

As soon as introduced in as the best people, and it is from that state taking I say so? schools and parochial am strength of other I need not because no to-day and the old system their schools up up their ing it. But at by taxing of children any for it, by treasury to the people are it. In the ment of our ing that line, until it is o one would at the trend schools, as once in other that I hold find facts er countries in that re- Encyclopedia find that all ing from the hands of the country; it earns, by the r experience of taking the er the hands of the be control of the true even ca, and in come to look that in Ire- where it is steeped in ig- of national school system Protestants have learned ing children ed, because harmonizing gs, tends to them worse, imistration devise what l school sys- to the same a school sys- the principles and the non- ur form of e the history

of the United States in regard to this question, as it is doubtless well known to members of this House. Although attempt after attempt has been made by the Roman Catholics, and in all honesty, in all sincerity, to bring the educational affairs of that country under the control of their church, as they have no doubt a perfect right to attempt to do, I say that great country, which is regarded as in the forefront of advancement and civilization to-day, has never accepted the principle of separate schools, and has never allowed education to pass from under her control. To-day her schools are free to every child of the state, and the children must be educated together in all state-supported schools. Denominational religion is not taught in her schools, but the principles of religion that are common to all, are inculcated in many of them. I know something about the schools in the United States, because I passed some time in her educational institutions; and although the state teaches some of the doctrines of religion that are common to all creeds, the same as are taught in many parts of this country, I heard no objection from any Roman Catholic. And although, as I say, application has been made from time to time for separate schools, the state has never abandoned her control of education. No doubt some hon. gentlemen will remember that two or three years ago the question was asked of one of the high dignitaries of the Roman Catholic Church of the United States, Mons. Satolli, Would the church in the United States allow the children of Roman Catholics to be educated in what were commonly called godless schools, and the answer was that under the circumstances, they could do so; under the circumstances they were at liberty to send their children to the public schools. The Roman Catholics do not enjoy the privilege of separate schools there, as they do here. Now, then, in Mexico also, free public schools have been established, and whoever sends a child to a parochial school is fined. Experience has proven the wisdom of preventing parochial schools from controlling the education of the country, and the state has made it a punishable offence for any one to send a child to a parochial school. On this question I find some facts quoted by Dr. Sidney. In the Republic of Central America children between the ages of eight and fourteen years are required to attend public schools. Education is free, compulsory, and under state control. Then I come to South America, to the republics of that continent with their 50,000,000 of population, and what system do we find there? Until twenty years ago the education of the children was carried on in parochial schools and under the control of the clergy, but experience has shown the unwisdom of that system of education, and they have changed it. Their schools now are public, under state control, and compulsory. The education of that great country is to-day closely modelled after

the system prevailing in the state of Michigan. In that great country of fifty millions of people, whoever sends a child to a parochial school is fined, and the parochial schools have been closed. Free schools have been established in Uruguay, and Venezuela, under a system much the same as that prevailing in other republics I have mentioned. Then we come to New Brunswick, and we find that they have practically state schools. They have state schools in the province of Nova Scotia, they have state schools in Prince Edward Island. Then, I say, I am justified in the conclusion that the trend of the age is towards the state controlling the education of the country. Why, I ask, should Manitoba be compelled to go back to what is really an obsolete, an unsatisfactory, and an unsuitable condition of things for the needs of that province? For that reason again, I am opposed to this Bill. Now, Sir, we are told that we have a right to legislate, because there is a grievance. What law has ever been passed restricting a man's rights, that does not leave a grievance behind it? Is there any law that restricts us in any walk of life that does not give rise to some grievance, if we are to consult our own feelings when rights have been taken away from us? But if, in the interest of the state, in the interest of humanity, it is necessary even to create a grievance by taking away certain rights, the state is justified in taking away those rights in the interest of the whole. And though there may be a grievance behind it, it is no justification for going back to the old condition of things simply because it is a grievance. Was there not a grievance in New Brunswick when the provincial government took control of the schools and changed the system? The Minister of Marine and Fisheries fought that question eloquently in this House, declaring there was a grievance and a very serious grievance. But when Sir John Macdonald was appealed to, he refused to give back what they regarded as their rights, because, he said, it was the right of a province to control that matter, and he informed them that it was their duty to go to the highest tribunal, the people, and fight out the question there. He told them to go first to the provincial legislature, and then to go to the people, because the people had the power to change the representation in the legislature. He told the representatives of the minority to go before the people and convince them that their demand was a right and just one, and he said, there was sufficient justice in humanity to grant what is right.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will permit me an explanation, as he referred to me by name. He has stated that the late Sir John Macdonald, when appealed to by the minority of New Brunswick, told them that he could give them no relief, but to go to the legislature. I think the hon. gentleman will find that there they