

ship we owe to the Almighty. The Holy Catholic Church has determined that the places where the sacrifice of the Mass is offered shall be kept holy. Therefore shall be a place dedicated to the service of God, where the faithful can render homage to their Creator.

The people of Israel had the temple of Jerusalem where sacrifices were offered, and there the people of Judaea always assembled for that object. Since the foundation of the Church, places devoted to prayer, have everywhere been erected. In the days of persecution they were established in the caverns of the earth; but when peace was restored, soon was the prophecy of Malachi fulfilled, "From the rising of the sun, even unto the going down of the same, my name shall be great among the Gentiles, and in every place there is sacrifice, and there is offered to my name a clean oblation."

Every where do we possess those temples where a pure and immaculate victim is daily offered for our sins. They are not open to the privileged class alone—no, they are of easy access to the small as well as to the great, to the poor as well as the rich. There are the wretched and afflicted over welcome; for Christ has said, "Come to me all you that labour and are burdened, and I will refresh you."

What a subject of consolation must it not be to you beloved sisters, (addressing the aged and infirm inmates of the Asylum) to gather the first fruits of this institution of charity.

Wherever our holy religion has been allowed to open places of refuge for the poor and wretched, Catholics have not forgotten to procure for those unfortunate, a sanctuary where they may seek spiritual aid and consolation. Such also was the desire that animated the founders of this Asylum, to whom the words of the Psalmist can very aptly apply—"To thee in the poor left, thou wilt be a helper to the orphan."

Accept my congratulations, you, Pastor of St. Patrick's Church, who together with your worthy predecessor, have with the assistance of your flock founded this institution destined to do much good. Accept my congratulations, you, worthy associates of the St. Vincent de Paul Society, who so powerfully supported your Pastors in the establishing of this Asylum.

Receive also my congratulations, you, charitable ladies, who by your industry, have prepared those splendid bazaars which have been of so much help to this institution.

Accept also my congratulations you, Irish Catholics of Quebec, who have so liberally seconded the zeal of your charitable ladies, and who have once again shown that an appeal to your charity is never made in vain.

But above all, receive my congratulations, you Reverend Sisters of Charity, who have renounced the comforts and sweets of life, to devote yourselves to the poor and wretched.

And you, in fine, the beloved friends of our Saviour, who seek a refuge in this blessed abode, receive also my congratulations. Here it is that after having "borne the day and the heat" you can rest your wearied limbs beneath the shadow of the sanctuary.

Let us now beseech the Lord to vouchsafe to visit this holy house, to send a protecting hand to this undertaking, and to cause it to prosper more and more, with the generous co-operation of the worthy sons and daughters of St. Patrick.

A Te Deum was sung by the members of the St. Patrick's choir. A collection was also taken up for the benefit of the asylum.

The chapel was nicely decorated: on the window at the Gospel side of the altar was a transparency of St. Patrick, and on the Epistle side, one of Saint Bridget. On the Gospel wall was a large fresco of the Resurrection, and on the Epistle wall was one of the Crucifixion.

A bazaar in aid of the asylum will be held, so I have been told, some time about January.

Yours truly,
UPSON.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY—JUNE 23.
DEBATE ON MR. FERGUSON'S MOTION TO ABOLISH THE SEPARATE SCHOOL SYSTEM IN UPPER CANADA—MR. M'GEE'S SPEECH.
MR. FERGUSON moved the resolutions of which he had given notice, for the repeal of the Separate School Law. He said that arguments in favour of this law might be drawn from expediency; but he thought that such reasoning should now be done away with, and that laws should be enacted solely for the benefit of all. Some said that the law should be maintained, because Lower Canada desired it; but he did not think that the feelings of the great majority of the people of Upper Canada should be set at naught upon this ground. It was supposed that the Catholics in Canada West were in favour of the present law; but that was not the case. Let the clergyman of all denominations keep to their own business, and there would be no trouble about Separate Schools. Nor was there any reason for this law, in a disposition on the part of the Protestant population to accommodate their Catholic neighbours. On the contrary, everywhere the Protestants were disposed to do justice to the Catholic just in proportion to the smallness of the numbers of the latter. It had been well known that this measure would be brought up this session. It had been debated for a long time in Upper Canada; but with all this agitation the Catholics had not thought it worth while to petition against it. Why was this? Just because the Catholic people did not feel that they were to be injured by it. It was true that one gentleman, the member for Ottawa, had moved to reject the Bill on the first reading; but it was said that that gentleman was more under the control of the clergy than the people, and this perhaps accounted for the course he had taken. Finally, besides those reasons which had reference chiefly to Christians of different denominations, he thought it was only fair to the coloured population that the law should be abolished as being oppressive to them.

per school—but because that insignificant sum stands for a sacred principle, they are all interested that it shall not be withdrawn, as a direct denial of the principle. For my part, I will not put the maintenance of their claims on the few grounds assumed by the Government—the ground of the smallness of the amount, and the harassment of 100 "Separate" companies with 3,700 "Commons" Schools; but I put it on the high ground of inherent right—of natural right which no law can take away—and on that ground I will endeavour to show to this House the rationale of Roman Catholic hostility to the pretensions of the State—the political power for the time being, assuming to itself the place and office of Teacher of all the youth born under it: for we object to the State, not as a Patron or Inspector of Schools, but as the author and administrator of a privileged establishment of education. If we were all Catholics or all Protestants in Canada this argument would be unnecessary; in that case Dr. Arnold's ideal of the Christian State, being but another name for the Christian Church, might be attainable, at least in the department of public instruction; but we have here, a large Roman Catholic majority in what may be called the Protestant Province, and a Protestant minority in the Catholic Province—the two religions interpretate each other; it is natural, therefore, that the majority in each section should exercise a sort of protectorate over their co-religionists above or below—and that under our Union, the rights of both minorities should be the care of both majorities. It is natural and it is right that we should thoroughly discuss the principle involved, and all the more so, because it has this year been left to the unprompted justice of Parliament, by those most deeply interested in its decision (hear, hear, hear). The subject of the relation of the State to the education of youth is by no means so free from difficulty as the honourable mover of this resolution seems to suppose. He rose, uttered a few confident sentences, and sat down as if quite enough had been said to settle the question for ever. But if any honourable gentleman who hears me desires to see at a glance how widely the ablest educators—a word I do not like, but it is the best at the moment—have differed from the very starting point of their own doctrine—I will beg of him to pass a forenoon, with that view, in our Library. Let him take down those dealers in definitions—the Encyclopedias—and turn to the article "Education," and he will not find any two of them agreed, either as to the duty of the State, or the object of education. The "Britannica," which stands facile princeps of all its kind in our language, says the object of education is the "happiness" of the educated, and includes virtue as essential to happiness; so that education in virtue, under this description, would be the duty of the State as Teacher. The Encyclopedist of Useful Knowledge—written by Lord Brougham, and his friends—says it is to fit the child "for after life," and there it stops. Is it possible for any thoughtful man, calling himself a Christian to stop there too? "After life"—what is "after life"? Is it the life between the schoolhouse and the churchyard? or does it reach far beyond—away into the limitless prospects of Eternity? I trust we all believe in the immortality of the human soul; and that none of us are content to rest on the giddy brink of the Utilitarians' definition of "after life." A third of these definers declares—"That the object of the training to be given by the State can only be determined by the legislature of each country. That in an antocracy the object should be the preservation of the monarchy, and in a democracy the inculcation of democratic principles." This is intelligible enough; but let us reflect a moment where it must lead. In Prussia it will justify, as it has justified, the military and despotic teaching by which the House of Brandenburg has sought to establish its own infallibility; in Russia it will justify, as it has justified, the teaching of the most servile doctrines, such as that the Czar stands in his people in the place of Christ; that he is, in the language of their political catechism—"Our God." It will justify a despotism educating in despotism, and a democracy in democracy—for it teaches that conformity to the standard of the State is the highest result of education. This indeed is the genesis of the miscellaneous system, which is equally in harmony with the despotism of the mob in America, and the despotism of one man in Russia. (Hear, hear.) Our own system comes to us from Prussia, through France and the United States. It was invented or adopted by Frederick II., a great soldier, a great Prince, and a great enemy of Christianity. It was introduced into France, under the first Republic, by Talleyrand, the epistate ex-Bishop of Autun. It was adopted by those rulers of France on Talleyrand's report, at a time when they madly struck the name of the Creator out of all their ordinances—when they substituted Pagan Decades for the Christian Sabbath—and strove to make God an outlaw in His own creation. With that constant searching for first principles which characterizes the French mind, Talleyrand boldly laid it down that children did not belong to their parents, but were born for the State. He proclaimed the Spartan doctrine that there was no family but one—the Republic. And like the Spartan, the French Republic abolished the sacred sanction of marriage, though it did not openly take the next step of legalising promiscuous intercourse.—This conduct was quite consistent with the whole course of the first Republic; with its conscription, and its *solidarité*, its universal fraternity, and universal hatred of all things old, tried, and traditional. It would never do to continue in the "Year I," so obsolete an institution as the Christian Family—an institution older than Bourbon or Brunswick line—older than all Christian Kings and Constitutions—the well-spring and the feeder of our hereditary civilization. Thus it was the French State, in 1791, undertook to educate the youth of France in its own political image and likeness, after the manner of Prussia, though with some variation; and thus the American State, about thirty years ago, began to imitate the experiment. The details and the direction may differ, but the principle of the infallibility of the State is everywhere the same. This doctrine may find favor with clever old maids like Miss Edgeworth or Miss Martineau, but it will have few disciples among fathers and mothers. It may find advocates in this House with philippic butchlers like my hon. friends from Toronto and South Hastings, but butchlers testimony ought not to be taken on the subject of children. If the Inspector General, among his new taxes, will only impose a pretty smart tax upon butchlers, he will be doing the State a service, and shall have my cordial support (laughter). The common school system of Upper Canada, Mr. Speaker, is a certified copy of that of Massachusetts, and others of the States. I have had some opportunities of judging of the growth and fruits of the American system. It is now nearly twenty years since I heard Horace Mann in Boston, pronouncing the panegyric of "the New England school system;" though it was, and is, in fact, the Prussian system, slightly modified. My opinion of that system is on record, long before I became a resident in Canada, or expected the honor of a seat in this House: so that it cannot be said that it is put on as controversial armor for this occasion. How has it worked in the older States of the Union? I remember, Sir, when the second generation of Americans were passing off the scene one by one; I remember the last survivors of the age that had seen Washington and his colleagues; I have seen the first common school generation grow to manhood, and I am quite willing to leave it to any intelligent American of the present day, who has seen both, whether the present age can compare for stability of character, sense of duty, sense of honor, or love of truth, with their predecessors. In acuteness and arithmetic the present generation may excel the past, but in public and private morals they are not their equals. The truth is, the common school system is mainly upheld in the older States and cities for the more speedy amalgamation of the children of "foreigners"—as they are called—with the native population. A new nationality is always more intolerant than an old one; and the

American will not permit, if he can help it, one trace of the social or national character of the emigrant to survive in his children. (Hear, hear.) An all-devoting uniformity, is the passion of a democrat. He insists on one costume, one tone, one accent, and one idea of everything American. The common school system is his crushing-mill for young foreigners, by which he separates the gold from the quartz. (Hear, hear.) Seven-tenths of the children of the more prosperous natives are themselves educated at academies and private schools; in Massachusetts alone, above \$3,000,000 are annually expended on private schools. The children of the native mechanic and trader may meet the children of the emigrant in the common school; but the statesman and the merchant who had the system so loudly, take good care not to send their own children to mingle with the common mass. (Hear, hear.) Such American parents feel that there is a public opinion among boys as well as among men, that every school has its dictator, its parasite, and its butt; they therefore naturally wish to select the associates of their children, believing that boys and girls learn as much from each other as they do from their teacher, and that virgin innocence of soul, like powder on the petal of a flower, may be very easily blown away, but never, never, never, can be restored. (Hear, hear.) Sir, at the last census the Roman Catholics of Upper Canada were 167,000 souls—the second denomination in point of numbers, and one-fifth or one-sixth of the whole population. They are now probably 200,000 souls, and it is most important this House should not misjudge the grounds of opposition assumed by so numerous a body towards State education. (Hear, hear.) It had been asserted that this opposition comes solely from the Priesthood, and is not shared in by the Laity. That is a total mistake, so far as I can judge. I believe, indeed I know; that nine-tenths of the Laity are opposed, and will be opposed to the common school system, unless some such modifications could be introduced into it, as exist in the National system in Ireland. There the Priest is always the Visitor, and usually the Patron of the school, and two afternoons in the week are set apart for religious instruction. (Hear, hear.) This is in accordance with the primary idea of education existing in the Catholic mind. In the last great assertion of Catholic doctrine—at the Council of Trent—the *Catechism* of which is to be found in our library—hon. gentlemen will find it laid down under the head of matrimony, that the object of that institution—which is with us a Sacrament—is that a pious and holy offspring may be raised up in the faith. Catholic doctrine like the old law of England, much of which comes down to us from Catholic times, maintains that the duty of the Christian parent is twofold—first to provide for the sustenance of the child, and secondly for his education. (Hear, hear.) You will find the same doctrine in Blackstone as in the *Catechism* of the Council of Trent, and almost in the same words. (Hear, hear.) This double responsibility springs from the Christian institution of marriage, and no power on earth, civil or ecclesiastical, can dispense a parent in possession of his faculties from directing the education of his own child. This, Sir, is not a Church question, but a parent's question; it is a father and mother's question, and not necessarily a question between different religious denominations. The skillful but sophistical *litterateur* who has so long presided over the Department of education in Upper Canada has never once met the question on the merits—he has never dealt with it as an inalienable prerogative and duty of parentage—but he has artfully raised a false controversial issue, and attempted to make it a Protestant and Catholic controversy. It is, in fact, a question whether the Christian family is to be permitted its free development in Western Canada, or whether the political power is to stand in *loco parentis* to all children under age. For whom does the Common School Teacher really represent in our system? Not the parent, but the act of Parliament that creates his office and defines his district. He is the creature of the political power, and though he may consult, and may co-operate with the parents of his pupils, he is not bound to do so; he is independent of them; he is not answerable to them; he must not distinguish between them or between their children. The principle of the Common School is, that every child, within a certain district, section, or ward, has an equal right to the advantages of the School and the time of the Teacher. As before the law, I admit, all men are equal, and inclusively, all children. But I deny as between each other in social or school intercourse, that either men or boys can be moral equals. The child of the drunkard and the swearer is not the equal of the child of virtuous and sober parents, and ought never to be contended with him. Children are great imitators, and what they hear and see at home they bring abroad; hence the teacher who does his duty ought to be always able, from the first, to distinguish the children by the character of their parents. In Select Schools, there is, I grant, the same danger of evil association, but the parent has a direct influence there. The parent, not the political power, places the child in charge of the Teacher; the Teacher has his brief from the father or mother; they enter as avowed partners, with a mutual understanding, into the work of education; and the natural law, which prescribes the parents duty, is not abrogated under such a partnership as that. (Hear, hear, and cheers.) That natural law has been violated in Prussia, in France in 1791, and in the United States; but it is still respected in England and Ireland. It is respected in the children of paupers, classified in the Workhouse by the creed of their parents; and I appeal to my hon. friends who are lawyers, if it is not the ruling principle in the decisions of the Court of Chancery, such as that given by Lord Eldon, in the well-known case of *Welllesley vs. Welllesley*. There, the Chancellor, whose solidity was equal to his clearness, lays down most plainly, that the law of England never interferences between parent and child—never assumes to act in *loco parentis*, except where it is proved that the mind of the child is likely to be debauched, by leaving it under the control of an immoral parent. (Hear, hear.) I appeal to this ancient and venerable law, against the pretensions of the common school system, on behalf of all the parents of Canada West, who are disposed to do their duty to their children. (Hear, hear.) It has been said—What danger is there in teaching children the multiplication table in common?—what danger in teaching them the alphabet in common? I repeat it is not the teaching, but the association which corrupts, and which is to be guarded against as the worst danger of the indiscriminate grouping of children together. But, there is another consideration: teaching that two and two make four, is teaching to reason—it is teaching the use of the mental faculties—and we insist that every lesson in reason, shall be accompanied by a lesson in revelation, as a rider, as a safeguard. I, as a parent, am not willing to risk the experiment of exercising only a Sunday revision over the imbedded errors and false impressions of the week. You might as well propose that the child should eat on Sunday all the salt necessary for the retrospective salting of its six days' food. (Hear, hear.) I, as a parent, believe the lungs of children, when inflated, to be buoyant; but I am not on that account disposed to bring my child to the pier, and throw it into Lake Ontario, to see whether or not it may rise and float. (Hear, hear.) No, Sir. These are desperate experiments, which I cannot try with my own flesh and blood, and with the immortal spirits, committed during their helplessness to my care. (Hear, hear.) But there are other objections, Mr. Speaker, though none of equal importance to that I have just stated. One of them is—that the Common School system is a monopoly of teaching, which it is wonderful that those who oppose bounties on industry of every kind, yet advocate in this instance. (Hear, hear.) This is an objection long ago made; it will be found stated with his usual force by Adam Smith. In his "Wealth of Nations," that great, though now sometimes despised economist, whose chief work has served all British statesmen as a com-

pendium and text-book for sixty years, lays down the doctrine, that the private teacher, as compared with the teacher in the pay of the State, is like the private merchant trading without a bounty, competing with the merchant trading with a bounty. He classes it among the monopolies fatal to free principles; and of all monopolies, a monopoly in public instruction must be the worst. (Hear, hear.) Catholics do not stand alone in their opposition to this monopoly. At the late Anglican Synod in this city, a Report in favor of Separate Schools was read, and would have been adopted, but that the Hon. John Hillyard Cameron pointed out, that they could have all they wanted under the present law. Among Presbyterians, Methodists, and other religious bodies, there are many advocates of combining religious and secular instruction, in the daily teaching of children. (Hear, hear.) In Lower Canada, the British Protestant population are a mere moiety. Are they in favor of abolishing their own schools? ask the hon. Members who especially represent them, if that is the case? No one rises to answer in the affirmative. Why then do not observe the common Christian rule of "doing unto others, as we would wish to be done by," and allow the Catholic minority in Upper Canada, to educate their own children in peace. (Hear, hear.) To honorable gentlemen on this side of the House, with whom I generally always agree on other questions, I would say, educate your children your own way, but allow us to educate ours; we don't want to interfere with your common schools, we only want to keep our own children out of them. (Hear, hear.) The principle for which we contend is the same which leads men to resist paying for the support of a State Church in which they do not believe; and the arguments that uphold the one, carried a little farther will uphold the other. If they can be advocated on the ground of benefiting society, so can the other. It is for the interest of society that adults should be taught their moral duties, as well as that children should be instructed in secular knowledge. Is the State therefore, to turn teacher on Sundays as well as on week days. And if not, why not? Catholic parents object to both assumptions, and to the state school system because it assumes that all sects are equal, and that all Christians are sectaries. We have never been a sect; and will not consent to write ourselves down beside every "ism" of yesterday. (Hear, hear.) I may be charged with illiberality in thus frankly stating my opinions, and those of every Catholic in communion with his Church; for it is not every one who calls himself a Catholic, that the corporation, that the Church recognises as such. (Hear, hear.) Every sect speaks of its "members in good standing," and so does the Catholic Church. And I repeat, Sir, there is not a Catholic layman "in good standing," knowing something of his own religion, on either side of the Atlantic, who does not hold unimpaired secular instruction to be an evil of the most dangerous kind, fatal to the faith and morals of his children. (Hear, hear.) This may be considered illiberal, but I have no desire to practise that false liberality whose honest name is duplicity. Are we, to win a name for liberality, to run into downright indifference? No, Sir—No. In genuine liberality—in charity and courtesy—I desire not to be outdone by any member of this House; but I desire also to love the lessons taught me in my youth by my own parents; I am quite content with my own religion; I have children to whom I desire to transmit it as their best inheritance; and I cannot, therefore, subscribe for one moment to the doctrine that the State—the political power of the day—can exonerate Christian parents from the duty of selecting, protecting, and directing the education of their own children. (Mr. McGeer concluded amid loud applause.)

pendium and text-book for sixty years, lays down the doctrine, that the private teacher, as compared with the teacher in the pay of the State, is like the private merchant trading without a bounty, competing with the merchant trading with a bounty. He classes it among the monopolies fatal to free principles; and of all monopolies, a monopoly in public instruction must be the worst. (Hear, hear.) Catholics do not stand alone in their opposition to this monopoly. At the late Anglican Synod in this city, a Report in favor of Separate Schools was read, and would have been adopted, but that the Hon. John Hillyard Cameron pointed out, that they could have all they wanted under the present law. Among Presbyterians, Methodists, and other religious bodies, there are many advocates of combining religious and secular instruction, in the daily teaching of children. (Hear, hear.) In Lower Canada, the British Protestant population are a mere moiety. Are they in favor of abolishing their own schools? ask the hon. Members who especially represent them, if that is the case? No one rises to answer in the affirmative. Why then do not observe the common Christian rule of "doing unto others, as we would wish to be done by," and allow the Catholic minority in Upper Canada, to educate their own children in peace. (Hear, hear.) To honorable gentlemen on this side of the House, with whom I generally always agree on other questions, I would say, educate your children your own way, but allow us to educate ours; we don't want to interfere with your common schools, we only want to keep our own children out of them. (Hear, hear.) The principle for which we contend is the same which leads men to resist paying for the support of a State Church in which they do not believe; and the arguments that uphold the one, carried a little farther will uphold the other. If they can be advocated on the ground of benefiting society, so can the other. It is for the interest of society that adults should be taught their moral duties, as well as that children should be instructed in secular knowledge. Is the State therefore, to turn teacher on Sundays as well as on week days. And if not, why not? Catholic parents object to both assumptions, and to the state school system because it assumes that all sects are equal, and that all Christians are sectaries. We have never been a sect; and will not consent to write ourselves down beside every "ism" of yesterday. (Hear, hear.) I may be charged with illiberality in thus frankly stating my opinions, and those of every Catholic in communion with his Church; for it is not every one who calls himself a Catholic, that the corporation, that the Church recognises as such. (Hear, hear.) Every sect speaks of its "members in good standing," and so does the Catholic Church. And I repeat, Sir, there is not a Catholic layman "in good standing," knowing something of his own religion, on either side of the Atlantic, who does not hold unimpaired secular instruction to be an evil of the most dangerous kind, fatal to the faith and morals of his children. (Hear, hear.) This may be considered illiberal, but I have no desire to practise that false liberality whose honest name is duplicity. Are we, to win a name for liberality, to run into downright indifference? No, Sir—No. In genuine liberality—in charity and courtesy—I desire not to be outdone by any member of this House; but I desire also to love the lessons taught me in my youth by my own parents; I am quite content with my own religion; I have children to whom I desire to transmit it as their best inheritance; and I cannot, therefore, subscribe for one moment to the doctrine that the State—the political power of the day—can exonerate Christian parents from the duty of selecting, protecting, and directing the education of their own children. (Mr. McGeer concluded amid loud applause.)

pendium and text-book for sixty years, lays down the doctrine, that the private teacher, as compared with the teacher in the pay of the State, is like the private merchant trading without a bounty, competing with the merchant trading with a bounty. He classes it among the monopolies fatal to free principles; and of all monopolies, a monopoly in public instruction must be the worst. (Hear, hear.) Catholics do not stand alone in their opposition to this monopoly. At the late Anglican Synod in this city, a Report in favor of Separate Schools was read, and would have been adopted, but that the Hon. John Hillyard Cameron pointed out, that they could have all they wanted under the present law. Among Presbyterians, Methodists, and other religious bodies, there are many advocates of combining religious and secular instruction, in the daily teaching of children. (Hear, hear.) In Lower Canada, the British Protestant population are a mere moiety. Are they in favor of abolishing their own schools? ask the hon. Members who especially represent them, if that is the case? No one rises to answer in the affirmative. Why then do not observe the common Christian rule of "doing unto others, as we would wish to be done by," and allow the Catholic minority in Upper Canada, to educate their own children in peace. (Hear, hear.) To honorable gentlemen on this side of the House, with whom I generally always agree on other questions, I would say, educate your children your own way, but allow us to educate ours; we don't want to interfere with your common schools, we only want to keep our own children out of them. (Hear, hear.) The principle for which we contend is the same which leads men to resist paying for the support of a State Church in which they do not believe; and the arguments that uphold the one, carried a little farther will uphold the other. If they can be advocated on the ground of benefiting society, so can the other. It is for the interest of society that adults should be taught their moral duties, as well as that children should be instructed in secular knowledge. Is the State therefore, to turn teacher on Sundays as well as on week days. And if not, why not? Catholic parents object to both assumptions, and to the state school system because it assumes that all sects are equal, and that all Christians are sectaries. We have never been a sect; and will not consent to write ourselves down beside every "ism" of yesterday. (Hear, hear.) I may be charged with illiberality in thus frankly stating my opinions, and those of every Catholic in communion with his Church; for it is not every one who calls himself a Catholic, that the corporation, that the Church recognises as such. (Hear, hear.) Every sect speaks of its "members in good standing," and so does the Catholic Church. And I repeat, Sir, there is not a Catholic layman "in good standing," knowing something of his own religion, on either side of the Atlantic, who does not hold unimpaired secular instruction to be an evil of the most dangerous kind, fatal to the faith and morals of his children. (Hear, hear.) This may be considered illiberal, but I have no desire to practise that false liberality whose honest name is duplicity. Are we, to win a name for liberality, to run into downright indifference? No, Sir—No. In genuine liberality—in charity and courtesy—I desire not to be outdone by any member of this House; but I desire also to love the lessons taught me in my youth by my own parents; I am quite content with my own religion; I have children to whom I desire to transmit it as their best inheritance; and I cannot, therefore, subscribe for one moment to the doctrine that the State—the political power of the day—can exonerate Christian parents from the duty of selecting, protecting, and directing the education of their own children. (Mr. McGeer concluded amid loud applause.)

pendium and text-book for sixty years, lays down the doctrine, that the private teacher, as compared with the teacher in the pay of the State, is like the private merchant trading without a bounty, competing with the merchant trading with a bounty. He classes it among the monopolies fatal to free principles; and of all monopolies, a monopoly in public instruction must be the worst. (Hear, hear.) Catholics do not stand alone in their opposition to this monopoly. At the late Anglican Synod in this city, a Report in favor of Separate Schools was read, and would have been adopted, but that the Hon. John Hillyard Cameron pointed out, that they could have all they wanted under the present law. Among Presbyterians, Methodists, and other religious bodies, there are many advocates of combining religious and secular instruction, in the daily teaching of children. (Hear, hear.) In Lower Canada, the British Protestant population are a mere moiety. Are they in favor of abolishing their own schools? ask the hon. Members who especially represent them, if that is the case? No one rises to answer in the affirmative. Why then do not observe the common Christian rule of "doing unto others, as we would wish to be done by," and allow the Catholic minority in Upper Canada, to educate their own children in peace. (Hear, hear.) To honorable gentlemen on this side of the House, with whom I generally always agree on other questions, I would say, educate your children your own way, but allow us to educate ours; we don't want to interfere with your common schools, we only want to keep our own children out of them. (Hear, hear.) The principle for which we contend is the same which leads men to resist paying for the support of a State Church in which they do not believe; and the arguments that uphold the one, carried a little farther will uphold the other. If they can be advocated on the ground of benefiting society, so can the other. It is for the interest of society that adults should be taught their moral duties, as well as that children should be instructed in secular knowledge. Is the State therefore, to turn teacher on Sundays as well as on week days. And if not, why not? Catholic parents object to both assumptions, and to the state school system because it assumes that all sects are equal, and that all Christians are sectaries. We have never been a sect; and will not consent to write ourselves down beside every "ism" of yesterday. (Hear, hear.) I may be charged with illiberality in thus frankly stating my opinions, and those of every Catholic in communion with his Church; for it is not every one who calls himself a Catholic, that the corporation, that the Church recognises as such. (Hear, hear.) Every sect speaks of its "members in good standing," and so does the Catholic Church. And I repeat, Sir, there is not a Catholic layman "in good standing," knowing something of his own religion, on either side of the Atlantic, who does not hold unimpaired secular instruction to be an evil of the most dangerous kind, fatal to the faith and morals of his children. (Hear, hear.) This may be considered illiberal, but I have no desire to practise that false liberality whose honest name is duplicity. Are we, to win a name for liberality, to run into downright indifference? No, Sir—No. In genuine liberality—in charity and courtesy—I desire not to be outdone by any member of this House; but I desire also to love the lessons taught me in my youth by my own parents; I am quite content with my own religion; I have children to whom I desire to transmit it as their best inheritance; and I cannot, therefore, subscribe for one moment to the doctrine that the State—the political power of the day—can exonerate Christian parents from the duty of selecting, protecting, and directing the education of their own children. (Mr. McGeer concluded amid loud applause.)

pendium and text-book for sixty years, lays down the doctrine, that the private teacher, as compared with the teacher in the pay of the State, is like the private merchant trading without a bounty, competing with the merchant trading with a bounty. He classes it among the monopolies fatal to free principles; and of all monopolies, a monopoly in public instruction must be the worst. (Hear, hear.) Catholics do not stand alone in their opposition to this monopoly. At the late Anglican Synod in this city, a Report in favor of Separate Schools was read, and would have been adopted, but that the Hon. John Hillyard Cameron pointed out, that they could have all they wanted under the present law. Among Presbyterians, Methodists, and other religious bodies, there are many advocates of combining religious and secular instruction, in the daily teaching of children. (Hear, hear.) In Lower Canada, the British Protestant population are a mere moiety. Are they in favor of abolishing their own schools? ask the hon. Members who especially represent them, if that is the case? No one rises to answer in the affirmative. Why then do not observe the common Christian rule of "doing unto others, as we would wish to be done by," and allow the Catholic minority in Upper Canada, to educate their own children in peace. (Hear, hear.) To honorable gentlemen on this side of the House, with whom I generally always agree on other questions, I would say, educate your children your own way, but allow us to educate ours; we don't want to interfere with your common schools, we only want to keep our own children out of them. (Hear, hear.) The principle for which we contend is the same which leads men to resist paying for the support of a State Church in which they do not believe; and the arguments that uphold the one, carried a little farther will uphold the other. If they can be advocated on the ground of benefiting society, so can the other. It is for the interest of society that adults should be taught their moral duties, as well as that children should be instructed in secular knowledge. Is the State therefore, to turn teacher on Sundays as well as on week days. And if not, why not? Catholic parents object to both assumptions, and to the state school system because it assumes that all sects are equal, and that all Christians are sectaries. We have never been a sect; and will not consent to write ourselves down beside every "ism" of yesterday. (Hear, hear.) I may be charged with illiberality in thus frankly stating my opinions, and those of every Catholic in communion with his Church; for it is not every one who calls himself a Catholic, that the corporation, that the Church recognises as such. (Hear, hear.) Every sect speaks of its "members in good standing," and so does the Catholic Church. And I repeat, Sir, there is not a Catholic layman "in good standing," knowing something of his own religion, on either side of the Atlantic, who does not hold unimpaired secular instruction to be an evil of the most dangerous kind, fatal to the faith and morals of his children. (Hear, hear.) This may be considered illiberal, but I have no desire to practise that false liberality whose honest name is duplicity. Are we, to win a name for liberality, to run into downright indifference? No, Sir—No. In genuine liberality—in charity and courtesy—I desire not to be outdone by any member of this House; but I desire also to love the lessons taught me in my youth by my own parents; I am quite content with my own religion; I have children to whom I desire to transmit it as their best inheritance; and I cannot, therefore, subscribe for one moment to the doctrine that the State—the political power of the day—can exonerate Christian parents from the duty of selecting, protecting, and directing the education of their own children. (Mr. McGeer concluded amid loud applause.)

pendium and text-book for sixty years, lays down the doctrine, that the private teacher, as compared with the teacher in the pay of the State, is like the private merchant trading without a bounty, competing with the merchant trading with a bounty. He classes it among the monopolies fatal to free principles; and of all monopolies, a monopoly in public instruction must be the worst. (Hear, hear.) Catholics do not stand alone in their opposition to this monopoly. At the late Anglican Synod in this city, a Report in favor of Separate Schools was read, and would have been adopted, but that the Hon. John Hillyard Cameron pointed out, that they could have all they wanted under the present law. Among Presbyterians, Methodists, and other religious bodies, there are many advocates of combining religious and secular instruction, in the daily teaching of children. (Hear, hear.) In Lower Canada, the British Protestant population are a mere moiety. Are they in favor of abolishing their own schools? ask the hon. Members who especially represent them, if that is the case? No one rises to answer in the affirmative. Why then do not observe the common Christian rule of "doing unto others, as we would wish to be done by," and allow the Catholic minority in Upper Canada, to educate their own children in peace. (Hear, hear.) To honorable gentlemen on this side of the House, with whom I generally always agree on other questions, I would say, educate your children your own way, but allow us to educate ours; we don't want to interfere with your common schools, we only want to keep our own children out of them. (Hear, hear.) The principle for which we contend is the same which leads men to resist paying for the support of a State Church in which they do not believe; and the arguments that uphold the one, carried a little farther will uphold the other. If they can be advocated on the ground of benefiting society, so can the other. It is for the interest of society that adults should be taught their moral duties, as well as that children should be instructed in secular knowledge. Is the State therefore, to turn teacher on Sundays as well as on week days. And if not, why not? Catholic parents object to both assumptions, and to the state school system because it assumes that all sects are equal, and that all Christians are sectaries. We have never been a sect; and will not consent to write ourselves down beside every "ism" of yesterday. (Hear, hear.) I may be charged with illiberality in thus frankly stating my opinions, and those of every Catholic in communion with his Church; for it is not every one who calls himself a Catholic, that the corporation, that the Church recognises as such. (Hear, hear.) Every sect speaks of its "members in good standing," and so does the Catholic Church. And I repeat, Sir, there is not a Catholic layman "in good standing," knowing something of his own religion, on either side of the Atlantic, who does not hold unimpaired secular instruction to be an evil of the most dangerous kind, fatal to the faith and morals of his children. (Hear, hear.) This may be considered illiberal, but I have no desire to practise that false liberality whose honest name is duplicity. Are we, to win a name for liberality, to run into downright indifference? No, Sir—No. In genuine liberality—in charity and courtesy—I desire not to be outdone by any member of this House; but I desire also to love the lessons taught me in my youth by my own parents; I am quite content with my own religion; I have children to whom I desire to transmit it as their best inheritance; and I cannot, therefore, subscribe for one moment to the doctrine that the State—the political power of the day—can exonerate Christian parents from the duty of selecting, protecting, and directing the education of their own children. (Mr. McGeer concluded amid loud applause.)

pendium and text-book for sixty years, lays down the doctrine, that the private teacher, as compared with the teacher in the pay of the State, is like the private merchant trading without a bounty, competing with the merchant trading with a bounty. He classes it among the monopolies fatal to free principles; and of all monopolies, a monopoly in public instruction must be the worst. (Hear, hear.) Catholics do not stand alone in their opposition to this monopoly. At the late Anglican Synod in this city, a Report in favor of Separate Schools was read, and would have been adopted, but that the Hon. John Hillyard Cameron pointed out, that they could have all they wanted under the present law. Among Presbyterians, Methodists, and other religious bodies, there are many advocates of combining religious and secular instruction, in the daily teaching of children. (Hear, hear.) In Lower Canada, the British Protestant population are a mere moiety. Are they in favor of abolishing their own schools? ask the hon. Members who especially represent them, if that is the case? No one rises to answer in the affirmative. Why then do not observe the common Christian rule of "doing unto others, as we would wish to be done by," and allow the Catholic minority in Upper Canada, to educate their own children in peace. (Hear, hear.) To honorable gentlemen on this side of the House, with whom I generally always agree on other questions, I would say, educate your children your own way, but allow us to educate ours; we don't want to interfere with your common schools, we only want to keep our own children out of them. (Hear, hear.) The principle for which we contend is the same which leads men to resist paying for the support of a State Church in which they do not believe; and the arguments that uphold the one, carried a little farther will uphold the other. If they can be advocated on the ground of benefiting society, so can the other. It is for the interest of society that adults should be taught their moral duties, as well as that children should be instructed in secular knowledge. Is the State therefore, to turn teacher on Sundays as well as on week days. And if not, why not? Catholic parents object to both assumptions, and to the state school system because it assumes that all sects are equal, and that all Christians are sectaries. We have never been a sect; and will not consent to write ourselves down beside every "ism" of yesterday. (Hear, hear.) I may be charged with illiberality in thus frankly stating my opinions, and those of every Catholic in communion with his Church; for it is not every one who calls himself a Catholic, that the corporation, that the Church recognises as such. (Hear, hear.) Every sect speaks of its "members in good standing," and so does the Catholic Church. And I repeat, Sir, there is not a Catholic layman "in good standing," knowing something of his own religion, on either side of the Atlantic, who does not hold unimpaired secular instruction to be an evil of the most dangerous kind, fatal to the faith and morals of his children. (Hear, hear.) This may be considered illiberal, but I have no desire to practise that false liberality whose honest name is duplicity. Are we, to win a name for liberality, to run into downright indifference? No, Sir—No. In genuine liberality—in charity and courtesy—I desire not to be outdone by any member of this House; but I desire also to love the lessons taught me in my youth by my own parents; I am quite content with my own religion; I have children to whom I desire to transmit it as their best inheritance; and I cannot, therefore, subscribe for one moment to the doctrine that the State—the political power of the day—can exonerate Christian parents from the duty of selecting, protecting, and directing the education of their own children. (Mr. McGeer concluded amid loud applause.)

pendium and text-book for sixty years, lays down the doctrine, that the private teacher, as compared with the teacher in the pay of the State, is like the private merchant trading without a bounty, competing with the merchant trading with a bounty. He classes it among the monopolies fatal to free principles; and of all monopolies, a monopoly in public instruction must be the worst. (Hear, hear.) Catholics do not stand alone in their opposition to this monopoly. At the late Anglican Synod in this city, a Report in favor of Separate Schools was read, and would have been adopted, but that the Hon. John Hillyard Cameron pointed out, that they could have all they wanted under the present law. Among Presbyterians, Methodists, and other religious bodies, there are many advocates of combining religious and secular instruction, in the daily teaching of children. (Hear, hear.) In Lower Canada, the British Protestant population are a mere moiety. Are they in favor of abolishing their own schools? ask the hon. Members who especially represent them, if that is the case? No one rises to answer in the affirmative. Why then do not observe the common Christian rule of "doing unto others, as we would wish to be done by," and allow the Catholic minority in Upper Canada, to educate their own children in peace. (Hear, hear.) To honorable gentlemen on this side of the House, with whom I generally always agree on other questions, I would say, educate your children your own way, but allow us to educate ours; we don't want to interfere with your common schools, we only want to keep our own children out of them. (Hear, hear.) The principle for which we contend is the same which leads men to resist paying for the support of a State Church in which they do not believe; and the arguments that uphold the one, carried a little farther will uphold the other. If they can be advocated on the ground of benefiting society, so can the other. It is for the interest of society that adults should be taught their moral duties, as well as that children should be instructed in secular knowledge. Is the State therefore, to turn teacher on Sundays as well as on week days. And if not, why not? Catholic parents object to both assumptions, and to the state school system because it assumes that all sects are equal, and that all Christians are sectaries. We have never been a sect; and will not consent to write ourselves down beside every "ism" of yesterday. (Hear, hear.) I may be charged with illiberality in thus frankly stating my opinions, and those of every Catholic in communion with his Church; for it is not every one who calls himself a Catholic, that the corporation, that the Church recognises as such. (Hear, hear.) Every sect speaks of its "members in good standing," and so does the Catholic Church. And I repeat, Sir, there is not a Catholic layman "in good standing," knowing something of his own religion, on either side of the Atlantic, who