

all know that it was a spurious document. So we have all the charges made by Mr. Ewart withdrawn, and only the statement remaining with regard to separate schools being preferable to public schools.

But there is another side to this question. Did the legislature of Manitoba wantonly do away with this system of schools? Did they do so simply out of bigotry? Nay, Sir, am I the author of all this discord that has arisen? Did those few words which I uttered in Portage la Prairie in the summer of 1889 really stir up the government and the people of that province so much as to induce them to abolish the separate schools and establish the public school system? It is a pity to destroy my own credit, but I cannot help doing so, having regard to the facts. The truth is that at that time, before I reached Manitoba at all, the government had announced their determination to do away with the dual system. On the very day that I reached Winnipeg I saw in the morning paper the statement that at a place called Clearwater, one of the Ministers of the Greenway government had announced as the policy of that government that the dual system of schools was to be abolished. I read that statement—I misread it I dare say—understanding that the separate school system was to be done away. In that I appear to have been mistaken. It was yet a matter for consideration whether, in abolishing the dual system, which entailed double expense on the province, they would also abolish the separate schools. Ultimately, it was determined that the separate schools should go with the dual system, and they went accordingly.

Now, it has been said with a good deal of force, why were those separate schools not reformed? Their inefficiency has been challenged. Has any man disputed it? They were not fulfilling the purpose for which they were designed. The children in the settlements where separate schools existed were growing up in ignorance—ignorance which, to use Mr. Sifton's words, was a disgrace to any civilized community. Did not that call for an inquiry?

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Has the hon. gentleman any evidence of that?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes. Was the legislature which was spending the money of the people in the attempt to educate their children not bound to inquire and investigate, when that money was not being properly used—at any rate, was not achieving the design for which it was intended? The hon. gentleman asks me if I have any evidence. I ask him to appeal to his friends. What is the Bill they have given you? Why, the Bill, on the face of it, admits the inefficiency of the schools. It says that you are not fit to be trusted with the management of the schools, with the examination of the teachers, or with the choice of the books.

Mr. McCARTHY.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Do you call that evidence?

Mr. McCARTHY. If that is not sufficient for the hon. gentleman, then I would like to know what further evidence he wants? Why did the Government, why did your own friends, after ordering the province to restore the system as it was, deprive you of this control?

An hon. MEMBER. Not as it was.

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes, the remedial order if I understand the English language, said as it was—as it was A, B and C, and in every respect. Then, have not the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches been going from stump to stump telling us how they were going to make the schools efficient. They never denied that the schools, as they existed, were inefficient. On the contrary, everybody knows they were inefficient. The public money voted for the schools was improperly expended, and in saying this I speak from evidence which ought to be accepted by this House. Remember how the money was used. A certain sum was granted by the province, and that sum was divided, according to school population. A census was taken by the trustees themselves, and the money was handed over, one portion to the Protestant and the other portion to the Catholic section of management; and the Attorney General of Manitoba has not hesitated publicly to say that that money, so obtained, from the province was obtained dishonestly and unfairly, and that there was no ground and no pretense for the sums which the Roman Catholics exacted from the public treasury. Now, that is Mr. Sifton's own statement, which I will trouble the House by reading.

Mr. DUPONT. The statement of Mr. Sifton is not proof.

Mr. McCARTHY. The hon. gentleman says it is not proof. Well, the public must judge between the Attorney General of the province and the hon. gentleman. All I can say is that I have the statement which was deliberately made, and in which that charge is deliberately stated. Here are the words of Mr. Sifton:

It was found that the school population which had been returned by the Catholic section of the Board of Education was palpably inaccurate.

Again there were grave abuses in connection with the distribution of money. We have never been able to ascertain how the Catholic section worked the matter out. But I will give you one result of the distribution of the public money. They so managed that while the Protestant school districts received \$197 each, the Catholic districts got \$347 each; that while for each Protestant teacher there was paid \$121.76, for each Roman Catholic teacher there was paid \$195.05.

That does not stand quite on Mr. Sifton's statement alone. Let me give you the statistics: