

should not these schools be inspected just in the same way as the public schools of province are inspected? Is there any reason for departing from the original rule? It seems to me they ought to return to that old method of inspecting schools. It would be fair for the Roman Catholics and fair for the Protestants to put them on the same footing in that respect. Then there was

Another Change Made in The Law

to which I desire to state my objections. You know that the county councils now appoint representatives upon the high school boards in counties, and city councils appoint representatives upon the high schools in cities. Well, now, six years ago Mr. Ross introduced an amendment in the law by which the Roman Catholic separate school board was authorized to appoint a member upon the high school board. Haven't they the same voice as the Protestants in the election of the city council? Haven't they the same voice in choosing the county council? And why should they have the right to select one member to sit upon the high school board? I believe that in the city of London they have a most excellent representative there, but what we protest against is this class discrimination, this religious discrimination. As reasonably might they say upon the arguments regarding the separate school trustee, because the people of the province did not elect to the Legislature a number of Roman Catholic representatives proportionate to the population, that the Government of the day ought to give seats to the requisite number there. It is not right. It is unjust for the majority to put the minority in an unfair position, and I think it would be something the Roman Catholics themselves would spurn, as being a matter as to which they would not stand side by side on their own feet along with their Protestant fellow-citizens. This is one of the amendments in the law against which I desire to enter my protest. I have only one other matter with regard to the separate schools which I desire to refer to, and that is regarding the

Text Books of the Separate Schools.

Now, sir, Mr. Mowat has declared that he could not support an amendment that was moved by Mr. Craig in the House declaring that the text books that are in use in the separate schools, except those that deal with matters of religion, should be under the control of the department. He said he could not support a proposition of that kind, because he doubted whether it was out of the power or within the power of the Legislature. Why, sir, by the law which created the separate schools provision is made under which there is ample power given to do this

thing. This is a provision of the original Act regarding Roman Catholic separate schools, so that they and their registers shall be subject to such inspection as may be directed, from time to time, by the chief superintendent of education, and shall be subject also to such restrictions as may be imposed from time to time by the Council of Public Instruction for Upper Canada. You see, therefore, in the terms of the charter for the separate schools a provision is made that they shall be subject to such regulation as shall from time to time be prescribed by the Council of Public Instruction. Do you say that the people of this country will ever consent that a school shall be conducted by any denomination in this country where the books are not subject to revision by those who are charged with the administration of educational affairs, except as to the books which deal with matters of religion? Why, sir, it seems to be one of the fundamental principles on which our school system stands, and I was astonished when Mr. Mowat took that ground, and from the position which he took I appeal to the people of this country whether they will not say that the authorized text books in use in the separate schools, except those used for the purpose of teaching religion, shall be subject to revision just the same as the books used throughout the province. (Applause.)

Now, sir, I desire to say a word or two before passing from this subject. It is said that our Catholic fellow citizens do not get

A Fair Share of the Appointments

to office, that they are not elected to the Legislature as they ought to be. There may be something in that, but, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, is that any reason why we should alter the whole law of the country? I say that in matters of state the men should be appointed and not the religion. Religion is a matter between a man and his God. We say the state should not know a man except as a citizen, and the only questions when a man presents himself for appointment to office or election by the people are first, is he a good citizen? and second, is he worthy of the position to which he aspires?

I venture to think, sir, that if some of our Catholic citizens would but separate themselves from the line they have been following and take the line of that principle there would be more firm friendliness between the people of one religion and the other in this country, and I appeal to my fellow-citizens of the Roman Catholic faith to join together as citizens and look not at whether men worshipped at this or that altar. As to a difference between men, who, sir, can conscientiously tell in this country

any
don
he
mar
and
men
the
by
hav
tinu
dom
of

I pr
any
any
spec
it is
men
then
and
as b
such
N
ques
have
plat
vent
right
I h
offen
faith
canu
call
and

The

N
disc
sch
mat
mor
illu
Mr.
pri
pla
cou
in
kne
cus
bec
hav
be
bo
pla
is
spe
be
pr
he
pa