

cipalities, or rather the people in each municipality, of the power of taxing themselves for the education of their children, without collecting and paying over a corresponding sum into the coffers of a sect,—a freedom which relieves a sect from the responsibility and trouble of levying school rates, yet invests it with absolute power of receiving rates levied by others,—a freedom which gives to one sect, or rather the heads of one sect, greater power over parents, over municipalities, and over the taxable property of the country, than that which is possessed by the Executive Government itself,—the “freedom of education” more appropriately deserving to be called “despotism in education,”—despotism over the child, over the parent, over taxable property, over municipalities, and over State Funds.

What the Foreign Element seek to influence.

As to whether I have been justified in ascribing to a “foreign element” this new doctrinal exposition of “freedom of education” which extends to all the politics, elections, and government of the country, may be judged from the facts, that it was first proclaimed by a Prelate who had drawn all his inspirations and sympathies from the Continent of Europe, and has been most stoutly advocated by one of kindred inspirations and sympathies,—that the present Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin, Dr. Paul Cullen—who had spent twenty years on the Continent before his appointment, denounces the school books and schools that his predecessor the late venerable Dr. Murray had devoted eighteen years of zealous labour as a member of the National Board of Education, to prepare and introduce into Ireland. (h) Indeed, if I am correctly informed, Bishop Pinsoneault himself, in his first Inaugural Discourse, avowed his supreme allegiance to the Sovereign of Rome, and none but a secondary or subordinate allegiance to any other Sovereign. For myself I hesitate not to avow that my first earthly allegiance is to the people and institutions of Canada, and to the Queen as our lawful sovereign and parental protector; and I doubt not such is and will ever be the allegiance of the Representatives of the Canadian people, whether in the Municipalities or in the Legislature.

How the Catholics Support the Schools.

But the Bishop claims the united Catholic body are of his views as to “godless Common School system being dangerous to faith and morals.” His argument to prove this statement is not an appeal to facts as they exist—that more than nine-tenths of the Roman Catholic children are still sent by their parents to the Common Schools, notwithstanding all the mandates and menaces put forth to alienate them, and that scarcely a week passes without my receiving letters from Catholic trustees and parents who have been urged into establishing and sending to separate schools, as to how they may regain their right to return to the Common Schools. There are upwards of three hundred and fifty townships in Upper Canada in which there is not a single separate school, although the Roman Catholics are numerous in many of them; but they are living in friendship with their Protestant neighbors and all are educating their children together. (i) But

(h) *Query for the Bishops and their protégés:* Would Archbishop Murray have consented to such a proceeding had he been alive? Or would they have dared to threaten him with “mortal sins,” and “excommunication,” because he chose to support the National System? And if they dare not do so to him, why are the terrors of the Church manufactured for his countrymen—in both Ireland and Canada—by a new foreign ecclesiastical element?

(i) The Bishop cannot account for it; save that he knows the Catholic laity claim and exercise the right of individual choice in the matter.