

THE ASSEMBLY.

Another Day of Separate School Talk.

MR. CLANCY SPREADS HIMSELF.

Mr. H. E. Clarke Wants the Constitution Revised.

SPEECHES BY MESSRS. BALFOUR AND AWREY.

Mr. French Makes the Final Effort of the Evening—The Debate Again Adjourned.

March 26th, 1890.

The Separate School debate again occupied the House all day, the speakers being Messrs. Clancy, H. E. Clarke and French on the Conservative side, and Messrs. Balfour and Awrey on the Liberal side. The debate was again adjourned shortly after half-past eleven, the galleries were crowded again all day.

FIRST READINGS.

The following bills were introduced and read a first time:—

An Act respecting the sale of lands for taxes in Muskoka and Parry Sound—The Attorney-General.

An Act respecting certain statistical returns—Hon. Mr. Drury.

THIRD READINGS.

The following bills were read a third time and passed:—

An Act to amend the Ontario Insurance Act—Hon. Mr. Gibson.

An Act to enable the City of Brantford to issue debentures for drainage, water, school and park purposes—Hon. Mr. Hardy.

An Act to regulate mining operations—Hon. Mr. Hardy.

An Act to provide means of extinguishing forest fires—Hon. Mr. Drury.

An Act to incorporate the Dunnville, Attercliffe & Smithville Railway Company—Mr. Harcourt.

An Act to incorporate the Dunnville & Smithville Junction Railway Company—Mr. Harcourt.

An Act to incorporate the Sault Ste. Marie & Hudson Bay Railway—Mr. Lyon.

An Act to amend the Act incorporating the Amherstburg, Lake Shore & Blenheim Company Railway—Mr. Balfour.

An Act to vest certain portions of the St. Catharines, Thorold and Niagara Falls road in the Town of Niagara Falls and the Township of Stamford—The Attorney-General.

The third reading of the Act respecting the City of London was postponed until Thursday at the request of the Attorney-General, Mr. Meredith, who introduced the bill, giving way to allow of the introduction of an amendment by the Government.

THE SEPARATE SCHOOL DEBATE.

Mr. Clancy resumed the adjourned debate on the various Separate School Acts. He held that the question was one which should be decided by the people of Ontario, but the facts should be so placed before them as to obtain a full discussion from the electors. As a Roman Catholic he utterly denied the authority of the hon. gentleman who spoke last (Mr. Fraser) to speak on behalf of the Roman Catholics of the Province. He hoped hon. gentlemen in future would not pretend to rise in their places and speak for any religious body in this country. Since the hon. gentleman had slept over the speech he made last night he desired to ask if he considered the ground taken last evening was calculated to allay the spirit that was manifest throughout the country. Before the elections of 1886 the speech of the hon. gentleman would have been cheered by his friends, but last night they sat as if they had wet blankets around them. Continuing, he criticised the "milestones" spoken of by Mr. Fraser in his speech, and contended that the position of that gentleman in the past had been different from that now taken by him. He desired to call to the remembrance of the hon. gentleman the position he had taken when the Catholic League was formed in this Province. There was no ground for the statement that the Roman Catholics of this country were banded upon one side in politics, or that they voted upon grounds

aim of the hon. gentleman to bring that about. It was a right of the Roman Catholic clergy to take part in the elections, but he denied that in all cases it was a prudent thing to do. Nor was it well to alarm the people, and get them to engage in a contest the difficulties of which they could not fairly estimate. The No-Popery cry of 1886 was not the cry of the Conservative party, but of a newspaper of the City of Toronto, and hon. gentlemen had sent out pamphlets alarming the Catholic people of this Province, and leading them to believe that a crusade would be raised against them. Would hon. gentlemen, by a mere reading between the lines, without a word being said by Conservative members of the House, have the cowardice to send from one end of the Province to the other a No-Popery cry? Such a cry would unite the Catholics and unite the Protestants, and place them in hostility to each other. The hon. gentleman had introduced Orangeism into this debate, and had pointed out that the Roman Catholics had to leave the Conservative party because of certain resolutions adopted at an Orange meeting in a city of this Province. But the hon. gentleman should remember the record of his political friends and abstain from bringing such matters into the debate. From THE GLOBE he quoted to show that no opposition was manifested by the Orange body to the incorporation of St. Michael's College in Toronto.

Mr. Fraser called for the date and Mr. Clancy said it was on the 24th of December, 1857. "Not very old," suggested Mr. Fraser. "It is not too old for the hon. gentleman to beg it." Continuing, he referred to an Orange banquet in 1858 at which the Attorney-General was in attendance, and at which doubtless he spoke to some of the toasts. In Oxford a short time ago the Attorney-General, speaking to his constituents, had shown to what an extent the Catholics were indebted for their privileges to the Reform party. The editorials of THE GLOBE on current politics were pointed to as showing the general tendency of the policy of Reform leaders. Continuing, Mr. Clancy said that for the first time he had learned that there was a disposition on the part of Conservatives to abolish Separate

Schools. All the Acts respecting the schools that were brought before the House were sufficient evidence that there was no intention to abolish the schools, but only to perfect the machinery. The honorable gentleman, in regard to the bills now before the House, held that they involved an important constitutional question, and that it could not be proceeded with on that account. If electors came and asked for the ballot in Public Schools elections would the gentlemen deny them that request on the ground that it involved a grave constitutional question? He claimed the right for as efficient machinery in the Separate Schools as in the Public Schools. In regard to the request for the ballot for Separate Schools, why should a different position be taken? The hon. gentleman, the Premier, had said that he had never been approached by the Roman Catholic hierarchy with a request for a change of the school laws. If his hon. friend (Mr. Meredith) came to power, as he had no doubt he would—(Ministerial laughter)—he (the speaker) would consider he had done nothing out of place if he received advice from the Roman Catholic hierarchy. It was a proper and very reasonable thing to do. Mr. Clancy then touched upon the question as to whether or not it was necessary for Separate School supporters to give notice of their intention to be such. He claimed that the Attorney-General had deceived the Roman Catholics of the Province in leading them to believe that there was no necessity for the continuance of such notice. Several legal decisions were quoted from to show the position taken by the Courts. The bill now introduced by the Government was an attempt to gild the past. Certain Separate School supporters that he had spoken to considered that there was nothing very objectionable in the placing of all ratepayers as Public School supporters. It was a matter of business, a method of working. The bill of the Government was too cumbrous and the whole matter should be left in the hands of one officer. The bill of the hon. gentleman had blocked the way rather than otherwise for Separate School supporters to give effect to their wishes.

As to the ballot he desired to say a few words. Roman Catholics, for Public School Trustees, for Parliamentary candidates, for the election of members of the House, voted by ballot, and therefore it could not be said that there was conscientious scruples against it. It was wrong that hon. gentlemen should say that a question of con-