

102

did at the time the British North America Act was passed would not be a violation of the Constitution? Did he not know that any violation of those provisions was a violation of that Act, and instead of being a guardian of that Constitution was he not making an inroad upon the Constitution which the House could not support? They took the ground that the right to open voting was a provision within the meaning of that Act, and the hon. gentleman must show good reasons to the contrary, and that the right was one that he could safely withdraw according to the provisions of that Act. But to proceed. He (Mr. Ross) was pointing out that if the ballot was provided as he proposed, it would only affect seven distinct municipalities. Besides, he should give them some reason for the introduction of his measure. Was he prepared to show that better Separate School Trustees could be secured? Was he prepared to show that intimidation was practised? Did he want to imply by his bill that Separate School elections were now under the control of the Hierarchy and that only by a measure such as this could they be emancipated from that control? If so, he (Mr. Ross) thought that the preamble should read that whereas the Roman Catholics were under the Hierarchy, therefore Her Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Legislature, etc., enacts that Separate School elections should be by ballot. That was its intent and purpose. It plainly intimated as much, and he thought his hon. friend in his London speech clearly indicated that was his opinion, and that some remedy should be obtained for such a condition of affairs. Could his hon. friend show that even on his own basis he could attain the object he had in view? They were charged with receiving more than their share of Catholic support. They received that under the ballot system. His hon. friend proposed to apply the ballot to Separate Schools in order that the elections should not be under the control of the hierarchy, and yet under the Ballot Act he asserted that the Roman Catholics showed sympathy to the Government. Hot or cold, thin or stout, the same inference was drawn, the same conclusion was reached by his hon. friend, that there was coercion, there was intimidation, there was injustice done to a large body of Her Majesty's subjects. But supposing the position were reversed; supposing a Roman Catholic majority prevailed and that the Protestant Schools were the Separate Schools, would the Protestants consider themselves fairly treated if legislation of this kind were forced upon them? Supposing the ballot were forced upon the Protestants of Quebec contrary to their desire, what would be said of the Roman Catholic majority there? Would it not be said—and no doubt his hon. friend would be the first to raise his voice against legislation of this kind—that they should not submit to such legislation unless asked for by themselves? But, besides, he asked, has my honorable friend any precedent for this? The Province of Ontario was not the only Province in the Dominion in which educational questions were considered of great moment. Could he find one Province in the Dominion where the ballot had been applied to Separate School elections? Could he find any State in the Union? or could he quote the example of England, Ireland or Scotland? The system of open voting prevailed everywhere; but, notwithstanding this, the hon. member proposed to enact this legislation. He (Mr. Ross) would ask the House to reject the measure; first, because there was no necessity for its application, and, second, because it would entail unnecessary expense upon those who did not desire to assume that expense. The measure should be rejected because it was a violation of the British North America Act. There was no demand for legislation of this kind, and the present law sufficiently covered the points brought forward by the hon. member.

He would now come to a bill introduced by his hon. friend from North Grey. The labor of amending the School Act seemed to be divided up among the hon. members opposite. The leader had evidently taken the heavy end, as he usually did, but the member for North Grey undertook to bring in a small bill—only a few lines—but one which, he thought, would be admitted to be unnecessary. He proposed that the legislation of 1863 and subsequent years should be changed, and that those employed as teachers in Separate Schools should no longer be allowed to teach unless they submitted to the same examination as Public School teachers. In 1855 the qualification of Separate School teachers was prescribed by a Board of Examiners, and by the Act of 1863 lay teachers were expected to take the same examination as clerical teachers. This legislation was ratified by the Confederation Act of 1867, and had been acted upon ever since. The hon. member proposed to change this and not allow these teachers to undertake their work unless they passed the same examination as Public School teachers. He was surprised that an attack of this kind should fall to the lot of the hon. member for North Grey. In the discussion of the Act of 1867 no member

was more anxious to maintain the integrity of the B. N. A. Act than the hon. gentleman. Now he came to the House with an Act which would be disallowed by the Dominion Government as soon as it was read by the Minister of Justice. Further, he would point out that the Government would not only have the right to disallow it, but to provide remedial legislation. He was not surprised that the leader of the Opposition, as a lawyer, had not introduced this measure, but left it to the member for North Grey. What the latter member knew about legal matters he did not know, but as to his lack of financial ability they had some experience in the House a few days ago. The laws now in force had been carefully and patiently considered by the greatest minds in the country, and he questioned the wisdom of the member for North Grey in attempting to amend them.

Before expecting the House to pass his measure the member would have to prove two things—first, that those who were members of the religious orders of the R. C. Church were inferior as teachers to those qualified under Public School Acts, and secondly, that the instruction imparted in Roman Catholic Schools was inferior to that imparted in the Public Schools.

There was in Toronto a training institute in connection with the Roman Catholic Church, where, he was informed, the curriculum was identical with the course of study taken by Public School teachers. There they had a

guarantee that the teachers were men of high attainments—that is, so far as the curriculum was concerned. Many Separate School teachers had taken courses in the High Schools and Normal Institutes. In the De la Salle School two of the teachers held certificates from the Provincial Normal. In St. Paul's School one held an Ontario certificate and another a Quebec. In St. Patrick's School one teacher held a Provincial certificate, and in St. Mary's School two teachers held certificates from the Province of Nova Scotia. Out of nineteen Christian Brothers in Toronto eight held Provincial certificates, either from Ontario, Quebec or Nova Scotia. He quoted Ottawa, St. Catharines and other cities, showing that a similar condition of affairs prevailed. In the various Roman Catholic Training Schools for females nearly all the Principals held first-class certificates. His hon. friend did not propose to proceed gradually, but proposed to compel all these teachers to take a course in the High and Normal Schools. He was, however, sure that the House would not consent to this measure of compulsion. From a report received he learned that out of 159 female teachers of religious orders in the various Separate Schools of Western Ontario 46 held regular certificates and nine had attended the Normal School, and from this it was evident that they were teachers of considerable training.

If the hon. member was unable to prove inferior attainments in these teachers what could he prove with regard to the training received by pupils in these schools? The impression had gone abroad that the training received in the Separate Schools was inferior to the training received in the Public Schools. Of this he could not speak personally, as he had not visited the former schools, except once, as an act of courtesy, but he had before him reports made by High School Inspectors as to the general efficiency of these schools. In 1882 the Inspectors were instructed to visit and report on the general efficiency of the Public and Separate Schools, and the Minister quoted from the reports made by Inspectors Buchanan and Marling to the effect that the work done in the Separate Schools and the department of the children were uniformly good. In the competition for teachers' examinations the pupils of the Separate Schools were reasonably successful. From Lindsay there were sixteen candidates for third-class, eleven for second-class, three for intermediate and seven for civil service, while the Toronto convent sent thirteen for third-class and sixteen for second-class certificates. The following were among the extracts read by Mr. Ross:—

Barrie, Inspector Marling, 1874:—
 "I examined several classes, Third Reader, Christian Brother series, two boys and four girls. Their reading was excellent, pronunciation, intonation, punctuation, definitions, all good to a degree seldom witnessed by me in any Canadian school. It was a pleasure to listen to these pupils. The boys were not, however, equal to the girls."

Peterboro—Inspector Marling, 1876:—
 "Mr. Donovan is doing good work and has some pupils who work very intelligently. The result of his Normal School training is very manifest in the performance of his scholars."

Flora—Inspector Marling, 1874:—
 "The children were mostly very young. I examined the 4th class in reading, geography and arithmetic, the work was all above the average, some of the arithmetic and much of the geography being really excellent. The neatness and manliness of the pupils were most gratifying. The teacher is energetic and interested in her work. The school is held in a small but neat and clean building behind the church."

Guelph—Inspector Buchan, 1874:—
 "These schools offer a striking contrast in organisation and order to the Guelph Public Schools. This is particularly true of the girls' school, which is remarkably well managed. One of the sisters, Sister Mary Aloysius, was formerly a student at the Normal School, and is a very superior person and a very clever teacher."

Goderich—Inspector Buchan, 1875:—
 "The order was good. I examined the best pupils first in dictation, in which they failed, and afterwards in arithmetic, in which they were more successful. In fact they did better in arithmetic than the pupils of the highest division of the Goderich Central School."

These statements from the High School Inspector, said Mr. Ross, would show that the work was not inferior in Separate Schools to that of Public Schools. But, besides those who were teachers in religious Orders, it must be remembered there were 190 Separate School teachers who were certificated and authorised under the Public School Act to teach. The proportion of first-class certificated teachers engaged in Separate School work was as large as first-class teachers engaged in Public School work. They had as large a percentage of those holding high-class certificates as the Public Schools had. Mr. Meredith would have to prove to the House that the Separate School teachers were generally inferior to those of Public Schools, particularly those in religious Orders. Also that the standard of education is lower in the Separate Schools than in the Public Schools. He would have to prove this by the results and by the curriculum of the two classes, otherwise this House could not accept his bill. He must show substantial reasons for his bill or the House would not consent to such a measure.

Mr. Ross then turned his attention to Mr. French's bill, which proposed to take from Separate Schools the right of electing a member to the High School Board. Mr. French, he said, must have something to do with school legislation, apparently, or the Act would not be perfect in all its details. He wanted the House to repeal that section of the Act that allowed Separate Schools to be represented on the High School Board. The amendment allowing this was made in 1886. Mr. French was then in the House and a consenting party to the amendment then made. He was not aware that he had made any objection to it at that time. What change had come over him since then? By what process had he been instructed as to the amendment he then supported and tacitly voted for?—for the amendment had passed unanimously. What was his reason for introducing this amendment? The grounds on which this amendment had been introduced were practically as follows:—(1) It was thought desirable that there should be a direct connection between Separate Schools and High Schools, for it was shown that while Roman Catholics were taxed for the maintenance of