

PROVINCIAL POLITICS.

1890.

A SPEECH

DELIVERED BY

HON. C. F. FRASER,

COMMISSIONER OF PUBLIC WORKS,

IN THE

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

MARCH 25th, 1890,

ON

SEPARATE SCHOOLS

And the position of the Roman Catholic Electors
with the two political parties.

*Copies of this Speech can be had by addressing W. T. R. Preston,
Secretary Provincial Reform Association, Toronto.*

Toronto :

PRINTED BY HUNTER, ROSE & CO.
1890.

HON. C. F. FRASER'S SPEECH ON THE SEPARATE SCHOOL QUESTION.

THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY AND THE ROMAN
CATHOLIC VOTE.

The following is a report of the speech delivered on Tuesday evening, March 25th, 1890, in the Legislative Assembly, by Hon. C. F. Fraser, Commissioner of Public Works, during the discussion on the amendments to the Separate School Act, as proposed by Mr. Meredith and his supporters:

Hon. Mr. Fraser followed close upon Mr. Meredith, and was received with hearty applause as he rose. Mr. Meredith, he said, had started out all right apparently, but had not gone far before it was manifest that, whatever else his intention was, he was bent on making an appeal to a certain class in this Province which might possibly tide him over to the Government side of the House. Mr. Meredith asked what could be the motives which would induce him to take this position. Why, even the page behind him could tell him, it was so self-evident. He (Mr. Fraser) had hoped that Mr. Meredith would confine himself to a discussion of the bills before the House, but he had taken the House very far afield, dealing with the whole question of Separate Schools, and, therefore, he (Mr. Fraser) would also have to go further afield than he had intended to. It would be necessary, it seemed to him, to clear up a little as he went along. He was not at present going to follow his hon. friend. He was not, for instance, at present at all events, going to discuss what he had to say about the hierarchy of the

Church, nor what he had especially to say about Archbishop Cleary. His candid opinion was, as between the hon. gentleman and Archbishop Cleary, the latter was able to take care of himself, and his impression was that the scoring which Archbishop Cleary had recently given him accounted for a good deal of the spirit of the attack of the hon. gentleman. (Applause.) Nor was he going to follow him through other matters with which he entertained the House respecting the hierarchy, unless at a later moment he should think it of any consequence so to do. It appeared to him from the London speech of the hon. gentleman, and still more clearly from his speech to-night—because in his London speech he did not go quite so far as he did to-night—together with what the member for Toronto, his first lieutenant, who occupied a seat beside him on the platform on the occasion of his speech at London, had said during a preceding debate—and together with the speech of the member for Muskoka and the resolutions passed at West Toronto Junction, the Convention at which Mr. Clendenan was nominated only very recently—taking these things all together, it was tolerably clear that they had heard the

FIRST GUN IN THE CRUSADE

which was intended to accomplish the abolition of Separate Schools. So they had better see now where they were, what Separate Schools really meant, what principle was involved in them, how their supporters might or might not be concerned, and what the school law provisions were. The general impression seemed to be that when a man became a supporter of a Public School or of a Separate School, what was meant by that was that he was compelled to send his children to a Public or Separate School, as the case might be. He did not read the law as meaning anything of the kind. When they talked of a Public School supporter it meant no more than this, that he was paying a certain amount to the support of a Public School to which he need not send his children at all. As a matter of fact, so far as the law of the Province of Ontario was concerned every Separate School supporter could, though he were required to pay taxes to a Public School, still send his children to a Separate School. The public mind must be disabused of the idea that he could not do this, because the public mind was greatly mistaken on that point. There was no law to compel a man to send his child to any particular school, and there was no such law in any land on this continent, or in any civilised land in the world. All the hon. gentleman would succeed in doing, if he did succeed

IN DESTROYING THE RIGHTS AND

privileges now enjoyed by law in respect of Separate Schools would be to compel those of the Roman Catholic religion—just as they were being compelled across the lines—to pay for the support of Public Schools to which they could not conscientiously send their children, and to carry on besides schools, which, to all intents and purposes, would be the same as the Separate Schools of to-day. He told the hon. gentleman, with respect to the 300,000 people of this Province forming its religious minority, who were concerned in this question of Separate Schools from the standpoint of their religion, and to whom it was a matter of conscience—who, when they aided in supporting Separate Schools were but doing that which their faith and religious belief required them to do—he told him that should they ever repeal these provisions, so that there would no longer be a Separate School Act, there was not a single Roman Catholic Separate School that would the day thereafter be closed, and they could not be closed under the law. Now, he would point out where the cardinal point of the whole school law of this Province was to be found. It was found in a couple of sections of the Public Schools Act. They were usually known as the compulsory sections. Sections 209 and 210 of the Public Schools Act were the only sections under which, by any law of this Province hitherto passed or now in operation, any parent or guardian of a child was compelled to send the child to school at all. They could take the parent's or guardian's rates or taxes, and compel them, whether poor or rich, to pay towards the support of a school, but under those two sections, which formed the

CORNER-STONE OF THE WHOLE SYSTEM,

and which directed whether a parent or guardian might or might not educate the child, there was nothing to compel him to send the child to any particular school. Section 209 said:—"The parent or guardian of every child, not less than seven years nor more than thirteen years of age, is required to cause such child to attend a Public School, or any other school in which elementary instruction is given, for the period of 100 days in each Public School year, unless there be some reasonable excuse for non-attendance." So that the parent or guardian was not bound by any law that was in existence now to send his child to any particular school, and they could not in this Province enforce any law to compel the parents to do so, because intelligent Protestants would

not, having regard to their own proper privileges and liberties as parents, permit the enactment of such a law. Therefore, it was only under this clause that there was any compulsion, and this clause applied only to children between seven and thirteen years of age, and under it the child might be sent to any school whatsoever where elementary instruction was given. The next clause proceeded :—" A child shall not be required to attend a Public School if such child is under sufficient elementary instruction in some other manner, or if such child has been prevented attending school by sickness or other unavoidable cause, or if there is no Public School which such child can attend within two miles, measured according to the nearest road from the residence of such child, if under the age of nine, and within three miles if over that age." So, he said again, that when people talked about abolishing Separate Schools, when it was said that a

CRUSADE WAS TO BE LED BY THE

hon. member for London looking to that end, he told them that if the day ever came when that decision would be reached by this Legislature, if they ever put the people of the minority in the same position as they found themselves in the State of New York, where, being compelled to pay towards the Public Schools, they at the same time voluntarily, because of their faith, had established schools of their own—he said to them ahead of time, if ever that time did come, if ever such a law was brought into operation, it would be the stealing—for he could not use any other phrase—from the Roman Catholic minority money for the support of schools to which they could not conscientiously send their children. What else could it be? Under a compact, as solemn as compact could be made, assented to by the old Province of Upper Canada, first formulated by conference, then ratified by the people, ratified by the Imperial Parliament and the Parliament of Canada, the pledged faith of the whole people of this country was given that the minority should be allowed to retain these Separate Schools, and why should they be jeopardised when they had done nothing to deserve the jeopardising of them? What had they done? he should like to ask the hon. gentleman. There were those who said the pupils were inferior, but where were they inferior, or how? In what line of life was it? The Separate Schools of this Province were 50 years old. They had been guaranteed to the minority now by the British North America Act for quite a quarter of a century. He would like to ask what class of the graduates were afraid

to face the majority of their fellowmen in this Province of Ontario? He thought that was the best test of what the system was doing. They might assert mere theories and say the Separate School teachers had not certificates, but the practical and beneficial fruits of the Separate School system were seen in every walk of life, and, comparing the position of the Separate School minority with that of 25 years ago, their position had distinctly advanced. Take the bar, take the pulpit, take the bench, take the merchant's desk, take any rank or walk of citizenship, and, bearing in mind their proportion and numbers, would not those educated in Separate Schools be found

TO BE THE EQUALS OF THOSE

who were presumed to be better educated because they came from Public Schools. He did not say they were any better. It was not because they said they were any better that they maintained these schools, but because they believed that their young children growing up should be educated day by day in their religion. What were they doing in the United States? There nearly a million of the Roman Catholic children attended what are called parochial schools, and these were supported out of the pockets of the Roman Catholic ratepayers, who had to pay besides towards supporting the other common or Public Schools of the country. And these parochial schools were increasing, and only recently there had been a more energetic move in the direction of increasing them in face of the fact that those who supported them had to pay two rates. Now, in face of this, when they were pledged to this system, when it was doing no harm and educating the pupils just as fairly as the Public School system, when the graduates were in all respects the equals of their fellows from the Public Schools, what pretext could there be for the abolition of the Separate School system unless it was to steal and pilfer from the minority? There could be no possible end gained, save this, and one had but to glance at what was going on in the United States to-day to find abundant proof for his assertion. There, where they had no Separate School law at all, the Roman Catholics were carrying on their own system of education, and the same thing would occur here. Did they think the Roman Catholic minority were going to be such sneaks, or make of themselves such palpable cowards as they would be if, under such provocation, they would be found submitting to that which was contrary to their conscience and faith and religion? Now, so far as the general question was concerned, it was sometimes asked by

those who claimed to belong to the "Equal Rights" party, "Why should the Roman Catholics have any rights which we have not?" He did not read the law as saying that Protestants could not establish Separate Schools. He read quite the contrary. As a matter of fact there were nine

PROTESTANT SEPARATE SCHOOLS

in this province, and, as he read the law, they could be established in every city, town and village to-morrow, and established by far more easy methods as to control, as to the giving of notice and as to all that concerned the machinery of the schools, than could Roman Catholic Separate Schools. He would quote from the Protestant Separate School Act on this point, because they had heard it stated that there was no such thing as power to establish Protestant Separate Schools except under certain exceptional circumstances. Section 1 of this Act said:—"Upon the application in writing of five or more heads of families resident in any township, city, town or incorporated village being Protestants, the Municipal Council of the said township, or the Board of School Trustees of any such city, town or incorporated village, shall authorize the establishment therein of one or more Separate Schools for Protestants; and upon the application of five or more heads of families resident in any township, city, town or incorporated village, being colored people, the Council of such township or the Board of School Trustees of any such city, town or incorporated village, shall authorize the establishment therein of one or more Separate Schools for colored people, and in every such case such Council or Board, as the case may be, shall prescribe the limits of the section or sections of such schools." The hon. gentleman read on to the 6th and 7th sections without interruption. These two clauses provide:—"In any city or town the persons who make application, according to the provisions of section 2 of this Act, may have a Separate School in each ward or in two or more wards united, as the said persons may judge expedient." Then the 7th,—"No Protestant Separate School shall be allowed in any school section, except when the teacher of the Public School in such section is a Roman Catholic." Mr. Fraser remarked that this was the only restriction contained throughout the Act as to the general power.

MR. MEREDITH—Hear, hear.

MR. FRASER said his hon. friend said "hear, hear," but this restriction only applied to the case of rural school sections, not to the case of cities, towns and villages, and there

might have been a very good reason in the minds of those framing this law why there should not be a second Protestant School in a rural school section where already there was one taught by a Protestant teacher. Section 8 said :—" In all cities, towns, incorporated villages and township Public School sections, in which Separate Schools exist, every Protestant or colored person (as the case may be) sending children to such a school, or supporting the same by subscribing thereto annually an amount equal to the sum at which such person, if such Separate School did not exist, must have been rated in order to obtain the annual Legislative Public School grant, shall be exempt from the payment of all rates imposed for the support of the Public Schools of such city, town, incorporated village and school section respectively, and of all rates imposed for the purpose of obtaining the Public School grant."

MR. MEREDITH—That is a condition a-l-o. There is no such condition in regard to the Roman Catholic Separate Schools.

MR. FRASER—No, but this is more liberal. It does not require any notice. I am pointing out that there is no mere technicality put in the way of Protestant Separate School supporters. Mr. Fraser re-read the clause together with the next succeeding one, which is as follows :—" The exemption from the payment of school rates, as herein provided, shall not extend beyond the period during which such persons send children to or subscribe as aforesaid for the support of such Separate School ; nor shall the exemption extend to school rates or taxes imposed, or to be imposed, to pay for school houses, the erection of which was undertaken or entered into before the establishment of such Separate School." The hon. gentleman asked the House to mark that the word " herein," as used here, would show what was meant by the preceding section. So that under this law which related to Protestant Separate Schools, there was no necessity for any notice at all, except the original petition, and thereafter any person might become a supporter, not being bound by any particular date, nor any particular rule ; but, so long as he chose to make a contribution, he was exempt from the rate that flowed to the ordinary Public Schools. In quoting the other clauses, he stated that in one respect the Act was less generous, if he might use the term, because once a man became a Roman Catholic Separate School supporter he

COULD NOT WITHDRAW EXCEPT

he had given notice before a certain time in the year of his intention. So that there were on the statute book

of the Province provisions more ample and more liberal for the establishment of Protestant Separate Schools than there were for the establishment of Roman Catholic Separate Schools. It was no answer to his argument that Protestants had not availed themselves of the law. His reference to this statute was mainly for the purpose of showing that those who said Roman Catholics enjoyed a privilege that was not extended to others were entirely mistaken. He could not quite understand why Protestant Separate Schools had not been established, unless it was that Protestants were a large majority in the Province, and that, controlling the Public Schools as they did, they should be quite content to have them as their system. But there were cases where Protestant Separate Schools had been established. There were nine in the Province of Ontario, where, until two or three years ago, the teacher's right to teach could have been a simple certificate from the Trustees without even the formula of an examination. But suppose there was no such statute as the one he had quoted, he had for a long time been unable to understand why in the larger centres—for example in the City of Toronto, where the schools were practically unmixcd—there had not been more religious education imparted. There was no reason why there should not be. If there was all the tendency towards union of the Protestant denominations which it was stated there was, would it not be possible where there were no Roman Catholic pupils, and where the children of various Protestant denominations were together, that there should be more religious education, and that it could be agreed upon. One could not if he would, nor dare not if he could, close his eyes to the fact that agnosticism and atheism were spreading a great deal in the world, and that these did not come from the farm, the hamlet or the township, but from the great centres of the population; and would it not be a good thing, instead of trying to abolish Separate Schools, if the Christian Churches of this Province, where they have the opportunity, without any demur being made, were to introduce into these Public Schools more of the religious teaching which in the end might save a good many from drifting from Christianity into the paths of agnosticism or atheism, or any of the other isms to which he had referred. The speaker next proceeded to give the reasons why the Opposition leader had entered upon this crusade against Separate Schools. He did not think he needed to go further than his friend's London speech to find the reason. The hon. gentleman had been in this chamber during the time that all these various amendments had been made. If there was anything that his friends boasted of more than another, it was that there was

not a single item of legislation that his eye had not scanned; that he was there to put the dots over the i's and the crosses over the t's; that he never failed to unearth and detect anything that was of doubtful or improper tendency, and that any particular provision that required amending he invariably put right. Now, it must be a very great humiliation to him to be compelled to practically say that these Separate School amendments had passed through the House without his discovering anything wrong or improper or unfair in them. He (Mr. Fraser) thought he found the reason for his (Mr. Meredith's) position now in what he had referred to to-day as

THE "SOLID VOTE,"

and that, as the Roman Catholics were against him and in favor of the Liberal Government of Ontario, he had nothing to gain from that part of the electorate, and could afford to take such a course as would give him increased support from Protestant recruits. He (Mr. Fraser) denied that there was any such thing, or ever had been such a thing, as a solid Roman Catholic vote in this Province or in the Dominion. Even the clergy were divided, and there had never been a time during which the Roman Catholic vote for any party or parties had been solid or nearly solid. Not only the laity were divided, but the clergy were divided in their politics, and the Bishops also, just as they had a right to be. There were some features of the political history of the Province, so far as it concerned Roman Catholics, which the leader of the Opposition seemed to have forgotten, and he begged to remind him of them. In the old days the Catholics were found supporting Baldwin and the Liberals of that time with an approach almost to unanimity, and to-day the Roman Catholic allegiance to the Liberal party would have been about as it was then had it not been for this Separate School question. It was well known that immediately prior to Confederation they were with the Conservative party. How did they come into Confederation? They came in with the Separate School system guaranteed, and when, according to the then views of the Conservative leaders, the old political parties were disbanded, and the political slate was clean. Next he referred to the calling of a Roman Catholic Convention in the City of Toronto, which was a lay movement prompted largely by the illiberal way in which the Conservative leaders had treated the Roman Catholic laity in the matter not alone of the distribution of the public patronage, but also as respected representation in Parliament. His hon. friend told him that the Roman

Catholics had a right to aspire. Yes, they had a right to aspire, but it was very rarely that they got there. It sounded well on the platforms, it went well at a convention, it had a very nice ring about it, but there was a great unwritten law that "blood is thicker than water," and where it was a matter of competition for a particular post it would be found that in the end there were not many offices for those

WHO FORMED A RELIGIOUS MINORITY.

Friends of the hon. gentleman, when they went out into the back school-houses, were too prone to say the Catholics obtained too much; yet even under this Liberal Government, desirous as they have been to do what was right by the Roman Catholics, they had not been able to do it, simply because the underlying influences had been against them. The next movement of any consequence among the Roman Catholics took place after the election of 1871. The taking into the Government of Mr. Scott, as Commissioner of Crown Lands, was looked upon by a large section as a certain concession to what they were asking. In consequence, a still further deviation from the ranks of hon. gentlemen opposite took place. Later on came the platform laid down by the Orangemen of this Province. In the Grand Lodge of Western Ontario that met at Hamilton in 1876, a political platform was adopted, which is quoted in another part of this report. He asked them, in the face of that platform, adopted by those who formed the strength of the Conservative party then as they did to-day, what might any intelligent Catholic be expected to do except to leave that party. In 1876, therefore, by reason of that platform, there left the ranks of the Conservative party a large body of Catholics, who joined the Liberal party and had remained with it ever since. But they did not all leave, not even then. There even then probably remained more than one-half the Roman Catholics following the hon. gentleman opposite. In order to see whether their separation from him had come about by perfectly natural stages, he proposed to take the returns of the general elections of 1879 and 1883 and 1886. There were in this Province constituencies in which the Roman Catholics were either in a majority or nearly so, and others in which they formed a very large proportion of the electorate, and he intended to take these constituencies to demonstrate that in the election of 1879, even after these amendments, the hon. gentleman had as nearly as might be one-half the Catholic vote. In Dundas his supporter was elected (Mr. Broder.) The Roman Catholic vote in that constitu-

ency was a large one, and they largely supported him then and still support him, though not in such numbers now as they did in the election of 1879. How could they be expected to do so now, when, as it would seem, the

LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION THOUGHT THAT

his only chance of success lay in driving out the Catholics from his party in the hope that he might gather in sufficient of others to compensate him, or more than compensate him, for their loss. His policy was one of desperation. Having failed at all other points, this last chance was to be taken. Then Mr. Fraser returned to a review of the results of the election of 1879. He showed how in Essex North, in Glengarry, in Huron East, in Lanark, in Ottawa, in Peterborough West, in Prescott, in Russell, in Stormont, in North York, etc., in sixteen constituencies in all where the Roman Catholic vote is either in the majority or forms a very important factor in the contest, that vote ten years ago, so far from being, as was now charged, a unit in favor of the Liberals, was, so far as could be gathered, much more in favor of the Opposition than of the Government. In all these places the Roman Catholic vote had either secured the election for Mr. Meredith of a follower, who was in several cases a Roman Catholic himself, or had furnished a large proportion of the support which the Conservative candidate had secured. In Essex South Mr. Wigle had been returned to support Mr. Meredith, and in Glengarry Mr. McMaster, one of his warmest and most talented supporters, had been elected, both of them receiving the bulk of the Roman Catholic vote. Mr. Lees had been returned for Lanark nominally as an Independent, though he seemed upon coming into the House to forget that he had ever seen such a word as "independent," and had been constantly voting for Mr. Meredith. He, too, had had the largest share of the Roman Catholic vote of that constituency. In Ottawa, if the Roman Catholic vote was not in a majority, it was close upon it. Under the Manhood Suffrage Act he believed it would be in a majority. This constituency sent a Roman Catholic to support Mr. Meredith, in the person of Mr. Baskerville, and so with other places named; and more than that, the Conservative candidate, defeated or victorious, had almost invariably received the larger share of the Roman Catholic vote of these constituencies. Altogether there were five Roman Catholic members supporting Mr. Meredith in the Parliament that ceased in 1883.

Mr. Fraser then told the story of the election of 1883, showing

that the result was practically the same, the larger proportion of the Roman Catholic vote being still cast on the Conservative side. Cornwall returned Mr. Ross, with the aid of a majority of the Roman Catholic vote; Essex North, Mr. White, a Roman Catholic; West Kent returned Mr. Clancy, a Roman Catholic; in Lanark the "independent" Mr. Lees was again returned, and all of them chiefly or largely by the aid of the Roman Catholic vote. In Kingston Mr. Metcalfe shared the Roman Catholic vote.

Mr. METCALFE—They are orthodox there yet. (Laughter.)

Mr. FRASER—Yes; my hon. friend is prepared to admit that in spite of the rumors that are abroad it is not true, so far as Kingston is concerned, that the Roman Catholics have left the Conservative party—not even with Archbishop Cleary there.

Mr. METCALFE—He is the best man they have.

Mr. Fraser, in continuing, briefly showed that in Ottawa Mr. Baskerville had been returned, in Prescott the Conservative candidate got 95 per cent. of the Roman Catholic vote, and Russell and Stormont both sent supporters of Mr. Meredith to the House. Thus, said Mr. Fraser, he had demonstrated that down to 1886, so far as Roman Catholics were concerned, notwithstanding all that had been said about the alliance between the Government and the Roman Catholic hierarchy, notwithstanding that it had been said that the Roman Catholic lay vote would go to the polls in a solid mass, notwithstanding that it had been called the "sheep" vote, notwithstanding all these and various other slanders, down to that time, at least, they found a goodly half of the Roman Catholics of the country supporting hon. gentlemen opposite, and several supporting them in the House. But in 1886, there was reason why they should not be found doing so. If the leader of the Opposition had not

MOUNTED THE PROTESTANT HORSE

he had at least put on the boots and fastened his spurs. Brother William Bell would not otherwise have told them what he had the other day in the city. The Roman Catholic people were not idiots or fools. They knew and scanned the politics of the country and could read between lines and see the signs of the times. If these told anything in the election of 1886 it was this—that, looking at what had been said from the public platforms in Toronto, platforms on which Mr. Meredith's chief lieutenants had been some of the speakers, the time had come for their departure from his political side in larger numbers than ever before. He ventured to say that any Protestant denomination that supported either

the Opposition or the Government, and that had been assailed as the Roman Catholic denomination had been then by the party it was giving its support to, would have deserted that party, Government or Opposition and rightly so. No wonder the Conservative party had lost a considerable portion of the Roman Catholic vote. Mr. Meredith had driven them from him. He had done so because at the very last minute he thought he saw his opportunity. He thought this great Protestant Province of Ontario could be aroused by religious prejudices. Although he had pretended no hostility to the minority, yet the minority had concluded from all that he had said, and that had been said by his followers, that if he got into power he would be at the mercy of those who formed the strongest part, the very backbone of his political party. Brother Wm. Bell had told them that he intended mounting the Protestant horse.

THE PROCLAMATION HAD BEEN

made. Everybody who could understand the English language understood from what had been announced that Mr. Meredith was prepared to vote for such an amendment to the Constitution as would give to the Legislature the right to deal with Separate Schools, and if this power were obtained by him there could be no doubt, after what he had said there that night that he could not, if he wished to be considered an honest man, do otherwise than endeavor to abolish Separate Schools. But even in 1886, in spite of all that had been said, and with so much that could be read between the lines of his manifesto that year, with the evident tendency of the statements made on his behalf through the country by his candidates, still there was no solid Roman Catholic vote in the Province of Ontario. Mr. Meredith had not so large a share of it as before, but even with things as they were, with the evident trend of his own mind, with his evident antagonism to the Roman Catholic minority of the Province, there were still thousands of Roman Catholic votes cast for him through Ontario. In Essex North, Mr. White was defeated by Mr. Pacaud but Mr. White received the vote of his co-religionists. Mr. White, by the way, Mr. Fraser pointed out, was the particular Roman Catholic who was taken round to the various constituencies to straighten things out.

MR. MEREDITH WAS ASHAMED

at this time to show any more than his boots and spurs, and he didn't want to risk too much on them; so while he was doing all

he could to increase the number of his Protestant supporters, Mr. White was sent around to try and keep the Roman Catholics together. Mr. Fraser then repeated the story of how, while he was going round in this way, Mr. White happened to get into a church one day while a service was on, and, upon the kneeling of the congregation, Mr. White had knelt, too, and the prayer happened to be for the success of Mr. White's opponents. Mr. White, no doubt, prayed as heartily as anybody, and his prayer was answered, for his opponents were successful. After that let nobody doubt the efficacy of prayer, said Mr. Fraser. The hon. Commissioner recounted the several other constituencies which retained even in 1886 a good share of the Roman Catholic vote. When he came to Kent, he remarked that his hon. friend, Mr. Clancy, a Roman Catholic himself, had been still returned for that constituency.

Mr. CLANCY broke in with, "Yes, in spite of you."

Mr. Fraser said, "I was on my back on a sick bed at the time, so I don't see how the hon. gentleman can say in spite of me. If I had been able to do anything I might have succeeded in reducing his two or three of a majority so much that he would not have got back here at all."

Mr. Fraser proceeded to show that even at the election of '83 he could point to fifteen or twenty constituencies in the Province where the Roman Catholic vote was largest, and demonstrate that that vote had not been influenced either one way or the other by the Roman Catholic hierarchy. The Roman Catholic minority were not slaves or bondsmen in the exercise of their franchise. They voted as independently as the Protestants. It was an insult, and an offensive insult, to say they did otherwise. They did not require the ballot to protect them. No doubt in some constituencies the ecclesiastics had exercised their influence, just as many of the Protestant clergy had done. He did not hear very much said against the political sermons that were preached from Protestant pulpits on behalf of the Conservatives so frequently, but if the Roman Catholic priests had done the like the Orange lodges would be blue with denunciation. The Roman Catholic clergy had the same rights as the Protestant clergy. He was not protesting against the use the Protestant clergy put these rights to. Ministers and priests had the right to use their influence just as other men did. He knew no reason why they should not be permitted to express their opinion just as other men did. Yet Mr. Meredith, only in his recent London speech, had taken a slash at Archbishop Cleary for using his influence, and had carefully refrained from mentioning the Protestant clergymen who had

preached sermons on his behalf in London pulpits on a certain Sunday shortly preceding the last general election.

MR. MEREDITH said he had never even heard of them.

MR. FRASER said they were reported in the press at all events, and must have been delivered. No doubt priests of the Roman Catholic minority had exercised their rights similarly. They had a right to do so. Many of them had used their influence against hon. gentlemen opposite. How could they have expected them to do otherwise when the conflict came to what it was in 1886, or, still more, what it had come to now, when it had become "a battle of the schools," as it had been styled the other day by the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. H. E. Clarke), an hon. gentleman whom he supposed would be one of those likely to form a Government if they were returned to power? He (Mr. Clarke) had said that Separate Schools would have to be tolerated until the Legislature got the power to abolish them. There was no reason then for Roman Catholic clergy acting otherwise than they had done. Actuated as they were from religious belief, they would be traitors to their Church if they did; false to their own conscientious convictions and to the Church of which they were priests and ministers if they did not, so far as lay in their power, seek to prevent the

ABOLITION OF THOSE SCHOOLS

of which they thought so much, and the maintaining of which was with them a matter of faith and conscience. They were not to be blamed either for their active participation in matters relating to the schools. They would have been more readily blamed by the Roman Catholic minority if they had not displayed this activity. The Roman Catholic minority expected them to do this. They felt, many of them, that their priests had more time at their disposal, and were otherwise better fitted than many laymen were, for taking an active part in defending the rights that had been guaranteed to the Roman Catholic minority in this respect. They were expected to devote themselves more particularly than laymen to matters connected with the training and education of the young. He repeated that if the Roman Catholic minority of the Province found their priests not giving attention to the schools and active in their defence, they would be the first to say the priests were wrong in not doing so, and when they do give attention, and carefully day by day, week by week and month by month, the Roman Catholic minority approve their action and applaud them. But there was yet another matter which the

Roman Catholic minority had not lost sight of. If the hon. gentleman opposite was called upon to form a Government, what sort of a one would it be? There would be, he supposed, his Brother from Owen Sound (Mr. Creighton), and his Brother from Grenville (Mr. French), and his Brother from Toronto (Mr. H. E. Clarke), and his Brother from Muskoka (Mr. Marter). Why, the Grand Lodge would be in session every time the executive council was called together! (Loud laughter and applause.)

MR. FRENCH said Mr. Fraser had made a mistake in including him in the Grand Lodge.

MR. FRASER, continuing, suggested that perhaps one of them would tyle the door, and the laughter was renewed. But, he said, he thought the Roman Catholic minority had no desire any more than Protestants to be ruled by the Grand Lodges. And thus the Conservatives as led by the member from London were even now driving Roman Catholics away from them: they were giving them no place in their counsels and did not intend to. That Roman Catholic would be stupid, would be a traitor to his own best interests, and would lose sight of what he ought to do if he lent any influence to help Mr. Meredith to power. He did not doubt that some of them would do it, some whom his words of advice would not reach. Mr. Clancy, no doubt, would do his best to help him, but if he came back, what influence would he have in such a Government as he had suggested, always supposing it was returned to power, and the hon. gentleman was lucky enough—no doubt he would consider it lucky—to form a member of it? And what other Government than such a one could be formed by the Conservatives opposite? Why, if the hon. gentleman entered such a Government and adopted as he must its policy on the Separate Schools question, whom would he represent? Nobody, he would tell him. One after another, said Mr. Fraser in conclusion of his remarks on this point, could be seen the mile-stones he had pointed out as having been planted by the hon. gentlemen opposite, and looking at these mile-stones the House would see why to-day there are so many of the Roman Catholic minority of the Province supporting this Liberal Government.

Although he had, said Mr. Fraser, already detained the House a considerable time, he could not refrain from a few words more in respect to some of the provisions of the bills before them.

MR. MEREDITH—"Hear, hear."

MR. FRASER—My hon. friend says "Hear, hear." He did not say "Hear, hear," some time ago when something was being said to which it would have become him well to say "Hear, hear."

(Laughter.) The member for London had denounced the Government, in his London appeal to the electors of the Province, as having been in league with the Roman Catholic hierarchy and of having, as the price of their support, made certain concessions in respect of Separate Schools. Nothing could be more untrue, nothing more unjust. He denounced the Government, too, because, so he alleged, legislation, sanctioned by the House, had tended to increase Separate Schools, and he said any man would be a traitor to the Province who would permit such legislation. Well, according to his own showing, he and the party to which he belonged must have been either traitors to their country or not quite so capable as they occasionally claim to be. Either they did not know what was going through the House, or else, knowing it, they were, directly or indirectly, instrumental in passing it. He could take whichever horn of the dilemma he liked. (Cheers and laughter.) What he (Mr. Fraser) had to say in reference to the proposed changes in the laws relating to Separate Schools was this:—That the British North America Act guaranteed to the Roman Catholics certain rights and privileges they enjoyed at the time that we came into Confederation. One of the rights and privileges so

ENJOYED THEN WAS THE RIGHT TO

maintain Separate Schools under the terms and conditions provided in the Separate Schools Act. This House had no power, as he read the law—no power whatever to enact some of the legislation that was now proposed by the opposition. In view of what had been said by the gentlemen opposite—in view of their avowed and evident intention to abolish Separate Schools—he proposed to advise, with a full sense of the responsibility that he might be under to the House, the Roman Catholic minority to resist these proposed amendments—to resist them on the ground that the House had no power to legislate in this direction—to resist them on the further ground that they have reason to believe that they are not proposed in the interests of Separate Schools—to resist them because, in short, they are *ultra vires*, and intended to cripple the Separate Schools. (Cheers.) There was an old saying anent the Greeks, that they were to be feared most bearing gifts. It was well to remember it here. None of these amendments came from the friends of Separate Schools. The gentlemen who are now proposing to amend the Separate School Act do not hide that they would prefer to abolish them altogether. Therefore Roman Catholics had reason to regard

with suspicion all proposals emanating from them. "We had the privilege," Mr. Fraser continued, "at the time that the British North America Act was passed; we had the privilege of selecting as teachers for Separate Schools those qualified under the then laws or regulations of either Upper or Lower Canada—Ontario or Quebec, and I say that there

WAS GOOD REASON FOR THIS

privilege being given us. I say that this House has no right under the British North America Act to change or alter this right. I venture to say that nothing can be alleged against the capacity of the teachers of our Separate Schools. They are in every way as fit for the duties they are called upon to perform as the teachers of our Public Schools. Here, in the City of Toronto, we are not afraid, so far as our system is concerned, so far as the teachers are concerned, to place them alongside those of the Public Schools and to challenge comparison in the matter of capacity. I say that in the Province of Ontario—and I am not now theorising or making rash assertions, or talking for talking's sake—throughout the whole Province of Ontario, taking the Separate Schools in comparison with the Public Schools, they stand just as high, and they rank equally strong, so far as teaching capacity is concerned. What happened the other day in the City of London, in the constituency of my hon. friend? I think every Public School teacher was dismissed.

MR. MEREDITH—Only for the purpose of re-engaging and re-classifying.

MR. FRASER—The system was not working well then. Whatever may be advanced or alleged against the Separate Schools, you will find that the same complaint can be made against the Public Schools. (Hear, hear.) As was inseparable from any system of public instruction extending over a large tract of country, there are here and there schools that are not free from objection. You hear the same things said even about the churches. Occasionally you hear a complaint that this or that church is not so well served, that there is a lack of efficiency, that there are defects somewhere or other that ought to be remedied. So there will be in almost any system; but although you may occasionally find ground for complaint, you will prove nothing against the system taking it as a whole. Take them as a whole, the pupils, brought up at these schools can challenge comparison with those attending the Public Schools, and results prove that what I have asserted is true. Therefore I say there are two reasons why

things should be allowed to remain as they are: First, the system is working well and satisfactorily, and second, we have no power to make the change. The hon. gentleman then pointed out that the Separate Schools, having regard to the fact that the Public Schools were supported not merely out of the rates and taxes of the ordinary Public School supporter, but had also the support received from the school tax paid by corporations, were not treated fairly, and that, therefore, in their Separate School system it was made practically

COMPULSORY FOR ROMAN CATHOLICS

to get their teachers at as small expense as possible. He had been told the other day, and his authority was first-class, that even in cases where the majority of shareholders in corporate companies were Roman Catholics, the whole of the school tax levied on the corporate property went to the Public Schools; but what he wanted to point out was that although there was a power in the statute book that permitted corporate bodies to pay their school rates to either Public or Separate Schools according to the proportion in which their stocks or shares were held by Roman Catholics or otherwise, yet it was only a permissive power, and had not been exercised to any extent within the Province. He might be mistaken in making a general assertion, but he was informed that it was a fact. Therefore there was financial as well as other reasons for the Separate Schools securing the less expensive and costly, but not less efficient teaching, securable through the services of some of the religious orders. There was no one who could over-estimate the advantage it was to young children that religious Orders of the Church devoted themselves to this work of teaching without asking but the smallest remuneration in return. It was only those who had experienced the benefit that could realize how much the gain was. There was not an honest Separate School supporter from one end of the country to the other who would be willing to part with a single advantage that the schools now had on the ground that the teachers did not carry the certificates that other teachers possessed. (Cheers.) So much for this part of the subject. He objected to the proposal to impose the ballot upon Separate School supporters for various reasons. One reason, as had been well pointed out by the Minister of Education, was that the compulsory adoption of the ballot would be a violation of the Constitution. It was only necessary to look at the system of election in operation at the time of Confederation to see in this what every reason-

able person would be prepared to admit, an infringement of their rights, an attempt to do away

WITH THE PRIVILEGES THAT THE

Roman Catholics then enjoyed. The point, however, would be made still more clear by supposing that the then system of voting had been by ballot, and that for any reason, no matter what, it were now proposed to abolish the ballot and to compel the election of trustees by open voting. Would it be contended that to so enact would not deprive Separate School supporters of a right and privilege—namely, the right and privilege of electing their trustees by ballot. What difference in principle, he asked, could there be between the supposed attempt to take away the ballot and the attempt now being made to take away the right of open voting. But there were other reasons why he objected, why the Roman Catholic minority of this Province objected, to the introduction of the ballot. “You cannot,” the hon. gentleman proceeded, “disassociate it from the discussion outside; you cannot disassociate it from my hon. friend’s London speech; you cannot disassociate it from what was contained in the platform of the hon. gentleman opposite; you cannot disassociate it from the fact that its alleged necessity is offensive to the hierarchy of the Roman Catholic Church; that it is offensive to the clergy of that Church; that it is offensive to the laity of that Church in that it insinuates that only under the ballot could their rights and privileges be maintained. (Cheers.) Gentlemen opposite, in order to make more studiously offensive what was already offensive enough, make the insinuation that the laity are afraid to exercise their undoubted rights on account of the improper influence of the clergy. I say there is no self-respecting Roman Catholic in this Province of Ontario who will not

FEEL KEENLY THE INSULT TO HIS

clergy, nor any less the studied offence to the laity. It says in effect that we Separate School supporters are slaves, bondsmen and serfs—not allowed to control our own actions—not allowed to have our own wishes in the election of Trustees. It said this because forsooth in the City of Toronto in certain localities the priest has happened to exercise his legitimate influence in the matter of elections. (Cheers.) The Roman Catholics are not asking for this legislation, and I make bold to presume that they know much better what their own requirements are than do the gentlemen opposite or any other persons

outside their Church." Was there, Mr. Fraser asked, a single denomination in the Province of Ontario who would not resent such legislation as this? Put the members of the Methodist persuasion or of any other denomination in a position similar to that of the Roman Catholic minority, would the House dare to force upon them such alterations of the law unless they were asked for? If any party proposed to abolish the privileges of any religious denomination, that denomination would be found a unit in opposition. The hon. gentleman had laid down the rule when he appeared before the electors of the City of London that the Roman Catholic minority, because of its being, as he in that speech wished the people to believe, a solid, compact political unit ruled by the Hierarchy, should be regarded as a common enemy, and where there was a common enemy people were justified in uniting against it. If this were so, then, according to his argument, every denomination

THAT UNITED IN DEFENCE OF ITS

rights should be treated as a common enemy. It would be the same were a proposal made, on the principle that there ought to be only one University in Ontario, to abolish the Victoria University or the Queen's University at Kingston. Does any one suppose that the religious denominations to which belonged these Universities would not stand up as a unit to defend their rights; and would they be regarded as a common enemy? If they proposed to interfere with the smallest right of the Presbyterian University of Queen's did they suppose they would not find the Presbyterians united against the political party at the next general election that attempted to infringe that right? (Hear, hear.) He wanted to know why it was that a different line of action was to be expected from the Roman Catholic minority than would under similar circumstances be expected from a Protestant denomination. Their educational institutions were as dear to Roman Catholics as were those of any other denomination to the members of their body. When danger assailed them was it not to be expected then that they would unite even more closely than they had done? So far as the Opposition was concerned, they were as good as pledged to abolish the Separate School system—they were practically pledged to the hilt to do so. It had become, in truth, a cardinal point in their platform when adopted and sanctioned by the Grand Lodges. This was the platform, adopted by the Grand Lodge of Ontario West, at Hamilton, at a meeting held on the 15th and 16th

February, 1876, and it was now virtually the platform of the hon. gentleman and his colleagues:—

Resolved, That, in the opinion of the Right Worshipful Grand Lodge, the time has arrived when the Orangemen of Canada, without reference to politics or political parties, must unite in one grand political phalanx in order to stop the encroachments of the Romish Hierarchy upon the body politic of the country, and that the following platform be adopted:—

Unswerving and untiring allegiance to the Mother Country and British Connection.

(2) No grants of money from the public purse for sectarian purposes.

(3) No Separate Schools, but free secular education for all.

(4) Taxation for all; taxation of all property held by religious bodies upon its fair assessment value.

(5) The opening of all public institutions in the land, religious or otherwise, to public inspection by Government officials.

(6) That it shall be the duty of the County Master in every Orange county, in the event of a general election or other election taking place, either for the Local or Dominion Parliaments, to submit the platform to the candidate or candidates to ascertain if they will support it or not, and then to call a county meeting before the day of polling, and if neither of the candidates will support the said platform, then it shall be the duty of the County Lodge to bring out a candidate.

The hon. gentleman and his colleagues were under the power of the Grand Lodges, and he (Mr. Fraser) did not think the day had yet arrived when this Province was willing to be thus controlled and ruled and legislated for. The Roman Catholics resented these proposed measures of the Opposition as an interference with their rights, as an insult to themselves; they objected, too, because they did not require them, because it was proposed to thrust upon them legislation that they did not ask for, and they opposed some of it because it was ultra vires. The Roman Catholic minority didn't propose to stand quietly by and see cut away, chip by chip, the whole of the Separate School system. If the hon. gentlemen opposite could have their way, if they could effect their purpose, the guarantees given under the British North America Act would only be

A SHAM, A DELUSION AND A SNARE.

He had a few words to say with reference to the necessity for giving notice by a Roman Catholic before he could become a Separate School supporter. It was an oft-repeated allegation that the amendment of 1879 was introduced to do away with the necessity for giving notice. There never was any such intention.

Those responsible for the amendment proclaimed almost from the housetops that it would still be necessary for Separate School supporters to first give notice that they were such. Before the last general election the Attorney-General in his letter to the Rev. Mr. Milligan showed as clearly as he possibly could that the law still required notice on the part of anybody intending to become a Separate School supporter; and that if he wanted to again become a Public School supporter he had to give notice. He (Mr. Fraser) during the last general election held several meetings, and at every one of those meetings he put it in the plainest language he could that there was no such thing as becoming a Separate School supporter without the giving of this notice. The amendment of 1879 was intended simply to provide the proper machinery for the performance by the assessor of his duties in preparing the assessment roll.

Mr. MEREDITH.—Why did not the municipalities act?

Mr. FRASER.—The hon. gentleman had given quotations showing that notice had not been given in some municipalities since 1879. He would find that prior to 1879 the same practice very generally obtained wherever there were Separate Schools. He (Mr. Fraser) had made diligent inquiry, and found in some places that although there had been Separate Schools in existence for thirty years there were no Separate School notices given. He was bound to say, if he told the truth, that he never himself gave a written notice that he would become a Separate School supporter. Even here in the municipality of Toronto, and in all municipalities where Separate Schools existed, neither authorities nor people had cared a brass farthing whether the Roman Catholics gave notice or not. They were acting neighbourly and friendly and generously, and not caring to take any advantage of the fact that no notices had been given. He would undertake to say that throughout Ontario, until this sectarian cry had been raised, not even the most vigorous opponents of Separate Schools concerned themselves as to whether notices were given or not. The fact was that where a Separate School existed everyone acted on what was well known to be the actual state of affairs, that all the Roman Catholics of the locality, with here and there a rare exception, were voluntarily and freely supporters of the school, and no attention was paid to the mere technicality of requiring a notice. On the other hand, everybody who was not a Roman Catholic was supposed to be a supporter of Public Schools. The public officers recognised this. He was not prepared to speak for every municipality, but he would undertake

TO SAY AS REGARDED A GREAT

many of them that prior to 1879, as since that time, notices had not been given, and it was a significant fact that nobody had been found mean enough to make an appeal against a Roman Catholic because he had not given notice. Was not this a proof that, throughout the Province, Protestants and Catholics alike were acting in a neighbourly and friendly way one toward another—that the Protestant majority did not care whether Roman Catholics gave notice or not, so long as they were voluntarily supporting their schools, that was all that they concerned themselves about. Separate School supporters did not ask for the amendment of 1876, which made necessary the amendment of 1879. As a matter of fact, in 99 cases out of 100, probably in almost all cases, the assessor was a Protestant, and being a Protestant would see that Public Schools were not prejudiced. He would ask anybody who knew the condition of affairs—he would ask the hon. gentleman himself—whether the state of affairs was not practically that every Roman Catholic, with very rare exceptions, was known to be a Separate School supporter in the municipality within which a Separate School was situated.

Mr. MEREDITH—I have no knowledge; I cannot say.

Mr. FRASER—I say that this was so the Province over. This was the state of affairs when this amendment to the law was passed in 1879. If they had the same regard, he contended, to the interests of the Roman Catholic body that they had for interests of the Wesleyan, the Presbyterian, the Baptist body or the Church of England, the Opposition would not attempt such legislation as was now proposed, for they knew it would be resisted and opposed by the masses to be affected by it. Mr. Fraser then, at considerable length, quoted from the reports of *The Globe* and *The Mail* of the debate in Committee when the Act of 1879 was before the House. The report read:—

“Mr. O’SULLIVAN moved an amendment to the bill providing that every Roman Catholic should be deemed *ipso facto* a Separate School supporter, and that notice in writing should be required to be given by a Roman Catholic rate-payer before school taxes levied upon his property should be applied in aid of Public Schools.”

The report of his (Mr. Fraser’s) speech read:—

“He desired that nothing should appear in the Act which might be claimed unconstitutional. The fundamental principle of the Separate School was that it was permissive.”

It was clear that Dr. O'Sullivan, who was one of the active supporters of the member for London, thought that notice would be still requisite, and that he (Mr. Fraser) contended that the necessity for giving notice could not be interfered with. The report of the debate proceeded :

"Mr. WHITE was somewhat surprised that the Commissioner of Public Works should discourage the motion of the hon. member for East Peterborough. He was not sure that it required an amendment to the Assessment Act, and if necessary he suggested that the consideration of the present bill should be postponed. In any case he submitted that there was nothing asked for but what was fair and reasonable and he believed the House was prepared to grant it. These schools were recognized by the Act, and, therefore, he (Mr. White) did not see where the constitutional question suggested by the Commissioner of Public Works came in."

"Mr. SINCLAIR said the idea of allowing any person to support the Separate Schools if he wished, simply meant that persons who cared nothing for the principle would support that school when the taxes would be lightest."

"Mr. CROOKS, (who was the Minister of Education at the time), said this would elevate the Separate School system into a rival of the Public Schools. The British North America Act provided that existing privileges of Separate School supporters should be continued, but this amendment would make the Separate School compulsory. The principle of Separate Schools," Mr. Crooks continued, "whether Protestant or Catholic, was simply permissive, and he was not prepared to go so far as to guarantee any support to them. His (Dr. Sullivan's) contention was that not only should every Roman Catholic be regarded as a Separate School supporter, but that he should not be regarded as a Public School supporter unless he gave notice. He (Mr. Crooks) was only in favor of an alteration of the law so far as the change was required by public necessity. All he (Mr. Crooks) assumed to do was to provide that the assessor should do his duty."

Mr. Fraser said it was necessary, in 1879, to provide some machinery for distinguishing between Roman Catholic School supporters and Public School supporters; and the machinery which was provided in the Bill introduced by Mr. Crooks as Minister of Education was the simplest and the most fair. He denied that there had ever been a single utterance of his made which could be construed into a contention that the Separate Schools should be compulsory; and the hon. gentleman must have misunderstood the position he (Mr. Fraser) had taken when he said what he did in his speech at London. If the House were willing, and there was no objection by anybody to the provision, that every Roman Catholic should be compelled to be a Separate School supporter, he (Mr. Fraser) would oppose it on the ground that the Legislature was assuming a prerogative that might eventually lead to the abolition of the Separate Schools. For if this Legislature could declare that all Roman Catholics must be Separate School supporters, the right to make such a declaration

would involve the power to declare that no Roman Catholic could be a Separate School supporter. The power to do the one thing would, of logical necessity, include the other. There was one other bill he would refer to—that relating to High School Trustees. The Separate School supporters were not very much concerned about that bill. It was

NEVER ASKED FOR BY PRIEST

or bishop. Some of the laity had thought it would be a good thing, however, to interest Roman Catholics more largely in the High Schools. If this House were of opinion that the privilege given of electing a High School Trustee, should—not, as a yielding to popular clamor, or cant, or hypocrisy,—be taken away from Separate Schools boards, no objection would be raised. At the same time he would be greatly disappointed if that were done, and the House was hardly likely to take away from these school boards a privilege that did nobody any harm. Moreover, wherever there was a High School in existence every Roman Catholic must pay taxes in support of it, and it was thought that the power of being able to select a High School Trustee would interest the Roman Catholics more in these institutions, and the result proved that they were right. If the Protestant majority of this country, however, thought this should not be continued, by all means let it be taken away; but if the House decided to do so he did not think it would be acting in the best interests of the country, in the best interests of the High Schools, or in the best interests of the cause of higher education. In conclusion, he would again repeat that there was nothing the Roman Catholics held more dear than their Separate Schools, and if the House passed a law abolishing them there would still be Separate Schools. What, after all, did they get towards their support? They got about \$18,000, about 60 cents for each pupil in the Roman Catholic Separate Schools. What was that amongst them? His hon. friend had shown that in this small contribution there was some connection between Church and State because there was religious teaching in the schools; but if there was a violation of the principle of no connection between Church and State in respect of Separate Schools, there was similar violation so far as the Public Schools were concerned, for in these, religious teaching, with certain restrictions, was also permitted. Undoubtedly there was religious teaching given in the Separate Schools; that was the reason for their existence.

IF ROMAN CATHOLICS DID NOT

intend to give their children religious education they would not ask for this system. It was, so far as religion was concerned, so far as the great hereafter was concerned, that they asked for this Separate School system. As regards the connection between Church and State there was just as much of it in mere principle in the case of the one class of schools as in the other; and he might be permitted to say again that he was surprised that the Protestant bodies did not unite and have a great deal more religion taught in their Public Schools than there was now, in localities where Roman Catholics had now their Separate Schools, and where, therefore, nobody's convictions could be in any way endangered. He was speaking now of the great centres, where there were Roman Catholic Schools, and where the Public Schools were attended by exclusively Protestant children. He was surprised that there was not more religion taught in the Public Schools in such places than there was to-day. He asked the pardon of the House for having detained it so long. He had endeavored to put the case on behalf of his fellow Roman Catholics as fairly as he could, and he hoped in doing so he had not given offence to any class. He concluded by expressing the hope that the time may never come in the Province of Ontario when the legislature would be called upon to deal with the question of the abolition of the Separate Schools. His hon. friend had asked for public confidence in three or four general elections and he had failed every time, and he (Mr. Fraser) would venture to predict that he would find the same thing true on this occasion. He hoped the great Protestant majority of this country would not be led by hypocrisy and cant, nor allow the ship of State to pass into the hands of any man who was willing to give up opinions and convictions he had expressed in former days in order that he might gain possession of the Treasury benches. (Loud cheers.)

