

the Church
wing, so that
leave without

that he called
ore his audi-
in Winnipeg
five hundred

To-day the
operation, but
has increased
our. During
porting these
id their share
in, in submis-
of law which
e tax.

the statement
ntly made by
and since by
on, that the
efficient. He
good, and as it
to bring the
he exhibited
and specimens
tables, which
erations.

ent hearers to
nelves and to
withstanding
has been with-
they have been
the great sac-
ces of the city

do Winnipeg
ble payment?"
for conscience
their Separate
on that Protest-
ant churches—

ong appeal to
will by assist-
injustice which
said:

protestants con-
of the Catholic
ish their own
ributions from
use of the pres-
ir? Is it just?
honest? Pro-
the best of you:
of the result to
brought us, as
broken path
come? Are
make money
victions of your
citizens? Are
for your own
olies keep their
the present sys-
tribute to your
judgment.

rt to place the
my prove of
egars' piece of
majority, which
ealthiest portion
id use underhand
upon their less
ness, to pay for
children, while
ndure the whole
eir own. It is a
similar to that
Turks govern
erefrom only in

to the assertions
d Sifton, we may
de that in the
hools have not
is desirable they
Dr. Ewart's con-
he known effi-
schools, perhaps
But it must be
ong the Catholic
e many poor
ls who are doing
their best to give
ation. It is not
the schools they
should be reme-
ing to raise a
paternal Gov-
enous-minded
avor to remedy
is exactly what
lature has not
for a peaceful
of the difficulty?

to the assertions
d Sifton, we may
de that in the
hools have not
is desirable they
Dr. Ewart's con-
he known effi-
schools, perhaps
But it must be
ong the Catholic
e many poor
ls who are doing
their best to give
ation. It is not
the schools they
should be reme-
ing to raise a
paternal Gov-
enous-minded
avor to remedy
is exactly what
lature has not
for a peaceful
of the difficulty?

to the assertions
d Sifton, we may
de that in the
hools have not
is desirable they
Dr. Ewart's con-
he known effi-
schools, perhaps
But it must be
ong the Catholic
e many poor
ls who are doing
their best to give
ation. It is not
the schools they
should be reme-
ing to raise a
paternal Gov-
enous-minded
avor to remedy
is exactly what
lature has not
for a peaceful
of the difficulty?

to the assertions
d Sifton, we may
de that in the
hools have not
is desirable they
Dr. Ewart's con-
he known effi-
schools, perhaps
But it must be
ong the Catholic
e many poor
ls who are doing
their best to give
ation. It is not
the schools they
should be reme-
ing to raise a
paternal Gov-
enous-minded
avor to remedy
is exactly what
lature has not
for a peaceful
of the difficulty?

to the assertions
d Sifton, we may
de that in the
hools have not
is desirable they
Dr. Ewart's con-
he known effi-
schools, perhaps
But it must be
ong the Catholic
e many poor
ls who are doing
their best to give
ation. It is not
the schools they
should be reme-
ing to raise a
paternal Gov-
enous-minded
avor to remedy
is exactly what
lature has not
for a peaceful
of the difficulty?

to the assertions
d Sifton, we may
de that in the
hools have not
is desirable they
Dr. Ewart's con-
he known effi-
schools, perhaps
But it must be
ong the Catholic
e many poor
ls who are doing
their best to give
ation. It is not
the schools they
should be reme-
ing to raise a
paternal Gov-
enous-minded
avor to remedy
is exactly what
lature has not
for a peaceful
of the difficulty?

to the assertions
d Sifton, we may
de that in the
hools have not
is desirable they
Dr. Ewart's con-
he known effi-
schools, perhaps
But it must be
ong the Catholic
e many poor
ls who are doing
their best to give
ation. It is not
the schools they
should be reme-
ing to raise a
paternal Gov-
enous-minded
avor to remedy
is exactly what
lature has not
for a peaceful
of the difficulty?

to the assertions
d Sifton, we may
de that in the
hools have not
is desirable they
Dr. Ewart's con-
he known effi-
schools, perhaps
But it must be
ong the Catholic
e many poor
ls who are doing
their best to give
ation. It is not
the schools they
should be reme-
ing to raise a
paternal Gov-
enous-minded
avor to remedy
is exactly what
lature has not
for a peaceful
of the difficulty?

to the assertions
d Sifton, we may
de that in the
hools have not
is desirable they
Dr. Ewart's con-
he known effi-
schools, perhaps
But it must be
ong the Catholic
e many poor
ls who are doing
their best to give
ation. It is not
the schools they
should be reme-
ing to raise a
paternal Gov-
enous-minded
avor to remedy
is exactly what
lature has not
for a peaceful
of the difficulty?

to the assertions
d Sifton, we may
de that in the
hools have not
is desirable they
Dr. Ewart's con-
he known effi-
schools, perhaps
But it must be
ong the Catholic
e many poor
ls who are doing
their best to give
ation. It is not
the schools they
should be reme-
ing to raise a
paternal Gov-
enous-minded
avor to remedy
is exactly what
lature has not
for a peaceful
of the difficulty?

to the assertions
d Sifton, we may
de that in the
hools have not
is desirable they
Dr. Ewart's con-
he known effi-
schools, perhaps
But it must be
ong the Catholic
e many poor
ls who are doing
their best to give
ation. It is not
the schools they
should be reme-
ing to raise a
paternal Gov-
enous-minded
avor to remedy
is exactly what
lature has not
for a peaceful
of the difficulty?

to the assertions
d Sifton, we may
de that in the
hools have not
is desirable they
Dr. Ewart's con-
he known effi-
schools, perhaps
But it must be
ong the Catholic
e many poor
ls who are doing
their best to give
ation. It is not
the schools they
should be reme-
ing to raise a
paternal Gov-
enous-minded
avor to remedy
is exactly what
lature has not
for a peaceful
of the difficulty?

to the assertions
d Sifton, we may
de that in the
hools have not
is desirable they
Dr. Ewart's con-
he known effi-
schools, perhaps
But it must be
ong the Catholic
e many poor
ls who are doing
their best to give
ation. It is not
the schools they
should be reme-
ing to raise a
paternal Gov-
enous-minded
avor to remedy
is exactly what
lature has not
for a peaceful
of the difficulty?

position of every man prominently
connected with Methodism in Ontario,
should have endorsed Dr. Douglas's
statement.

So as to be possessed of accurate in-
formation, inquiries have been made
as to some of the more important offices
in Ontario filled by Methodists, and as
to the first class mentioned—the Judi-
ciary—they have neither been ostrac-
ized nor taboed by the Government,
unless the following list proves the in-
justice of which Dr. Douglas com-
plained:—

1. Judge King, Supreme Court, Ottawa.
2. Judge Burbridge, Exchequer Court, Ot-
tawa.
3. Judge Rice, High Court, Toronto.
4. Judge McDougall, Co. Court, Toronto.
5. Judge Jones, Co. Court, Brantford.
6. Judge Price, Co. Court, Kingston.
7. Judge Merrill, Co. Court, Peterborough.
8. Judge John Deacon, Co. Ct., Pembroke.
9. Judge Dean, Co. Court, Lindsay.
10. Judge Ketchum, Co. Court, Cobourg.
11. Judge Curran, Co. Court, Cornwall.
12. Judge Thos. Deacon, Co. Ct., Pembroke.

Where is the interdict against Meth-
odism, with this list of its adherents in
the Judiciary of Ontario?

Judge Burbridge, of the Exchequer
Court, has the position of a Chief Jus-
tice, and his salary of \$6,000 a year
equals that paid to the Chief Justice of
Ontario.

The emoluments of Judge McDoug-
all's office as County Judge and Judge
of the Surrogate Court, exceeds \$5,800
(nearly equal to a Chief Justiceship),
in addition to what he receives as an
Arbitrator.

Judge Jones, according to the Order-
in-Council, has been a Judge for over
35 years, and Judge John Deacon for
over 25 years. There are some others
on the list for more than 15 years.

There is another class of Govern-
ment officials nearly allied to the Order-
in-Council, namely, the County Crown
Attorneys and Clerks of the Peace. The
list hereunder attests that the Meth-
odists have not been overlooked in the
filling of these important offices:—

- G. V. Vannorman, Brantford.
- J. L. Whiting, Kingston.
- Alfred Frost, Owen Sound.
- A. L. Mordan, Napanee.
- James Macree, London.
- Thomas Johnston, Muskoka.
- W. H. Dewart, (Crown Attorney), Toronto.
- T. H. Hall, (Clerk of the Peace), Toronto.
- John W. Kerr, Cobourg.
- John Maxwell, L'Orignal.
- J. H. Metcalf, Pembroke.
- Thomas A. Gorham, Port Arthur.

While there is a total of 40 of these
offices in Ontario, who shall say there
has been an interdict on Methodism,
when its adherents fill so many of them?

Can it with truth be said that Meth-
odism was allowed to suffer when the
Sheriffs were being appointed. Here
is a list of its adherents in these offices:

- John Bowles, Orangeville.
- John C. Tier, Sandwich.
- C. H. Moore, Owen Sound.
- W. Clements, Milton.
- James Elliott, Sarnia.
- J. W. Betts, Muskoka.
- J. P. Tuxton, Whitby.
- H. Armstrong, Parry Sound.
- R. Broddy, Brantford.
- A. Hagur, L'Orignal.
- Hon. Chas. Drury, Barrie.
- W. H. Carpenter, Port Portage.
- Moses Springer, Waterloo.
- Robert McKim, Guelph.

And until the death of Sheriff Glass,
in 1893, we had for 30 years a Meth-
odist sheriff in London.

If Rev. Dr. Douglas had spoken
with a knowledge of the facts, he
could not have said as to these offices,
that there was any "tabooing."

In the County of Renfrew, John
Deacon, the Senior Judge, is a Meth-
odist. Thomas Deacon, the Junior
Judge, is a Methodist. His son-in-law,
J. H. Metcalf, the County Crown At-
torney, is a Methodist, and Judge
Deacon's brother-in-law, S. C. Mitchell,
the Police Magistrate of Pembroke, is
a Methodist.

Credit for the last two appointments
must be given to Thomas Murray, a
Catholic, then M. P. for Renfrew.
As will be seen, the whole of the judi-
cial offices in the County of Renfrew
are in the hands of one family, mem-
bers of the Methodist Church. The
Catholics of Renfrew number 18,000,
while the Methodists number but
6,000, and we know of no office in the
gift of either Government, held by a
Catholic in the county.

Then, going to Kingston, we note
the generous treatment accorded the
Methodists in appointments. Judge
Price is a Methodist. Mr. Britton, who
was the County Attorney and Clerk of
the Peace, is a Methodist, and when he
was appointed Drainage Arbitrator by
the Ontario Government, a few years
ago, at a salary of \$3,000 a year, his
partner, Mr. Whiting, a Methodist,
succeeded him as County Attorney.
Dr. Lavelle, the Warden of the Peni-
tentiary, is a Methodist, and his son
has lately been added to the staff of
that institution.

In New Brunswick and Nova Scotia,
as stated by Dr. Douglas, the Meth-
odist body always had a most liberal
representation in the Judiciary, includ-
ing amongst the number some Chief
Justices.

Out of the seven Protestant Ministers

forming the Federal Administration
for fifteen years, the Methodists had
two of their denomination—Sir John
Carling and Sir McKenzie Bowell.
Could any one, knowing these facts,
say they were ostracized?

EDITORIAL NOTES.

It appears that Hamilton city is not
so entirely given over to P. P. A. in-
fluences as was at one time thought,
and not without pretty good reason.
At a meeting of the Public Library
Board, held a few days ago, the in-
decency of the reading matter con-
tained in the *Detroit Patriotic Ameri-
can*, the central A. P. A. paper of the
United States, was brought to the
attention of the Board, and it was
unanimously decided to exclude the
nauseous thing from the library files,
as unfit for public reading. The local
agent of the paper was present, and
desired to speak in its behalf but
was very properly refused a hear-
ing. We congratulate the people of
Hamilton that their representatives on
the Library Board have so far cut the
leading strings of P. P. Aism that they
will no longer furnish abusive and in-
sulting language and cartoons to the
public in order to please that organiza-
tion.

The April number of *The Canadian
Magazine* contains some very interest-
ing and instructive articles. Profes-
sor Tadmor has a bright sketch en-
titled, "A Summer Evening at the
Village Post." We congratulate him
on his portrayal of scenes that must
bring back the long ago to many of
us. Hon. David Mills writes on the
policy of Russia, and while we admit
its aggressiveness yet must we refrain
from committing ourselves to the con-
clusion drawn by the honorable gentle-
man. We are most happy to say that
The Canadian Magazine maintains its
high reputation. Controlled by no
class or creed it sends us a written page
that reflects the greatest credit on the
taste and talent of its editor.

WE are pleased to learn that Dean
Harris has another work ready for
publication. It will treat of an interest-
ing epoch of Canadian history. One
need not be a prophet to say that it
will meet with an enthusiastic wel-
come from all who love their country's
past and who have aught of apprecia-
tion for graceful fiction. Dean Harris
has the rare faculty of investing his
fictitious with life and reality.

THE eminent Boston Prelate will
celebrate on May 17th of this year the
Golden Jubilee of his priesthood.
Priest and people are making every
preparation for its worthy celebration.
Anyone who has watched the progress
of Boston diocese may well say that its
ecclesiastical chief has given many
and manifest proofs of consummate
prudence and keen executive
ability. Humble and unassuming,
of winning manner and generous
heart, he is a magnificent type of
a priest and gentleman. Confronted
betimes by adversaries he has never
uttered a word that was not the echo of
a perfect manhood. We tender him
our congratulations and pray that he
may not for many years relinquish
mitre and pastoral staff.

It is stated that the secession from
the Free Presbyterian Kirk in Scot-
land, which took place about a year
ago in the Highlands of that country,
has become a movement of much
greater importance than it was at first
anticipated it would be. It has
assumed the proportions of a new sect,
and the adherents of the secession are
earnestly propagating their new
gospel. The list of grievances against
the Free Church has been largely ex-
tended since the secession, which seems
to have established itself as a new form
of Presbyterianism, just at the time
when there was supposed to be some
prospect of a reunion, not only of Pres-
byterian denominations, but of various
Protestant creeds. This, however, is
not to be wondered at, for the first
principle of Protestantism, and espe-
cially of the Presbyterian form of it,
that of private judgment, is of neces-
sity a principle of disintegration.

We learn by an associated press de-
spatch that in reference to General
Booth's proposition to settle a colony of
his rescued paupers in Canada, the
London *Daily Chronicle* of the 1st inst.
has an editorial in which it is
said that, "We must not ignore the
fact that in Canada there will be
strong opposition to General Booth's
plans to colonize the Dominion with
the victims of poverty in England."
While it is quite true that we have
sympathy with the victims of poverty,
whether in England or elsewhere, it

will be hard to convince Canadians that
they ought to make a present of hun-
dreds of thousands of acres of land to
the general as an inducement to have
a colony of rescued paupers dumped in
our midst. The general receives \$75
as a bonus for each pauper whom he
manages to send away from England.
It would be better for Canadians to pay
something to the general to keep his
settlers out of Canada, than to offer any
inducement to have them brought here,
whereas we see England so glad to be
rid of them.

THE Passion Play of Ober-Ammergau,
in Germany, in which Joseph Meyer
has been long the central figure, who
represents Christ, has justly a world-
wide fame on account of the earnest-
ness with which all the participants
therein religiously and with great de-
votion fill the parts allotted to them.
It is not generally known, however,
that in Mexico on every Good Friday
there are more or less elaborate rep-
resentations of the Passion in many
villages. The players are all Indians,
and their dresses are shabby, but the
earnestness with which the various char-
acters are represented is not exceeded
even at Ober-Ammergau, and in some
of the large towns the representation
is very realistic. Crude though
the representation be in many in-
stances, it has a wonderful effect
in impressing upon the
minds of the untaught Aztecs the love
of Christ for mankind as manifested in
His work of our redemption, and in
cultivating their piety and love for
religion. The representation speaks
to them with more power than any de-
scription which could be put into a
formula of words. This year it has
been peculiarly impressive in many
places.

GEORGE JACOB SCHWEINFURTH, the
pretended Messiah who has gathered
about him a number of followers at Rock-
ford, Ill., has been indicted by the grand
jury on three different charges of im-
morality with regard to three women
who live under the name of angels at
his heaven. The people of Rockford
are delighted with the prospect afforded
by the indictment, that they will get
rid of the nuisance of Schweinfurth's
presence among them.

THE Mayor of Raubois in France
has given to the world one of the most
ridiculous and stupid documents ever
issued by a public functionary. It
runs as follows: "Considering that the
transport of the Viaticum to the houses
of the sick by a priest clothed in
sacerdotal garments, accompanied by
persons bearing lanterns and ringing
a little bell, has the grave inconveni-
ence of frightening the inhabitants,
who are thereby reminded of the im-
portance of death by this religious
ceremony, we decree: the transport of
the Viaticum is forbidden." Truly a
mixture of brazen effrontery and in-
curable foolishness.

PROFESSOR MARCUS DODS, of Edin-
burgh, speaking recently in support of
disestablishment of the Presbyterian
Church of Scotland, said that the
proper course would be for members of
the Established Church to come for-
ward themselves with a frank con-
fession that the time for disestablish-
ment has come. "It would be a gain
for the Church," he said "if they would
do this. There might be a loss of re-
spect on the part of those who adhere
to it merely because it is the establish-
ment, and some might leave it if such
ceased to be the case; but there would
be a gain in spiritual influence, and
disestablishment would be followed by
an early union of the three Presbyter-
ian Churches between which the
country is now divided. Great spirit-
ual enthusiasm would certainly result
from such a union, and he hoped that
the day is not far off when it will be
accomplished." Why should there
be such longing for union among
these divided branches, unless it be
true that Christ intended that His
Church should be one in doctrine and
government? And if the Church is
essentially one, there was no justifica-
tion for the first Presbyterians, who
established division by rejecting the
authority of the one Church, and pro-
claiming the supremacy of individual
opinion.

Mary and the Poor Souls.

In her prayers for deceased friends,
relatives and benefactors, the Church is
mindful of Mary's sweet influence with
her Son, and asks their deliverance
through her intercession. She is fitly
called the Mother of Mercy. Her mer-
ciful heart goes out to these, the fav-
ored ones of her Son, all the more lov-
ingly and tenderly because they are
unable to help themselves.

"He only who lives by faith, by faith over-
comes the world."—St. Bernard.

SPEECH OF HON. JOHN COSTIGAN, M. P., On the Manitoba School Question.

The following very clever speech was
delivered by the Hon. John Costigan, in
the House of Commons on Tuesday,
23rd April:

Mr. Costigan. Mr. Speaker I need
not assure the House that I have no in-
tention of answering the hon. gentle-
man who has just sat down (Mr. Mc-
Carthy) by any constitutional argu-
ment on this subject, to meet the argu-
ments put forward by him. In rising
at present I simply ask permission of
the House, and of you, Mr. Speaker, to
deal for a few moments with the sub-
ject from another point of view en-
tirely—first, because I do not think
that the line which the hon. member
has followed was at all a proper line to
take; and, secondly, because I do not
think we have reached the stage when
we are called upon to discuss the sub-
ject at any great length. I may say
at the outset that while many of the
speakers who have taken part in this
debate have alluded to the reference
made to this subject in the Speech from
the Throne as one calculated to create
strife and enmity in this country, there
is one consolation to every old member
in this House—yes, and a consolation
to every Canadian in this country who
feels that he is represented in this
Parliament—that this Parliament
has time and again given proof
of its ability to deal with the most
delicate questions, and to deal
with them in the most intelligent and
satisfactory manner. We have had
occasion before to discuss subjects
which were calculated to create divi-
sions and dissensions in our country
that would have had consequences very
serious to its peace, and I am sure that
every member of this House will agree
with me, on looking back at the record
of those discussions, that those of us
who have taken part in them can
congratulate it upon the tone and
the dignity that this Parlia-
ment has exhibited on all
such occasions. Therefore, Sir, I feel
confident that the remarks which I
offer to-day will be received by my
fellow members in the spirit in which
I intend to deliver them. In the first
place, I deny the right or the propriety
of the hon. member for North Simcoe
(Mr. McCarthy) making the appeal
which he has made in this House and
in the country on the question of
Separate schools as against Common
schools, because that question has
not arisen. The whole question
with which this Parliament has been
or may be called to deal, the question
with which the courts and the Privy
Council have been called to deal, is
not whether Separate schools are to be
established in Manitoba or not. They
could not deal with such a question;
they were not clothed with the power
to deal with it. The whole question
was: Have any rights under the con-
stitution under which we live been
taken away from any minority? And
what has been the answer? The
highest tribunal in the Empire has
declared that certain rights have been
taken away from a minority in one
of the provinces. This is the whole
subject, and not whether Separate
schools are better than Common schools,
or whether they should be forced on
the people of Manitoba or not. But I
want to take issue with the hon.
gentleman on another point, and a
more serious one. I want to say in the
name of the people for whom to some
extent I have the right to speak, that
it was a gross act of injustice to the
Catholics of this country for the hon.
member for North Simcoe, as well as
certain newspapers and other promi-
nent gentlemen, all through the time
that the question has been under dis-
cussion, to inflame the public mind by
trying to create the impression that
the Catholics of this country have been
the aggressors, and have attempted to
force Catholic schools upon the country,
and to interfere with provincial rights.

While I do not want to discuss the
question, because the time has not yet
come for discussing anything beyond
the remedial order that has been
passed, let me say here that I fully
agree with the hon. gentleman who
have preceded me in expressing the
most earnest desire that the Legisla-
ture of Manitoba will afford the remedy
to the evil created in that Legislature
by its own act, and that the matter
may not be brought into this Parlia-
ment at all. I will not be so unkind
as to suppose for one moment that any
hon. gentleman in this House would
feel disappointed at such a peaceable
solution of the matter. I would not do
so cruel a thing to any public man in
this country as to charge him with en-
tertaining the hope that Manitoba
might not settle this question, and that
it might come here to be settled by the
Dominion Parliament, with the view
of creating dissatisfaction and anxiety
in the country. We all trust that the
remedial order, having gone to the
Manitoba Legislature, will be dealt
with effectually by that body. We do
not all insist, as did the hon. gentle-
man who last addressed the House,
that the remedial order places that
Legislature in the position that they
must pay the last pound of flesh. If
the hon. gentleman were in a position
to say that the Legislature of Mani-
toba had refused to take action and
that this Parliament was called upon
to do so—if he were in a position to
say that the Legislature of Manitoba
had offered any fair and reasonable
compromise, with the object of restor-
ing peace and harmony, and that the
minority in that province had refused
such a fair and reasonable compromise,
his argument might have some weight.
But I say that it is most unfair and
most ungenerous to charge the Cath-
olics of this country with the responsi-

bility of this agitation. There must
be a beginning of all things, and
there must be reasons for the excep-
tional legislation to which we are obli-
gated to refer, and out of which this
question grows. Every hon. member of this
House who is familiar with the history
of confederation and the circumstances
under which confederation was brought
about, knows full well that it was not
the Catholics of this country who in-
sisted on this exceptional legislation.
We know that as a matter of history,
as a matter of record, from the discus-
sions which took place when the whole
question of the agreement and the
treaty between the different parties to
the confederation was under considera-
tion. When that was being considered
by the old Canadian Parliament, the
Parliament of Upper and Lower
Canada, what were the real
facts? The Catholics did not say:
You must give us certain rights and
privileges and make them permanent
by law or else we will not go into con-
federation. No; it was quite the other
way. It was the Protestants, the lead-
ing men in Parliament at that time,
men like the Hon. George Brown, the
Hon. Mr. Holton, Sir Alexander Galt
—all the prominent men at the time—
who insisted, as the first condition of
confederation, that the educational
rights of the Protestant minority in
Quebec should be protected and guar-
anteed. At that time the Protestant
minority in the province of Quebec had
certain rights, though not so extensive
as those they now have. The Catholic
minority in Ontario had certain rights
under the Bill of 1863, but more
limited than those now enjoyed by the
Protestant minority in Quebec. It was
then declared by all these gentlemen
I have named that before confederation
could take place at all, the Govern-
ment must bring in a Bill dealing with
the province of Quebec, and amend-
ing right there and then the school
law as it then existed in that province.

The Protestant leaders in Parliament
were not content that the rights of the
Protestant minority in Quebec as they
then existed should be secured by con-
federation. They said: That is not
enough, we want perfect and full con-
trol of educational matters for our
minority in Quebec, and unless you
amend the law now so as to give us
that full and complete control, it will
not be binding under the Act of Con-
federation. Therefore, that was done,
and let me say to the credit of the
people of Quebec, and their represen-
tative men, that no voice was raised
during that discussion objecting to the
slightest degree to the proposal. On
the contrary, they said they were will-
ing to give that, and any further
guarantee which the minority might
desire at the time. Then followed the
proposition that if you gave to the
minority in Quebec the protection they
asked for on the educational question,
why not give the same guarantee to
the minority in Ontario? That was a
fair proposition to make at a time
when the prominent men of the coun-
try were assembled together to lay the
foundations of a new nation by uniting
provinces with different interests,
speaking different languages, and be-
lieving different religions. The fair
proposition was then made to give, on
the other hand, the Catholic minority
in Ontario similar rights. I am not
going to find fault, I am not attempt-
ing to draw a comparison in an offen-
sive sense between the Protestants and
the Catholics at that time, but I simply
state the facts as proving the position I
have taken from the first—that the
condition of things we have now is not
chargeable to the Catholics at all, ex-
cept in part, but is simply due to the
movement made by the Protestants
themselves to secure protection to
their minority in the province of Que-
bec. That was agreed to in the first
place by the Finance Minister, Sir
Alexander Galt, when he pledged him-
self to it in his speech at Sherbrooke.
He was questioned in the House after-
wards by the Hon. Mr. Holton, who
said:

"The Minister of Finance, in a speech
at Sherbrooke, had promised that the
Government would introduce a Bill to
amend the school laws of Lower Can-
ada. The honorable gentleman must
be aware that this was a question on
which there was a great deal of feeling
in this section of the province amongst
the English-speaking, or the Protestant
class of the population. He did not
like to introduce anything of a religio-
us character into discussions of this
House, but in debating the great
changes which it was proposed to effect
in our system of government, the effect
of them upon that class to which he
referred must be considered. Among
that class there was no phase or feature
of these threatened changes which ex-
cited so much alarm as this very ques-
tion of education. Well, the Minister
of Finance had said, with great solemn-
ity, as having the authority of his
colleagues for it, that this session the
Government would bring down amend-
ments to the school laws of Lower Can-
ada, which they proposed enacting into
law before a change of Government
should take place, and which would
become a permanent settlement of the
question."

That pledge was carried out. I may
quote further what the Hon. Mr. Le-
telleur de Saint Just said, and I do this
merely to show the spirit in which this
proposition was met by gentlemen
representing different nationalities.
He said:

"I have heard it said that the Protest-
ants of Lower Canada ought to be satis-
fied with their prospects of the future,
because we have always acted with
liberality towards them. But that is
no guarantee for them, for we would
not content ourselves with a mere
promise to act liberally, if we con-
sidered that our interest or our insti-

tutions were threatened by a majority
differing in race and religion from
ourselves; and in any case that is not
the way to ensure the peace of the
country. If we establish this prin-
ciple, we should say to the Catholics of
Upper Canada that they ought to be
satisfied with the lot which we provide
for them. When we make a constitu-
tion, we must, in the first place, settle
the political and religious questions
which divide the population for whom
the constitution is devised; because it
is a well known fact, that it is religio-
us differences which have caused the
greatest troubles and the greatest diffi-
culties which have agitated the people
in days gone by.

There were no two opinions on that
subject, that, in the best interests of
the country these things should be
settled at once, so that friction might
be avoided in the future. The
Quebec representatives, having con-
ceded the Protestant minority the
right to so amend the then existing
law as to give them full and complete
control in the matter of education in
the province of Quebec, Mr. Bourassa,
whom I am glad to see hale and hearty
in his place to-day, moved an amend-
ment to the effect that similar
privileges should be extended to the
Catholic minority in Ontario. That
amendment was, however, lost by a
very large majority. Mr. D'Arcy Mc-
Gee said that the Bill of 1863, which
had been carried, conveyed to the
Catholic of Ontario all that they had
asked for in their petition, and he, for
his part, had accepted that as a final-
ity, and therefore would not ask to
open up that question again, unless
special and further privileges were
granted to the Protestant minority in
Quebec, in which case he thought the
minority in Ontario ought to be pro-
tected in exactly the same way.
Well, the vote was taken, and only a
small vote was given in favor of the