

account; and we considered the settlement was one which, as it was the best that could be obtained, the country should sanction; and so far as the country has had an opportunity of expressing an opinion, the country has sanctioned it. It is to be remembered too that even from a Catholic standpoint the settlement is far in advance of the condition of the public schools in the Dominion and in the United States, which are attended by multitudes of Roman Catholic children, with the approval of their spiritual advisers, where there are no separate schools. There is no doubt, so far as I have read, that there is no doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church which says that their children must never attend a public school, that they must attend a separate school or go to none. Of course they must attend separate schools when they can, but when there are no separate schools they will take advantage of the public schools. This settlement provides for religious teaching in all public schools, and it provides for it in a definite and practical way. There is no such provision for the public schools of my own province. I wish there was. I think it would be an advantage if there was. I do not see why it is not practicable. But the fact is that there is no such provision there, and therefore from a Roman Catholic standpoint this condition of public schools is far in advance of the condition of public schools in Ontario where notwithstanding Roman Catholics attend the common schools in the absence of other schools. It is also far in advance of the provisions of the law in the maritime provinces, speaking still from a Roman Catholic standpoint. The law there does not provide for religious teaching, and yet Roman Catholic children attend the public schools there, and for many years there has been no agitation in those provinces to establish separate schools. The condition of the public schools there renders separate schools unnecessary. We know that in every state in the United States, no provision is made for religious teaching in public schools. It is not practicable there, and the provisions of this settlement are far in advance of the United States system, from the same standpoint. In view of these and other considerations which if it were desirable to take up your time I could point out, it seemed to us plain that this was a settlement such as the people of Canada should accept, as an advantage both to the country and to our

Roman Catholic fellow brothers. Roman Catholics also constitute a large proportion of our population and it is important that they should be educated, and also that they should be contented, and that peace and harmony should exist between them and the rest of the population, and we believe that this settlement, in view of the circumstances I have mentioned, is what we all desire. My hon. friend next took up the subject of the tariff. My hon. friend says that we have ceased to be free traders. My hon. friend's notion of free traders is that they must either cease to be free traders, or must take into account nothing whatever that would justify duties. Now any free traders who take a view of that sort would be very unpractical men, and the free traders of Canada have never taken any such absurd position. Why, if we are to proceed upon the ground that my hon. friend says we are bound to proceed on, if we are free traders at all, we could not even have a revenue tariff.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—  
Hear, hear!

Hon. Sir OLIVER MOWAT—A revenue tariff involves a tax upon imports and therefore gives necessarily a certain amount of protection.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—It does not involve protection now.

Hon. Sir OLIVER MOWAT—A revenue tariff involves some protection.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—  
Not at all.

Hon. Sir OLIVER MOWAT—A revenue tariff gives protection and sometimes it is quite sufficient protection.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—It may be.

Hon. Sir OLIVER MOWAT—And then it would not be statesmanlike of free traders, or any other set of men, to disregard changed circumstances and changed conditions. Things were possible 18 years ago which are not possible now. The changes have been so great we need an immensely greater revenue than we needed then. That is to be taken into account; and then we are just now met with a policy on the part of the United States which few of us thought they