grieves, for the lesson in ornithology and the snowmobile suggestion.

My original comments had been intended to reflect upon year-round fly-in and other motorized activity in the Whiteshell park — not just snowmobilers.

Despite the concern and consideration of conscientious snowmobilers like yourself, outdoor atrocities continue. As you are no doubt well aware, enforcement problems as well as environmental impact has necessitated restricting motorized activities in most park systems in North America.

The point I attempted to make in the interview was for the establishment of

an unspoiled, undisturbed primitive area such as may be found in most national, state and provincial parks on this continent.

Many people who are themselves gun or snowmobile owners agree, in fact some were with us on our four-day backpack trip.

In other words, primitive park areas benefit everyone, including snowmobilers, most of whom are versatile enough to also enjoy snowshoeing, cross-country skiing, etc. With 99% of the province available for motorized activities, they have the best of two worlds.

Incidentally, Mr. Grieves, shut off your motor some winter day and you may hear the song of a chickadee, purple finch or the evening grosbeak.

Tom Walker

Winnipeg



One of India's 80 million untouchables, a youngster visits a statue of the late Mahatma Gandhi, first Indian leader to champion the cause of the untouchables. A new law guarantees equality for the untouchables and provides punishment for offences related to the question.

A challenge to Manitoba legislature

County Court Judge Armand Dureault's ruling on a St. Boniface parking offence seems to be a most curious episode.

In 1890 the Manitoba legislature abolished the language clause of the federal parliament's Manitoba Act which gave the French language official status in this province.

The right of Manitoba to amend its own constitution so long as such amendment did not infringe the BNA Act was upheld by the highest court in the British Empire in the famous public schools cases of the 1890's. Admittedly, these cases concerned religion, not language, but the right of a province to amend its own constitution was undoubtedly maintained.

Judge Dureault's ruling is thus a direct challenge to the ability of the Manitoba legislature to amend its own system of government. In how many ways? At how many times — past, present and future? If Manitoba cannot amend its own constitution (a right guaranteed to it in the BNA Act) then what authority can?

Recently the Quebec government has seen fit to amend its own constitution through the well-known Bill 22 which, as proudly reported by Quebec politicians, made French the only official language in the province of Quebec.

It may be true that the Quebec government has done nothing to deprive the English-speaking minority of the rights guaranteed in section 133 of the BNA Act, namely that English (as well as French) be used in the debates, records and journals of the Quebec

legislature and in the courts of Quebec, but do these rights still enjoy a legal foundation?

If they do not, then Quebec has unilaterally amended the BNA Act — and has thus gone beyond Manitoba which in 1890 merely amended a federal statute.

If the language rights of the Anglophones of Quebec rest simply on the goodwill asserted by Rene Levesque,

Yes, there is!

The little girl asks the question: is there a Santa Claus? Yes, Lee-Ellen, there is a Santa Claus.

Who is he?

He is the gift of love.

Where does he live?

In the hearts of the people.

What does he do?

He brings to the children smiles and laughter: he brings to the adults joy; the happiness of seeing a child's face radiant with the wondrous expectations of Christmas.

When will you meet him?

When you are old enough to understand the gift of love. You will not see him, but you will believe!

C. S. Joynt

Winnipeg

then the recent affront in not using English in the speech from the throne is hardly reassuring.

That demonstration contrasts rather strikingly with Mr. Schreyer's efforts to placate Franco-Manitobains by using French on occasion in the proceedings of the Manitoba legislature where French (as yet) enjoys no legal status — unless, of course, Judge Dureault's ruling is allowed to stand.

Mr. Alain Hogue, counsel for the accused, has argued that Bill 22 has made French merely the "primary" language of Quebec.

If that is the case, does English remain a "secondary" official language of Quebec, and, if so, by what sanction — that of the BNA Act or of the whim of the Quebec government?

The difference is by no means insignificant. If the language clause of the BNA Act has indeed ceased to be legally operative, then there is no use arguing that rejection by the Supreme Court of Judge Dureault's decision would endanger the legal rights of the English-speaking minority in Quebec as regards language.

Such rights (in the sense of being embedded in an operative BNA Act) would already have ceased to exist.

W. T. Shaw

Winnipeg

All letters to the editor must bear the name and address of the writer. Addresses will not be published but only signed correspondence will be published. Names of writers will not be withheld. All letters may be edited for length, general interest and good taste.