

establish the right to material food; nay will do more—will prove that children should be altogether cared for by the Government. For if the benefit, importance or necessity of education be assigned as a sufficient reason why Government should educate, then may the benefit, importance or necessity of food, clothing, shelter and warmth be assigned as a sufficient reason why government should administer them also. So that the alleged right cannot be established without annulling all parental authority whatever."

The right of the parent in relation to his child is then prior to that of the state. How, we ask, can the state impart education in its triune form, the moral, the intellectual, and the physical, when, properly speaking, the state has no religion? Can morality be taught without religion? It certainly cannot. But first, let us ask, what is this state or *civil government*, about which we hear so much in the administration of education? Did the state create the people or did the people create the state? Undoubtedly the state or *civil government* was created by the people and for the people. Do you then think that the state created by the people for the individual and collective welfare of the people, has a right to dictate to parents what manner of education their children must receive? Nothing to our mind seems more absurd than this assumption on the part of the state, to wrest from parents the sacred and inalienable right of educating their children according to their religious convictions and principles. And the Catholics of this Province are termed bigoted, because they struggle to maintain Separate Schools, in which their children may receive an education without fear of losing the eternal gift of faith. Catholics are at all events consistent, and only ask for the same rights and privileges in Ontario that they, as a majority, concede to the Protestant minority of Quebec.

We hear too a great deal about Protestant liberality in school matters. Well, let the following extract from a lecture delivered last winter by Dr. Sullivan of St. George's Church, Montreal, speak for Protestant liberality. Dr. Sullivan, we believe, is quite a noted English Church divine of the Metropolitan city, and though he is not so inflated a ministerial champion as his dear neighbor Dr. MacVicar, of the Presbyterian College, yet considering that he is a disciple of the *Revised Edition*, and prays by Act of Parliament, his words may be taken as an echo from one of the chords that vibrate through the heart of Protestant liberality. The lecture of this *liberal* English Church divine was entitled "Parents and Children." He said: "I would rather that my own children should go down to the grave ignorant of the rudiments of their mother tongue than put them in the hands of a Church, so plausible, and yet so corrupt as the Church of Rome." We have had our glasses on for more than an hour, and yet we have failed to find the fibre of liberality in this; it may be the fault of the glasses, but we rather think not. If Dr. Sullivan wishes to feast his eyes on festering

corruption, let him read an article in "The *Boston Herald*" of Oct. 20 1871, giving the substance of Prof. Agassiz' address before the Massachusetts State Teachers' Association. There he will find what public school education has done for the "soiled doves" of that great intellectual city—the modern Athens of America.

No, the Catholic Church alone recognizes the necessity of educating the heart as well as the head. She alone in education places the spiritual above the temporal, virtue above vice, heaven above hell. Let Protestants then cease calling the Catholics of this Province bigoted, because they maintain a system of Schools which guard as sentinels the sacred inheritance of our holy religion; keeping a watch over the hearts of our tender youth, that the garden of their souls may bloom with the bright blossoms of an early Faith, matured and strengthened by the deep and chastening rays of noon-tide Hope, ripening at eve into the rich fruitage of that greatest of all virtues, benign Charity.

—:—

HALF HOURS WITH MODERN PHILOSOPHERS.

II.

Side by side with the Idealistic movement, another and far more dangerous one was set on foot in England, presenting a most violent antithesis to its rival, whose doctrine was the target of the cunningly devised and plausible arguments of this more tangible yet more fatal system. Its prime mover was John Locke, the Apostle of Materialism; who transformed the traditions of the Empiricists, which had been renewed by Bacon and systematized by Hobbes, and whose fundamental principle was the testimony of the senses. Contrary to the Cartesian method, he held that all our ideas come from external objects, and the mind is not the active judge but the passive recipient of sensation. Starting with the postulate, that the mind is but a "tabula rasa," he traced the origin of our ideas to experimental facts, which may be either external, or internal, sensation or reflection. With him, therefore, the senses are all in all;—they are not merely the windows of the soul, but the actual sources of all cognition. His method is purely physical, and everything beyond its scope—the immaterial, the supernatural, the mystical, he ignores. Our will, he says, is not free, nor can it be the instrument of knowledge. His ideas of good and evil are entirely of the utilitarian order, and are made the result, rather than the foundation of our ideas of reward and punishment. In England, his skeptical principles were used as arms in defense of their infidel opinions, by the Deists, or Free Thinkers. Hartley and Priestly, followed by Erasmus Darwin, developed his doctrine into a Materialistic Psychology, wherein science, politics, religion, and philosophy came to man through the sensations; in which in fact all our faculties are represented as only modifications of the sensations. But