

who are prejudiced against us, but nevertheless that appears to be the fact. The reason of it I do not know; but it has always been a conundrum to me why the people of England are broader in their views on these matters than are the people of Canada. The people of England have shown their liberality by the Education Act passed by the British parliament in 1902, and that Act was the outcome of a Royal Commission appointed in 1886 by our late lamented Majesty Queen Victoria. During this discussion we have often heard advocated, separate schools in which no religion at all would be taught; we have heard non-sectarian schools exalted; men sincere in that view say: Why not send Canadian children to school together and bring them up in friendly feeling and in harmony. I have already said that this is ideal, but it is not practical and whenever it has been attempted it has been a failure. As a Roman Catholic I declare that religion must be taught in the schools, and when I make that declaration I am in accord with a great body of the Protestant people. Later on I shall read the curriculum of an English Protestant college in my county, and which will show that they care a great deal about religion in Protestant schools. It would seem that some people are in favour of non-sectarian schools only when they want to entrap the Roman Catholics, and then they say: We will have no religion at all in the schools, we will educate all the children together. But, when these gentlemen have the management of their own schools for their own Protestant children there is not such a demand for non-sectarian schools, and their schools have as much religion taught in them as have the Roman Catholic schools. The Royal Commission appointed in England in 1886 looked over the educational systems of the different European countries and I quote from their report:

In Prussia, in all the elementary schools the religious instruction is compulsory as well as the other branches of instruction. The religious instruction is given by the teacher, exceptionally by clergymen and by special teachers of religion.

That is the way I understand religious instruction; I do not understand it as being merely one-half hour's instruction at the close of the school day. The religious instruction which the right hon. gentleman is giving in the Northwest schools means that when a child has been in class for six or seven hours learning secular subjects, there is to be half an hour for religious teaching. What veneration can a child so taught have for religion. Will he be imbued with the idea that it is the most important of all things to learn and practice if he wants to be an honest man and a good citizen. What will he think of religion when it is relegated to one-half hour at the close of the day? That is giv-

ing the Catholics of the Territories a stone instead of a loaf of bread. Here we have the example of Protestant Prussia which I hope every man here will heed, and in the schools of which country religion has a first place. The report continues:

Religious instruction is obligatory on all the scholars. For the religious instruction of the minority provisions are made partially at the expense of the state. For this purpose means are regularly granted by the government.

They are not afraid in Prussia to grant state aid to teach the children religion and morality.

In Saxony religious instruction is given in the schools of the state; in Protestant schools by the master, in Catholic schools by priests.

The religious instruction is obligatory on all the scholars but the minority of Catholic scholars would be taught by the local Catholic priests.

And yet that is in a Protestant country; a country more Protestant than Canada:

In Wurttemberg the schools of the state give religious as well as secular instruction. One-third part of the school time is devoted to religious instruction.

It is not one-half hour at the close of the day, but one-third of the entire school time is given to the teaching of religion:

The greatest part of the religious instruction is given by the teacher. The religious instruction is not obligatory on all the scholars. The minority may take part in the religious instruction of the majority, but if the parents prefer their children may not do so, they may be excused.

In Bavaria in the schools of the state religious instruction forms part of the curriculum, and is given by the parish priest. The religious instruction is obligatory on all the scholars.

These quotations are from the report of a Royal Commission of England, and on that report I assume was founded the English Education Act of 1902, under which not only do they teach religion in the schools but they teach the religion that the parent desires, and no religion will be taught in the English schools unless it is approved of by the bishop of each denomination. And why is this? It is because the great principle is understood in England, that the state has not the right to teach the child in any way other than as the parent desires. That is the natural right of the parent. No law and no constitution can change that. It is the natural law that you have the right to educate your child as you desire. But, my right hon. friend is giving to the state the control of the education of the child, and if the Catholic minority in the Northwest Territories do not want to avail itself of the education which it provides, then they will have to pay out of their own pockets for private education, and at the same time pay taxes to support the state education of which they disapprove. Now, let me point out that in the town of Valley-