

his own

r urges
question
r own
in his
arise
on the
conces-
grieved
object-
nt exer-
ate on
posses-
be alto-

dress he
"I am
ges re-
lic min-
rier said
ould ex-
ery first
ess his
religion-
t strug-
however,
rms ex-
nce that
one, his
adly see
conceded.
is audi-
e in an
t who
Catholic
ature of
at the
t, accord-
a spec-
stration,
Mr. Laur-
ts," and
dissentient
of approb-
al lead-
was re-
mitted, Mr.
y in those

er, which
se before
which I
e, "there
Canadian
legislature
ust where,
an Grant
ctly diag-
o not like
t we are
have an-
vere, even
ere Mani-
ost liberal
t, the fact
of unfa-
her prov-

inces. But the moment the federal arm is raised to attack our legislature, popular sympathy is stirred in favor of the province, even amongst the classes whose sympathy, under other circumstances, would be extended to the minority—to the weaker body that complained of a grievance inflicted by the stronger one.

There is no disposition, I believe, on the part of the Protestant majority, throughout the Dominion at large, to refuse concessions that will satisfy all reasonable members of the minority, if the question is once fairly put before them. This fact was well illustrated a good many years ago, when the great Liberal leader of the day—honest and tolerant Alexander Mackenzie—so eloquently pleaded for the restoration to the Catholics of New Brunswick, of the privileges that they had formerly enjoyed. Nay, the privileges that they had before enjoyed were not even theirs by sanction of law, but by the grace of the authorities; and Mr. Mackenzie pleaded that they should not only be restored, but made sure by statutory enactment. And with remarkable unanimity, both sides of parliament applauded Mr. Mackenzie, and voted with him in asking the sovereign and her imperial advisers to intercede with the legislature of New Brunswick on behalf of the aggrieved minority. Mr. Greenway himself was there amongst the rest, and recorded his vote for toleration and conciliation and concession. The voice of the Protestant majority throughout the land stood at that time, too, with Mr. Mackenzie. He spoke in the name and he expressed the sentiments of that Protestant majority, when, in his place in the Commons, referring to the struggle of the New Brunswick Catholics to secure the rights enjoyed by their co-religionists in Ontario, he reminded the house that, though he himself preferred above all others, a public school system free from denominationalism, yet he had by speech and vote supported in the confederation debate, the scheme which perpetuated separate schools for Catholics in Upper Canada and for Protestants in Lower Canada. It was so also when he made the memorable declaration of his desire that the privileges enjoyed by the Catholics of Ontario should be extended to their co-religionists in every province in the union. Mr. Mackenzie's language at that time is so applicable to the position in Manitoba that some of his words may well be reproduced at this time.

"Sir," said Mr. Mackenzie, "the same grounds which led me on that occasion to give loyal assistance to the confederation project, embracing as it did a scheme of having separate schools for Catholics in Ontario and for Protestants in Quebec, caused me to feel bound to give my sympathy, if I could not give my active assistance to those in other provinces, who believed they were laboring under the same difficulties and suffering under the same grievances that the Catholics in Ontario complained of for years."

There is evidence of a strong feeling on the part of the Protestant majority in Ontario against federal legislation establishing separate schools in Manitoba. But this feeling can scarcely be based on any decided objection to a system in itself, which permits Roman Catholics to have schools in Catholic districts, in which the tenets of their own faith are taught, so long as the requirements of the law as to secular education are complied with. That this is so, plainly appears from the general satisfaction given by the system that prevails in Ontario itself. That it is accepted because of its real merits, and not because there are constitutional obstacles in the way of its removal, is also amply testified. It is scarcely necessary to do so, but I may quote just a little testimony on this point. There is for instance, the Toronto Globe's editorial statement in April of this very year. "We advocate the Ontario system," said the Globe at that time, "not because it is fixed by the constitution, but because we consider it to be a good system, embodying a satisfactory settlement of a vexed question. If this province were making a fresh start to-day, absolutely untrammelled by constitutional restrictions, we do not know that it could do better than continue that arrangement without any material change."

There is also the testimony of the Hon. David Mills in 1892, when he said. "The course taken in the province of Ontario, on the whole, produces the most satisfactory results on this continent, of the educational question . . . I say there is no public school system on this continent, producing more satisfactory results, and that works out with less friction than the separate school system of Ontario."

Even in the province of Manitoba, in the hottest of the present agitation, an earnest and eloquent voice was raised in testimony to the satis-