

object in asking the omission of such passages. Therefore it was absurd to argue that the Government had omitted them to please the Roman Catholics. He objected strongly to this question being made one of party politics. He would rather not have the Bible read in the school at all than have it turned into a political football. Some of the arguments that had been advanced on his side he did not altogether agree with, but he had no hesitation in supporting the Government.

Mr. SPRAGUE said he was sorry that this question should have been introduced. The question had been originally sprung upon the country only for political purposes, and he objected to its being brought into the House. He would, therefore, support the Government.

Mr. PHELPS pointed out that of the two millions of people living in Ontario only about 500,000 lived in cities, towns and villages, the remainder residing in rural districts. A great many Roman Catholics were found in these districts, and they generally availed themselves of the advantages of the Common Public schools, and the ideas of the hon. gentlemen opposite, if carried out, would interfere with the religious liberty of these Roman Catholics.

Mr. CRAIG said one of the prominent members of the Reform party had told him that the Book of Scripture Readings was "a hard pill" to swallow. He did not know why there had been so much talk about the resolutions as had taken place. It was unfair to charge that members of the Opposition were not sincere in bringing forward these resolutions. He, himself, was going to vote for them in all sincerity, and was sure the other members on his side would do the same.

Mr. MURRAY said members of the Conservative party objected that the majority of Roman Catholic votes had been cast for the Reform party at the last election. Well! What of that? They showed their good sense in supporting a sound Government. The majority of votes in most Churches, including the Episcopalian, in his riding, were cast for the same party; moreover, in the adjoining riding of his own, and in one or two other places he knew of the Roman Catholic clergy supporting the Conservative candidates, or at least opposing the Government candidate.

Hon. C. F. FRASER said that nothing more serious and harmful could happen to the Catholics of this Province than that the Protestants should come to believe that the Catholics were endeavoring unduly to control the affairs of Ontario. Therefore he was glad that the matter had come up at this time, away from the din and dust of party strife. He agreed that the speech of the member was moderate, conciliatory and fairly tolerant. His only regret was that the hon. gentleman, when he was appealing to be put into power, did not then take advantage of the many opportunities offered him to make such a tolerant, conciliatory and fair-minded speech. He did not think it was necessary to have introduced into this subject so largely questions of religion. But the hon. gentlemen were responsible for it. They raised this cry, not because they had not thought it out, but because they had thought it out. He claimed that when it was stated that the Roman Catholic electors were a subject

#### OF BARGAIN AND SALE

between the Government and the hierarchy, this was distinctly raising the No-Popery cry. Such statements as these were being made in The Mail day by day. He proposed to show that the hon. gentleman and his friends had distinctly endorsed these utterances of The Mail. The leader of the Opposition was a vice-president or a president of

#### THE LIBERAL CONSERVATIVE UNION.

Now, the Liberal Conservative Union was day by day, and week by week circulating, as campaign sheets, copies of The Mail containing these utterances. It was not only The Mail which was making these statements. They were made by local Conservative organs all over the country. Not only that, but as part of their campaign literature they circulated the "Lynch-Mowat Concordat." They were sent out in packages by express, and when these packages were not delivered they were returned to Mr. Birmingham, Secretary of the Conservative Association. He ran over Mr. Meredith's address to his London constituents, paragraph by paragraph, criticising it, and contrasting many of the statements made therein with what he claimed Mr. Meredith knew to be the real state of affairs. He charged that the address was so penned that it might at once lead people reading it to believe that the charges made against the Government were true, and at the same time would allow of his claiming that he had not identified himself with the "No-Popery" cry. He made numerous quotations from the pamphlet, "The Lynch-Mowat concordant," commenting with great severity on its contents. He referred to Mr. Meredith's speech at Cobourg, in which he spoke of the No-Popery cry, and noted that when there he did not repudiate The Mail, which did raise the No-Popery cry, but THE GLOBE, which had never raised it at all.

The hon. speaker claimed that he had proved his point, viz., that the "No Popery" cry had been raised by the Conservative party, and that the leader of the Conservative party in this House, had never repudiated that cry so long as he thought it could do him any good. He then took up the questions touched on in

the resolution submitted by Mr. Meredith, travelling briefly over the numerous points as to the principle of Separate schools, of which he had been a supporter and trustee for over twenty years. They were here, he said, to stay, no matter even if the Government should compel Roman Catholics to support Public schools. If such a thing were to happen, Roman Catholics would simply have to support two systems of schools instead of one.

Mr. LEES moved the adjournment of the debate. Carried.

The House adjourned at 1:30 a. m.