schools. Of course it would be useless at this stage to point to the great differences which exist between our own country and England in respect to broadness of concession in regard to education, but in connection with this very important subject I have had occasion to look over the English educational law and the debates which have taken place on the Bill of 1902, and it is amazing, it is edifying to see to what extent they have gone in England in order to maintain the principle of religious liberty in connection with schools. Of course as every one knows, denominational education exists in England ; there are there denominational schools such as exist here, but denominational schools helped by the state, supported by the state, and in the educational Bill of 1902 they have gone to a great length, they have improved the system in every way but they have stuck with admirable tenacity to the principle that there shall be no schools without some kind of religion. There are board schools in England, where secular matters are taught, subject to what is known as the Cowper-Temple clause which provides that there will be religious education but not of any particular denominational character. They have not wished even in the board schools to exclude the religious principle. In the voluntary schools denominational education is provided and encouraged by the state, and, always faithful to the principle of liberty of conscience, there is in the voluntary schools a conscience clause which exists since the educational law of 1870 and which provides that any pupil attending a school, may, if his conscience or the conscience of his parents require it, absent himself during religious instruction. In England they have stood firm throughout all educational changes to the principles of absolute religious equality in the schools and true to the principle of religious teaching.

There is in this country, for some reason which I am unable to understand, a servile desire to imitate the United States.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MONK. We are very proud of English traditions, of constitutional liberty, of all that the British flag and the British constitution represent in the way of freedom ; but, for a reason which I do not know, when we come to schools, amongst a certain set of people we have a desire to do exactly as they do in the United States.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MONK. But as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, that system is on trial, it is on trial. It has only existed for some fifty years. Up to 1842, the primary education provided in the United States was exactly the same as that provided in England and out of those schools which existed in the United States and which were similar to the schools that we have in Quebec, and that exist in Ontario, have come the most famous men whom we have had in the world during the last century. These schools have produced men like Washington, Jefferson, Colquhoun and Webster, and many others who have not been followed by men of equal value in the public life of the United States. And even those state schools which originated in New York in 1842 and have since spread over the whole republic, are in a tentative state ; they are on trial. Have they given absolute satisfaction ? Far from it, they are only on trial and many people have condemned that system of schools, have found it insufficient, inadequate to meet the wants of the nation. I have taken the trouble to find out what the judgment in the United States upon that system of schools has been, the judgment of men whose opinion is worth considering, not men of my own creed, but men of other creeds, and I find that opinion is very much divided as to the value of these schools. If anybody has any doubt as to the matter, he should read the 'New York Herald' of October 20, 1871, in which are given the results of an inquiry made by no less a person than Professor Agassiz of the value in 1871 of the new educational system established in the United States. Speaking of the New York Act of 1842 which was the beginning of the new system, an eminent American publicist, Richard Grant White said :

> It was a misfortune, not only for the city of New York, but for the state and for the whole country.

In the 'Popular Science Monthly,' March 1871, H. M. H. Wilson said :

> Of all the acquisitions of American liberty, our educational system is the most vaunted, and as usual the most spoiled.
>
> However bitter it may be, the inevitable conclusion is this : the development of our present system of education carries with it the destruction of individuality, and that destruction means political, intellectual and social stagnation.

In the 'Journal of Education,' March 17, 1881, Mr. Hazen said :

> The moral aspect of our schools is distressing. It is no more a question of the Bible to be kept or excluded, of Catholic or Protestant influence, but rather of such immoral tendencies that our public schools are a menace to the family, the state and the nation.

The Rev. John Doane, at the ministerial meeting at Cleveland, Ohio, in June, 1888, said :

> I believe that immorality and drunkenness often are the work of that American God, the public school.

The Rev. Thomas Green, pastor of the St. Andrew's church, in Chicago, said in November, 1886 :

> There is a great evil in the public schools as directed.