

all mixed together, finding only one cause of cleavage between them in Christian faith, that is dogmas, allowed religious teaching to be had in all the schools of our country, so that every man could give to his own child the religious tenets which he held sometimes dearer than life. That is the whole meaning of separate schools.

I have just stated that in 1863 a law was passed on this subject. At that time, in 1863, there were two men in Canada who each within his own circle and his own party, maintained a sovereign sway. One was Mr. Macdonald, now known to history as Sir John Macdonald, and the other was Mr. George Brown. Mr. Macdonald was a supporter of separate schools. He gave to the law of 1863 his vote and his influence. Mr. George Brown, on the contrary, was a most determined opponent of separate schools. He attacked the system relentlessly; he attacked it in his paper, on the floor of the House of Commons and upon the hustings. He attacked it with all the vehemence of his strongly impassioned nature. The arguments we hear to-day against separate schools are not new; they were heard 50 years ago. The arguments we hear to-day are but the attenuated echo of the strong denunciations of Mr. Brown, which were heard by our fathers two generations ago. But the views of Mr. Brown did not prevail, and notwithstanding his efforts, he was not in the House when the law of 1863 passed, which confirmed to the Roman Catholic minority of Upper Canada the privilege of separate schools. In view of the agitation then maintained by Mr. Brown in favour of representation by population, it is perhaps not inopportune to analyse that vote. The Bill of 1863 in favour of separate schools was carried by a vote of 80 against a minority of 22. Of this minority of 22, 21 belonged to the province of Upper Canada, and of the majority of 80, 33 belonged to that province, so that, leaving the vote of Lower Canada aside, taking only the vote of Upper Canada, we find that the law of 1863 was carried by a majority of the representatives of Upper Canada at that time. This is significant. Mr. Brown at that time was carrying on the strong agitation which he had maintained for years, and which he continued to maintain in favour, within the constitution of that day, of representation by population.

Sir, if we review the events of that period of our history, we must all admit that the constitution of 1841, which united Upper Canada and Lower Canada, was radically faulty. It was so constructed that it never gave satisfaction to either province. Lower Canada from the first looked upon it as an instrument of oppression, designed to deprive her of some of those institutions which she held dearer than life. Yet she it was who in after years held to that constitution, and defended it against reforms which she

regarded as fraught with still greater dangers to herself. Upper Canada accepted that constitution, not with any enthusiasm, but because it relieved her for the time from serious financial embarrassments. But Upper Canada, before many years had elapsed commenced also to find herself oppressed by the clumsy clauses which it contained, and sought relief in the agitation of Mr. Brown in favour of representation by population. The radical fault of the constitution of 1841 was that it was neither federative nor legislative. It united two provinces, but kept them as separate entities, gave them the same number of members, provided against an increase of representation, and allowed only a single executive. This equality in representation coupled with a single executive was a defect which no expedients thereafter could altogether overcome. As soon as Mr. Papineau had returned from exile, he attacked that feature of the constitution, and demanded its repeal. He was opposed by Mr. Lafontaine, not on principle, but simply from expediency. Mr. Lafontaine represented to him that Upper Canada would grow in population faster than Lower Canada, because as Upper Canada was getting an immigration which Lower Canada did not, Upper Canada would soon be the stronger province and therefore all the arguments which Mr. Papineau advanced for the repeal of that portion of the constitution on behalf of Lower Canada, would react against her. The predictions of Mr. Lafontaine as to the movement of population were soon fulfilled. Upper Canada became the more populous province. Then Mr. Brown took up the agitation where Mr. Papineau had left it, and carried it on for years, with never abating vigour. He opened a current in the public opinion of Upper Canada, which yearly increased in volume until it became well nigh irresistible: successive and short-lived administrations succeeded one another, and the day came in 1861 when there were two hostile majorities, one from Lower Canada and one from Upper Canada, facing each other and unyielding. There was a deadlock, and the government of the Queen was almost impossible if not actually impossible in the province of Canada. That was Mr. Brown's opportunity, and he seized it. It must be said, with alertness and courage; and whoever has to speak of those events must admit that on that occasion Mr. Brown rose to the highest stature of statesmanship. He was not satisfied to take advantage of the occasion simply to obtain the realization of the principle which he had at heart, but he made it the basis for a union of all the British provinces on the continent of America. That is his glory, and that is his chief title to fame—every Canadian acknowledges it. But Sir, the difficulties of the task were simply enormous, greater in my judgment, at all events, than