

The Examiner.

A WEEKLY JOURNAL OF POLITICS, LITERATURE AND NEWS.

EDWARD WHELAN]

This is true Liberty, when Free-born Men, having to advise the Public, may speak free.—EURIPIDES.

[EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.

Vol. VII.

CHARLOTTETOWN, PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND, MONDAY, MAY 31, 1858.

No. 47.

PROSPECTS OF WAR WITH FRANCE.

England is slowly but surely drifting into war—a great war—greater than the American, and to which the Indian conflict will appear but trifling in comparison. France is as surely doing the same thing; and unless both nations begin seriously to consider what it is they are differing about, and why it is they are calling each other ugly names and putting their arms a-kimbo, with an air of "I'm as good as you!" we shall proceed to blows, and the youngest of living men may not live to see the last of the blows in the warfare thus commenced. In order to avert such a calamity, we would earnestly exhort well-intentioned men on both sides of the channel to divest themselves of those passions and prejudices which had-intentioned men among them have invoked, and sit down calmly to ask each other what it is they are quarrelling about.

No greater calamity could occur on the face of the earth than a war between England and France. This is a proposition that will be admitted. But what are we doing to prevent it? There are men among us snarling, like ill-conditioned dogs, at the Emperor of the French, but who would be the first to cry out against war when they found themselves in the thick of it. And there are similarly constituted men in France, snarling at England, and who would be very abject in their humiliation, if the chapter of accidents should compel them to leave their country and take refuge in England, as their Jesuit fathers did in times gone by. These are the mischief-makers—the peace-destroyers—whom better men are influenced by, and whose follies and bad passions make the work of statesmen difficult, and compel transactions which, under different circumstances, would not be thought of. There is Sardinia, for instance—gallant Sardinia—calling for help, which England, with all her good-will, cannot afford. Sardinia appeals to English patriotism against the craft and oppression of Austria; but English patriotism is silent, for we may require the friendship of the despot, in the event of the folly and wickedness of the peace-destroyers leading us into hostilities with France. Count Cavour, the Sardinian Minister, has appealed to the great and growing sympathy which the struggle of his government has called forth in all free states throughout the world, but he appeals to England in vain. A combination, such as some Frenchmen, not without influence, are advising, would at once become possible, in which France, Austria, and the chief German states would be arrayed against England; in which case it would not be difficult to draw Russia to the side of our antagonists. We have had the world against us before, and our indomitable "pluck" might carry us safely through the encounter again; but at what a frightful cost would the contest be carried on! Hundreds of thousands of lives would be sacrificed, and the war would leave us bankrupt in means, and no other consolation than such as might be derived from the circumstance of our foes being reduced to a similarly wretched condition.

And what is it that we are to fight about? Is it the errors of the Emperor? What have we to do with the Emperor? If the Emperor's politics forbid the continuance of certain persons in France, there is an asylum for them in England, so long as they pay respect to the laws which Englishmen consider necessary for their own government; and there should be an end of it. If the people of France dislike their Emperor, it is for them to demonstrate their dislike. It is not our business to fight their battle. Nor do they ask us to do it. They are well able to fight themselves. The principle which should actuate all Englishmen is that of non-interference. It would be as unfortunate a thing for the Emperor as for England, if the two nations were to go to war; perhaps more so; but the Emperor may be unable to control the disposition of his army and people. Let a sense of indignity be deeply impressed on either country, and hostilities are certain. Reasonable men should endeavour to show that no intentional offence has ever been thought of, and to remove misconceptions on the subject.

For while the misunderstanding lasts, England, like Sardinia, most needs seek alliances, and with powers with which it has no sentiment in common. "We have endeavoured," said Count Cavour, "to form a system of alliances with the Western Powers who had no interests in Italy contrary to ours. Unhappily, fortune is not always the friend of strict right and justice. When a nation has not large squadrons to dispose of, it must endeavour to secure, in case of need, the support of the large squadrons of its friends and allies." In this paragraph, the Sardinian Minister answers his complaint of the neglect of England. We have, unhappily, no such large squadrons to dispose of as would be required in the event of a war with France. "Let us renounce the English alliance," says the French Jesuit organ—"the alliance with perfidious, insolent England, which has never been cordial, and can never be relied on." As the eldest and first of Catholic nations, France, "according to this firebrand," ought to form an indissoluble bond whose force in Europe should counterbalance throughout the world that of England and Russia united. "Sincerely allied to Austria," adds the *Univers*, "France would pacify Italy, consolidate Belgium, purify Switzerland, and attach to herself all Germany, by generously inviting her, through Austria and the Hanseatic Towns, to assume her part in the domain of the Seas. Holland and Prussia, though Protestant, would enter into this confederation of European public safety against Russia and England, become Asiatic Powers. Who could prevent France from advancing to the Rhine, or Prussia from obtaining military ports, a navy and colonial establishments? There would be a German marine, the Italian navy would revive, the Adriatic reanimated would bless Austria for restoring its splendour, and the flags of Sicily and Sardinia, with those of Rome, would fraternize in the free waters of the canal of Suez, constructed, if necessary, with stone taken from the rock of Perim." This rock of Perim being the site (as we recently showed) which Lord Palmerston adroitly took possession of when French mischief-makers were tending in that direction, and their progress through the Red Sea was virtually stopped thereby. England and Russia, it may be observed, are not natural allies, and we could not depend upon deriving much help from the latter in case of danger. The importance of an Austrian alliance is indicated by the direction of the French journal to its own Government, to cultivate a good understanding with Austria. It is believed that England has been beforehand with the French advisers, and, although we dislike and have no faith in Austrian friendship, we must not be fastidious in case of danger; and there is truth in the saying that "necessity makes a man acquainted with strange bedfellows." We would rather go hand in hand with France, and be regardless of all the rest of the world, than have occasion to look for friendship elsewhere; and this is the policy the soundness of which we would impress upon the British people.

Condemning, as we do, the passionate excitement in this country about the internal affairs of France, (which concern only the French themselves) we think it is equally incumbent on the directors of public opinion on the other side to censure and disavow the frantic declamation of mischief-makers among themselves. The *Univers* declares that "everybody knows that the English alliance is a snare," and then goes on to say that "England will have no alliance except for her own advantage, and in accordance with her secular policy. It is for that reason that, after the capture of Canton, the expedition

to Pekin was adjourned and afterwards abandoned. There is no objection that France should aid England by striking blows, but it is desirable that she should figure in a treaty, and, for that reason, a treaty will be dispensed with. When we are no longer at Canton, the English will fortify themselves there, in order to secure the easy possession of southern China as far as Szechuen and Tibet, while they will advance into the Burman Empire by the Irrawadi, and, ascending the Salween, arrive in the Yunnan. That is the reason why, when our expedition to Cochinchina was resolved on—at the same moment, and by one of those acts which abound in the history of England and in that of the buccaniers, Perim was seized and a fortress erected there. We shall have a position in Cochinchina, but England will hold the key, or we shall be six months making the voyage, which England will perform in six weeks. That is the reason, in fine, why the trial of Bernard is a greater triumph for English policy than even for the sect of Assassins." All this is extravagant and very unjust and honest Frenchmen might profitably occupy themselves in repudiating it. But they are silent. "England," continues the French journalist, "finds it well to be a den of assassins in London, as she finds it well to be a manufacturer of poison in Bengal." This is more offensive than the flourish of the silly colonels, who would have been satisfied with promotion; because it is the deliberate expression of the representative of a large class of persons in France by whom it should be at once disavowed. Nothing at all approaching the malignity of these expressions has appeared in the most violent of the English journals which throw dirt at the emperor.

And where are the avowed "friends of peace" at a moment when the relations of the two countries are becoming thus embittered? Where is the peace society? There was a time when gentlemen could go as far as St. Petersburg in the hope of calming strife. Is that pacific spirit dead? Or has it become, on a sudden, anxious for war? The true interests of England and France lie in the continuance of peace, and it would be well for both nations if they were to dedicate themselves, at once and earnestly, to the suppression of angry passions and the strengthening of the alliance which ought never to have been shaken.—*News of the World, May 9.*

Colonial Legislature.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

FRIDAY, March 19, 1858.

BIBLE QUESTION.

PETITIONS RELATING TO EDUCATION.

(Continued.)

Hon. D. MONTGOMERY.—Hon. members who have opposed the Resolution and supported the amendment, have all said that the liberty of reading the Bible in the District Schools, which is freely extended to all scholars whose parents wish them to read it in school, works well, gives satisfaction to such parents, and in no way offends those who do not approve it, or wish their children to participate in it. Well then, this being allowed to be the real state of the case, as respects our District Schools, for it is not disputed by any one, I think it will puzzle those hon. members to prove that, if the same liberty were extended to the Central Academy and the Normal School, it would not, with respect to parents whose children attend, or may attend either of these institutions, be productive of the same happy results. [Hon. Col. Secretary. It does so with respect to the Normal School.] No; I say it does not; for the privilege of reading the Bible, to the Master of that School, by such scholars as may choose to attend half an hour before school, or to stay half an hour after school, two or three days a week, for the purpose, or whose parents may direct or command them to do so, is not, by any means, extending to any the privilege of reading the Bible in school; but, on the contrary, it is the inflicting of a punishment, by extra confinement, both upon such scholars and the master himself. And, sir, the tone and mode of argument in which some hon. members have indulged, in their opposition to the Resolution, are, I must say, of a character the very reverse of that which ought to distinguish speeches, delivered during the discussion of so serious a question, as that which now engages our attention. Such a question ought to be decided solely upon its own merits; and nothing extraneous, especially of an irritating or offensive character, ought to be connected with it, to prevent our bestowing upon it the most impartial and equable consideration. This sense of propriety has, I am sorry to say, been much disregarded during the discussion; and the hon. member from Finty Glen, is not the only one who has done violence to it. Hon. members who opposed the Resolution seem to be particularly anxious to establish, or at least to create a suspicion of some previous connexion between members who support the resolution and the petitioners; and earnestly wish it to be believed that we have no better motive or higher design in the support which we give to the prayer of the petitioners, than the aim and expectation of, thereby, being able to prepare the way for the defeat, at the coming elections, of the party at present having the majority in this House. Now, for my own part, I can truly say—and I imagine every other member on this side of the House can as truly say very nearly the same—how much soever I may desire the overthrow of the party at present in power, and how willing soever I may be to aid in the endeavour by honorable and constitutional means to hasten their downfall, I had no share in getting up the petitions for such purpose; and more, I knew nothing about any of them until they were sent into this House, and sincerely believe that the idea of effecting a change in the Government of the Colony, by their means, was never, for one moment, entertained by those who most earnestly desired to see them numerously and respectfully signed. That the people throughout the country are not, however, generally satisfied with the limitation to which the use of the Bible is confined in our public schools, is sufficiently and most convincingly proved by the signatures to the petitions now before us. Reverence for the Bible, as the Word of God, and dependence upon the sacred truths which it reveals, is a test of religion, amongst all Christians; but yet, we know, all Christians do not agree as to the extent and freedom with which it ought to be read by children and the laity in general. We who are Protestants think that our children ought to be taught to read it, and to be daily instructed from it, even from their most tender youth; and hence our earnest desire that they should be freely allowed to read it in our public schools. Catholics, on the contrary, however do not wish their children to read it in that way; and I am very sure no desire exists on our part to force them to do so. We are unwilling to be coerced ourselves, and, therefore, do not seek to coerce others. When I went to school, children of Catholics as well as of Protestants, were my school-fellows; and the Bible being regularly read in school, we all, both Catholics and Protestants, with the most kindly feelings, one to another, and utterly ignorant of any cause for distrust or jealousy amongst us, read the Bible together in one class. I am sorry that the same harmony of feeling does not still exist throughout the country, with respect to the Bible in

our schools; and perhaps, I may be permitted to say also, that I am sorry that such feeling has not been as prevalent as it ought to have been during the present discussion. I support the Resolution of my hon. colleague.

Hon. J. WIGHTMAN.—On a question concerning so grave a subject as that which now engages the attention of this Committee, I cannot think that I could justify myself as having done my duty to my constituents were I to give a silent vote. I shall, therefore, endeavour briefly to state my reasons for the vote which I mean to give on this occasion. The Petitions which are now before us, have reference to the Normal School and the Central Academy only; showing by their silence with respect to the District Schools in the country, that the people are perfectly satisfied with what was done, by this House, in its last session, touching the use or the reading of the Bible in those schools. If the fact were otherwise, the people would have got up petitions, setting forth their dissatisfaction with it. The question then concerning the use of the Bible, we may consider as wholly and finally settled, so far as it concerns our public schools in the country; and what we are now, in an especial manner, called upon to do is to settle the same question as it respects the Central Academy and the Normal School. In approaching this immediate question, I feel constrained to say that I have been much surprised to hear it questioned whether the people in the country have a right—nay indeed to hear it almost denied that they have a right—to interfere, even by petitions to the Legislature, with the public educational institutions in Charlottetown, the Central Academy and the Normal School. Are not these institutions supported by appropriations made by us from a revenue derived from the people? Do not our agriculturists contribute to their maintenance, as largely as do the citizens of Charlottetown and, although but very few of their children are educated in these seminaries, are they not directly concerned, not only as to the kind and extent of secular knowledge imparted to scholars and pupils therein; but are they not also most especially, interested in the moral training bestowed upon them; in as much as their District schoolmasters must be selected from amongst those who have been educated at one of these institutions? These questions cannot be truly answered except affirmatively; and surely then it follows that the people may freely petition the Legislature concerning the kind of education and moral training imparted in those schools; and good right have they to expect that any of their petitions relative thereto, sent up to the Legislature shall, if expressed in respectful language be respectfully considered; and more especially so in that branch of it which is composed of their own direct representatives. In my opinion that system of education which, whilst it admits the necessity of religious teaching in our schools, does not make compulsory, either in appearance, or in reality, is the best adapted to the wants of the people, and such a Catholic children and Protestant children together; and, in conformity with this opinion, I would propose that, in the Central Academy and the Normal School, which are attended by young persons of both Communions, the Board of Education should authorize the reading of the Holy Scriptures, in the version of each Communion; by Protestant youth, in the Protestant version; and by Catholic youth, in the Catholic version; but yet without making it compulsory upon either; leaving it entirely to the parents of the children of each Communion, to avail themselves of such liberty for their children, or not, as they might think proper; and such a permissive regulation would, I think, be the best evidence we can give of our being actuated by the true spirit of Christian liberty. To compulsion on this subject, I am most decidedly opposed; for it would, if admitted, greatly impair the efficiency of our present impartial system, and positively imperil its existence. My wish is that, in our schools, religious instruction shall be secured to all, without shocking the principles or opinions of any. As far as my own feelings are concerned, I would be well pleased that the authorized version of the Holy Scriptures should be read in all our schools; but, as our present system of education has been established on non-sectarian grounds, and for the purpose of extending the advantages of education to all, I shall never give my vote for the establishment of any rule which might operate as an exclusion to children of the Roman Catholic persuasion. According to my views, the authorized version of the Holy Scriptures might be appropriated for the reading of such by the children of such parents as should desire it; and the Duty version for the reading of such by the children of such parents as believe that version to be the more correct. The entire exclusion of the Bible from our public schools, is what I cannot approve of; for I am fully convinced that, if we would instruct children in the relative duties which as children, they now owe, and, by such instruction, prepare them for the proper discharge of the relative duties which, on emerging from the control or restraint of parents and of school, they will have to perform in the fulfilment of their obligations as citizens, we cannot lay a more solid foundation of such instruction on any code of morality or rule of life, save on that which is found in the Word of God. The system of Free Education which we have lately established in this Colony, is, in my opinion, of vital interest to the welfare and perpetuity of a free government; as upon the intelligence and moral culture of the people, depend their capacity for self-government; and it is therefore to the education and moral training imparted in our public schools, that we must chiefly look for the broad foundations of the civil and social structure in the erection of which we are deeply concerned. No greater obstruction to such completion could arise, I feel certain, than jealousy and discord created by placing the members of different Christian Communions in antagonistic positions one towards another; and nothing, I am equally certain, will tend more to the future well-being of a people, composed of different religious denominations, than their having their children educated in the same schools, subject to the same authority and discipline, daily occupied together with the same moral exercises, and daily engaged, in the most harmonious, in the same physical sports. So reared, they could not fail to grow up in the exercise of the most kindly feelings towards one another, and their youthful friendships would be the foundation and guarantee of their union as a people. I hold in my hand a Resolution which I have drawn up in conformity with my opinions on this subject; which I mean to submit if the Resolution of the hon. member for Prince-town (the Hon. T. H. Haviland) be lost; and which I will now read. The hon. gentleman then read his Resolution, which is as follows:

"Whereas, while the House repudiates the principle of encroachment upon the religious opinions of any denomination, it considers that the most effectual evidence of the true spirit of Christian liberty will be afforded by allowing to each class of Christians the use of the copy of the Holy Scriptures in which it believes;

"And whereas the parties attending for instruction at the Central Academy and Normal School belong to the Protestant and Catholic Communions, and it is not inexpedient that the Copies of the Holy Scriptures to which they respectively adhere should be read without note or comment to the parties belonging to each denomination respectively;

"Be it therefore Resolved, as the opinion of this Committee, that the Board of Education should authorize the reading, in the above institutions, of the Holy Scriptures, without note or comment, during school hours, in such versions and to such of the pupils and students whose parents or guardians may require it."

Hon. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—The Journals of the Session of 1845, show that the hon. member for Prince-town (Hon. D. Montgomery) and the hon. member for the Third District of King's County (Hon. J. Wightman) both voted against a Resolution, the object of which was to declare in the Academy Act which prohibits the use of the Holy Scriptures, without note or comment, as a Class Book, in the Central Academy, by children whose parents or guardians shall not object to the same; as also that Resolution which "deemed it inexpedient to adopt any compulsory measures for the introduction of the Bible, as a Class Book, in the Central Academy, or the other Schools throughout the Island receiving grants of public money." It now however appears that their opinions on that question are the very reverse of what they were then.

Hon. HAVILAND.—A reference to that Journal will, I believe, show that these two hon. members are not the only individuals in this House, who have changed their opinions upon that question since that time; and that such may be found on both sides.

Hon. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—As the hon. member, my colleague, (Mr. Laird) has, in his own way, endeavoured to prove against me, not only that I have said the people in the country have no right to petition the Legislature concerning the discipline or course of instruction, or other internal regulations, observed or practised in the Central Academy or the Normal School; but that, with respect to the latter institution, I, at its inauguration, gave my sanction to the mode of moral teaching and training which Mr. Stark said was to be practised therein; I will, sir, by your leave and that of the Committee, take this opportunity to rebut both of these charges, to the end that the people may be fully and correctly informed concerning both, particularly the last. First, as to my having said the people in the country have no right to petition the Legislature concerning the Central Academy and the Normal School, I must take leave to tell the hon. member, my colleague, that in understanding me to say any thing of the kind, he has certainly very strangely misunderstood the meaning of my words. What I did say, with reference to the petitions, and which the hon. member seems to have so strangely misunderstood, was, that the petitions are all from the country, and that, if any part of the public felt themselves aggrieved by the rules and regulations now in operation, concerning the use of the Bible in the Central Academy and the Normal School, one would naturally conclude it would be those whose children were scholars in these institutions; and as such children, with scarcely an exception, belonged to Charlottetown, it was pretty clear that they who had the most direct interest in these institutions did not believe that, in these rules and regulations, there was any thing of which they could reasonably complain. So much for

that. Now for Mr. Stark, who, by certain parties, has been represented as one who had been victimized on account of his love of the Bible. I hold in my hand a pamphlet, copies of which are, by the same parties, eagerly circulated throughout the country, in which that individual is represented as having been obliged to leave this Island in consequence of his resistance to Papal aggressions upon the public schools. This statement, I hesitate not to say, is a most wicked and groundless falsehood; and the object of its dissemination throughout the country is one who no truly Christian man can entertain; being nothing less than the revival and the perpetuation of disagreement, bad feelings, and discord of the most hateful character in our midst. The object of the ex-Visitor of Schools, in representing himself, in Scotland, as having been unjustly deprived of his appointment in this Island, and driven from it, through Papal persecution, is plain enough in that country. It is evidently to engage in his favour, as an ill used man, the sympathies of his fellow countrymen and co-religionists; but, in this Island, we know, concerning him, what they cannot so well know in Scotland. We know that his representations concerning "Papal aggression upon the public schools in this Island," are positively false; and we also know that he has been most basely ungrateful to the Government of this Island, by which he was most leniently and kindly dealt with, not only before, but even after they knew he had been both inefficient and unfaithful in the performance of his duty; for so far did they carry their lenity and kindness to him, that they actually allowed him his full salary for three months, after he had ceased to discharge any of the duties of his appointment. To the history of Mr. Stark's retirement from his office, I would not now advert, did I not feel it necessary to do so, in order to counteract the influence which certain parties are covertly and basely seeking to establish over the public mind, by surreptitiously circulating such falsehoods concerning it as that which I have just noticed. When Mr. Stark undertook the duties of Visitor of Schools, at a salary of £200 a year, the Royal Agricultural Society, being desirous of conferring upon our farmers the benefits of modern discoveries in agricultural science, agreed to set apart £100 of their legislative grant for lectures on Agricultural Chemistry; and Mr. Stark having undertaken to deliver such lectures, it was agreed that this sum should be paid him annually for such service. Finding, however, after a short trial, that he had not knowledge enough of Agricultural Chemistry, to enable him to lecture thereon in an acceptable or edifying manner, he properly enough abandoned the lecturing part of his business. He still, however, continued to draw the £300; but his unfaithfulness in the discharge of his other duties as School Visitor gave rise to much murmuring and complaint; and it was with some difficulty that, in the session of 1856, the Government induced their supporters to vote for his full salary of £300 a year. The Government, having engaged his services for a certain period, felt that they were, in honor, bound to give him the £300. They accordingly applied to the Legislature for this amount; and it is worthy of remark that every one of the Conservative opposition, they whose friendship he thought was surely his, resisted the vote for £300, and declared their opinion that he should have only £200, as he had ceased to be a lecturer on Agricultural Chemistry; whilst it was sustained by most of the Government supporters, including three of the liberal Catholics. The Government, however, carried the vote of £300, with the understanding that their supporters should not be called upon to sanction a similar vote in another session. The Government then finding that the lectures on Chemistry had ceased, and that there was no likelihood of the Legislature's continuing the £100 formerly given for that service out of the Agricultural grant, gave notice to Mr. Stark, that after the quarter which would end in the following April, the salary for the Chemistry part of the business should also cease. Surely this was fair enough. Mr. Stark however, in reply, wrote to the Government expressing his desire to be at once relieved from his duties as Superintendent of the Normal School, and announcing, at the same time, his intention to relinquish all his duties in May next. The Government then perceiving that Mr. Stark was getting rid of his duties by piecemeal—first having declined the lecturing, and then having abandoned the Normal School, besides instead of visiting the public schools twice in the year, as he was bound to do, not having visited several of them even once,—very properly answered Mr. Stark's letter of resignation, by intimating to him that he was at once relieved from all his duties, since a part of them had become so disagreeable to him. The truth, in few words, is that Mr. Stark was not dismissed; but that he rather dismissed himself; for, so far from his having been driven out of office, on account of his firm Protestantism, and his unwillingness to succumb to Papal aggressions, as it seems he has contrived to make his present sympathizers believe, he was merely relieved, at his own request, from the burden of duties, which he had previously in part abandoned, and in the discharge of which he had been found neglectful. What is meant by Papal aggressions on the public schools in this Island, is a false representation of the ground which was taken by the majority in the Legislature, concerning the use of the Bible in these schools; which is, that the Education Law does not prescribe the use of the Bible—that the Board of Education has made no rule against its being read in the public schools,—but, on the contrary, has expressly declared that the Bible may be introduced into the public schools wherever the people desire it,—that the school returns (Mr. Stark's) showed that the Bible was freely read in many of the schools,—and that, as the voluntary system had given great satisfaction to all classes and all denominations, it would not only be useless, but dangerous to interfere with it. Mr. Stark's gross misrepresentations of these facts, and those of the chief agitators of the Bible question, together with his concealment of the fact that, on his arrival in this Colony, he was told by Sir Alexander Bannerman, that as the students and scholars of the Normal School would be of different religious denominations, Snow's system of moral training, by the master's hearing and explaining Scripture lessons, during the regular hours of tuition, could not possibly be adopted,—constitute the Papal aggressions spoken of in this pamphlet, and make up the whole of the persecution to which Mr. Stark was subjected in this Island. I have entered somewhat into detail on this subject, to the end that it may be seen by the people how easily, by the simplest statement of facts, the foul libel upon the Catholic portion of our community may be refuted; and how unworthy and base must be the purposes of those who industriously circulate it. Some hon. members say that the resolution is not compulsory; but, even as these hon. members themselves explain it, its operation might frequently be very and most unjustly compulsory. Suppose, for instance, that there were, in the school, only two or three scholars whose parents wished them to read the Bible, it would, in such case, under the operation of the resolution, be necessary for the master to devote, perhaps half an hour daily, to the hearing of these two or three read a lesson from the Bible, whilst all the rest would, in a manner, be compelled to be idle for the want of a teacher. The objection made by the hon. member for Prince-town (Hon. D. Montgomery) to the voluntary or permissive principle, as it respects the use of the Bible in the Normal School, is exactly that which has been made by other hon. members of the opposition, and as I have already answered them, I need not, I think, occupy any of the time of the Committee by answering the hon. member on that score.

Mr. YEO.—I can truly say that no church or sectarian prejudices weigh with, or influence me, in my consideration of the question now before this Committee; and that I would, at any time, be as ready to serve a Catholic as a Protestant, and quite as unwilling to sanction an infringement of either the religious or the political rights and privileges of the one, as of the other. My children have grown up, and my grand-children are growing up, among Catholics in perfect good will and harmony with them; nothing like bigotry on either side, having ever provoked the least feeling of religious animosity between them. That the reading of Protestant versions of the Bible, in the Central Academy and the Normal School, or in any of our public schools, in which Protestant children are required by their parents or their guardians to read it, agreeably to the resolution of the hon. member for Prince-town, (the Hon. T. H. Haviland) would give offence to Catholic parents having children in the same schools, is what I cannot easily persuade myself to believe. There is not, in my opinion, anything in the resolution, or in its contemplated operation, which can justly give offence to any Catholic, how strict and zealous soever he may be in holding the tenets and observing the doctrines and practices of his church; and, therefore, as it otherwise is intended only to secure to Protestants that privilege which they account their highest, and their best,—the privilege of having their children trained in the morality of the Bible, by being regularly taught to read it in school, I freely and heartily