

young children that the Church devoted themselves to this work of teaching without any reward save the recognition they received. It was only those who had experienced the benefits that could realise how much the gain was. There was not a single Separate School supporter from one end of the country to the other who would be willing to part with a single advantage that the schools possessed on the ground that the teachers did not carry the certificates that other teachers possessed. (Cheers.) So much for this part of the subject. He objected to the proposal to impose the ballot upon Separate School supporters for various reasons. One reason, as had been well pointed out by the Minister for Education, was that the compulsory adoption of the ballot would be a violation of the Constitution. It was only necessary to look at the system of election in operation at the time of Confederation to see in this what everybody would be prepared to admit, an infringement of their rights, an attempt to do away with the privileges that the Roman Catholics enjoyed under Confederation. But there were other reasons why he objected, why the Roman Catholic minority of this Province objected, to the introduction of the ballot. "You cannot," the hon. gentleman proceeded, "disassociate it from the discussion outside; you cannot disassociate it from my hon. friend's London speech; you cannot disassociate it from what was contained in the platform of hon. gentlemen opposite; you cannot disassociate it from the fact that all over the Province it is offensive to the Hierarchy of

Roman Catholic Church; that it is offensive to the clergy of that Church; that it is offensive to the laity of the Church in that it insinuates that only under the ballot could their rights and privileges be maintained. (Cheers.) The hon. gentleman, in order to make more studiously offensive what was already offensive enough, made the insinuation that the laity were afraid to exercise their undoubted rights on account of the improper influence of the clergy. I say there is no self-respecting Roman Catholic in this Province of Ontario who will not feel keenly the insult to his clergy. It is a studied offence to the laity. It says in effect that we Separate School supporters are slaves, bondsmen and serfs—not allowed to control our own action—not allowed to have our own wishes in the election of Trustees. It said this because forsooth in the City of Toronto in certain localities the priest happened to be exercising his legitimate influence in the matter of elections. (Cheers.) The Roman Catholics were asking for this legislation, and I promise that they know much better what their own requirements are than do the gentlemen opposite or any other persons outside their Church." Was there, Mr. Fraser asked, a single denomination in the Province of Ontario who would not resent such legislation as this? Put the members of the Methodist persuasion or of any other denomination in a position similar to that of the Roman Catholic minority, would the House dare to force upon them such alterations of the law unless they were asked for? If any party proposed to abolish the privileges of any religious denomination, that denomination would be found a unit in opposition. The hon. gentleman had laid down the rule when he appeared before the electors of the City of London that the Roman Catholic minority, because it was a solid, compact political unit ruled by the Hierarchy, should be regarded as a common enemy, and where there was a common enemy people were justified in uniting against it. If this were so, then, according to his argument, every religious denomination that united in defence of its rights should be treated as a common enemy. It would be the same were a proposal made, on the principle that there ought to be only one University in Ontario, to abolish the Victoria University or the Queen's University at Kingston. Does any one suppose that these Universities would not stand up as a unit to defend their rights; and were they to be regarded as a common enemy? If they proposed to interfere with the smallest right of the Presbyterian University of Queen's did they suppose they would not find the Presbyterians united against the political party at the next general election that attempted to infringe that right? (Hear, hear.) He wanted to know why it was that a different line of action was to be expected from the Roman Catholic minority than would under similar circumstances be expected from a Protestant denomination. Their educational institutions were as dear to Roman Catholics as were those of any other denomination to the members of their body. When danger assailed them was it not to be expected that they would unite even more closely than they had done? So far as the Conservative party was concerned, they

110  
abolish the Separate School system—they were pledged to the hilt to do so. They had made it a cardinal point in their political platform, when they accepted the sanction of the Orange Lodges. This was their platform, adopted at a meeting of the Grand Lodge of Ontario West, at Hamilton, at a meeting held on the 15th and 16th February, 1876, and it was the platform of the hon. gentleman and his colleagues:—

Resolved, That, in the opinion of the Right Worshipful Grand Lodge, the time has arrived when the Orangemen of Canada, without reference to politics or political parties, must unite in one grand political phalanx in order to stop the encroachments of the Romish Hierarchy upon the body politic of the country, and that the following platform be adopted:—

Unswerving and untiring allegiance to the Mother Country and British Connection.

(2) No grants of money from the public purse for sectarian purposes.

(3) No Separate Schools, but free secular education for all.

(4) Taxation for all; taxation of all property held by religious bodies upon its fair assessment value.

(5) The opening of all public institutions in the land, religious or otherwise, to public inspection by Government officials.

(6) That it shall be the duty of the County Master in every Orange county, in the event of a general election or other election taking place, either for the Local or Dominion Parliaments, to submit the platform to the candidate or candidates to ascertain if they will support it or not, and then to call a county meeting before the day of polling, and if neither of the candidates will support the said platform then it shall be the duty of the County Lodge to bring out a candidate.

The hon. gentleman and his colleagues were under the power of the Orange Lodges, and he (Mr. Fraser) did not think the day had yet arrived when the Roman Catholic minority was to be controlled and ruled and legislated for by Orangemen. The Roman Catholics resented this measure as an interference with their rights, as an insult to themselves; they objected to it because they did not require it, because it was proposed to thrust upon them legislation that they did not ask for, and they opposed it because it was ultra vires. The Roman Catholic minority didn't propose to stand calmly by and see cut away, chip by chip, the whole of the Separate School system. If hon. gentlemen opposite could have their way, if they could effect their purpose, the guarantees given under the British North America Act would be only a sham, a delusion and a snare. He had a few words to say with reference to the necessity for giving notice. It was sometimes said in the country that the amendment of 1879 was introduced to do away with the necessity for giving notice. There never was any such intention. Those responsible for the amendment proclaimed almost from the housetops that it was necessary for Separate School supporters to give notice that they were such. Before the last general election the Attorney-General sent an open letter to Mr. Milligan showing as clearly as he possibly could that the law still required notice on the part of anybody intending to become a Separate School supporter; and that if he wanted to again become a Public School supporter he had to give notice. He (Mr. Fraser) during the last general election held several meetings, and at every one of those meetings he put it in the plainest language he could that there was no such thing as becoming a Separate School supporter without doing so. The amendment of 1879 was intended simply to provide for the proper machinery for the elections, more particularly as regarded municipalities.

Mr. Meredith—Why did not the municipalities act?

Mr. Fraser—The hon. gentleman had given quotations showing that notice had not been given in some municipalities since 1879. He would find that prior to 1879 there was no notice given. He (Mr. Fraser) had made diligent inquiry, and although there had been Separate Schools in existence for 30 years there were no Separate School notices given. He was bound to say, if he told the truth, that he never himself gave a written notice that he would become a Separate School supporter. Even here in the municipality of Toronto, and in all municipalities where Separate Schools existed, the authorities did not care a brass farthing whether the Roman Catholics gave notice or not. They were acting fairly and legitimately although no notice had been given. He would undertake to say that throughout Ontario, until this sectarian cry had been raised, not even the most vigorous opponents of Separate Schools concerned themselves with whether notice were given or not. The fact was that every Roman Catholic was a Separate School supporter, but no notice could be found with the Clerks of the municipalities. On the other hand, everybody who was not a Roman Catholic was supposed to be a supporter of Public Schools. The public officers recognised this. He was not prepared to speak for every municipality, but he would undertake to say as regards the City of Toronto that up to 1879, and even