

the ballot should not be granted. Continuing, the speaker said that if at any time it was proposed to abolish Separate Schools, then, should his party support that proposal, he would have no hesitation in opposing his party on that issue. The primary end of all education, both Separate and Public School, he held to be the giving of a secular education. Not that he opposed religious instruction in the schools, but he doubted much if the aid sought by those who desired it had been compassed. He considered that it might be well for all parties if religious instruction were put aside, and the children of all could attend the Public Schools, where they could refrain from attendance on the religious exercises. In concluding this part of his address, Mr. Clancy said he could not see any objection to the granting of the ballot, and did not believe there was objection on the part of his Roman Catholic friends, and when the time came he would have pleasure in supporting it. He then discussed the bill having reference to the qualification of teachers, whom he considered should be certificated like the teachers of the Public Schools.

In conclusion Mr. Clancy expressed disapproval of the bill by Mr. French withdrawing the right of Separate School Boards to send delegates to High School Boards, but repudiated the statement of hon. gentlemen opposite that the Roman Catholics would cease sending their children to the High Schools if representation was not allowed them on the Board.

Mr. Balfour followed Mr. Clancy. He represented, he said, a constituency in which there were twenty thousand Protestants and five thousand Roman Catholics. He had never had more than a third of the Roman Catholic vote since he had represented the constituency of South Essex. There was one place, therefore, where the Roman Catholic vote was not solid for the Government. Now, Mr. Clancy had accused the Minister of Public Works of assuming the right to speak for the Roman Catholic minority. Well, if Mr. Fraser had assumed this position, was it not a position that the leader of the Opposition had long given to him? Because Mr. Clancy had not spoken on behalf of the Roman Catholic minority, was that any reason why Mr. Fraser should not do so? Why should not Mr. Fraser speak on behalf of the minority? Where could they find a more eloquent or a more liberal advocate of the Roman Catholic minority of the Province than the Commissioner of Public Works? It was incorrect that Mr. Fraser had spoken with heat on the preceding evening. He had spoken without excitement, and had presented his case with great fairness to the members of the House and to the country. (Applause.) Continuing, Mr. Balfour said he had heard it justified by the hon. gentleman opposite when the hierarchy and the priesthood were supporting them, but when they supported the Government it was all wrong. The hon. gentleman had said he was not responsible for The Mail, but he remembered that during the last election copies of The Mail had been purchased and sent by thousands into the Protestant sections of his constituency, but not one copy into the Catholic sections. He taunted the Opposition leader with his frequent change of front, and said there had been no stronger No-Popery cry than that set forth by The Hamilton Spectator when on the morning of the last election that journal said the Conservatives did not want any Catholic votes. The hon. member for Kent had read an extract from THE GLOBE, but had failed to disclose what sort of an extract it was. He thought it was probably some of the Conservative campaign literature of the time, distorted to suit the occasion. The hon. member for Kent had said that the Separate Schools should be improved—that was the position taken by the Attorney-General—but they should be improved under the provisions of the Act passed prior to Confederation, and the Government, during the years that he had been a member of the House, had proceeded along that line. Mr. Balfour here quoted from speeches by Hon. George Brown showing the terms upon which the Separate Schools were finally established. Mr. Clancy had dealt with the questions of the assessment roll, and he had quoted from some County Court Judges to show that the interpretation of the law by the Attorney-General in this respect was wrong. But the law on this point had been laid down by the Superior Court Judges, and they agreed with the interpretation of the Attorney-General; and the County Court Judges would have to accept the interpretation of the Superior Court Judges. Mr. Clancy objected to the present bill because it would divide the work between the Clerk and the Assessor, and he said the Assessor would not go to the Clerk for the names. By such an argument Mr. Clancy showed he could have no practical experience, or else it was

By the law the assessor was bound to go to the Clerk, and the binding was more rigorous now than before. Mr. Meredith's bill, too, threw everything on the Clerk alone. The principle of the Government legislation was that the assessment roll was final. The Clerk had to take that, and that was all he had to do with it. The Court of Revision and the County Judge and the Municipal Council were the authorities dealing with the roll after that. Mr. Clancy had instanced the case of those who might be unable to read. When the assessment notice was sent them they generally went to their neighbors, and very soon found out what the assessment notice contained. There

was no argument in that contention. In regard to the practice pursued in the west there was no feeling such as the gentlemen opposite tried to work up, and there was no trouble as to the giving of notice; the two parties got along together without rivalry, and ninety-nine out of a hundred of the Roman Catholics were supporters of the Separate Schools where there were any. But what had never happened before in his riding was that at the last election for trustees he had found that this question had arisen because of the agitation raised by the members opposite, and steps were being taken to establish Separate Schools where they had never before existed. In regard to the question of the ballot, while he would not oppose an optional ballot if there were an agitation for it, he could not see his way to make the ballot compulsory in Separate School elections while it was optional in Public Schools. Continuing his remarks Mr. Balfour was expressing his decided approval of the Government policy on these questions when Mr. Meredith interrupted him by saying:

"I thought you were not one of the faithful any longer."

Well, said Mr. Balfour, I may just take this occasion to tell the hon. gentleman that I come here this session not bound by any party lines to take any particular course of action, but I say I have the right to take the line I am taking to-night, because it is a position in which I shall be supported by the great majority in my constituency. That is my position on this matter, whatever it may be in regard to any other public questions that come before the House. (Applause.)

At this point, it being six o'clock, the Speaker left the chair.

The House, on resuming, went into Committee on several private bills, Mr. Harcourt in the chair. These having been disposed of,

Mr. Balfour, continuing his speech on the Separate Schools question, referred to the question of certificated teachers of Roman Catholic Schools. His hon. friend opposite was the last man he should have thought likely to bring forward the proposition regarding these teachers, for he knew the value of the work of these teachers. Should that bill become law its effect would be to greatly hamper these schools and unnecessarily increase the cost of the maintenance of the schools, and the burdens upon these were already sufficiently heavy. The people belonging to the religious Orders of the Church were willing to carry on these schools at low, in many instances merely nominal, salaries, and they turned out pupils who could hold their own with the scholars taught in the Public Schools. Therefore he thought the hon. gentleman ought to have stayed his hand. Having twitted the member for West Kent with having at last mounted the Protestant horse, after several unsuccessful attempts, and described the great joy with which he now celebrated the accomplishment of the feat, Mr. Balfour provoked not a little mirth by his humorous references to the speeches of gentlemen opposite in raising the sectarian cry. Turning to the speech of the member for London, he said that that gentleman seldom made an oration without deriving inspiration from the leader of the Government in Ottawa, and they were justified in regarding it as the joint production of two great minds. The speech of the hon. gentleman deprecated the raising of a sectarian cry, but he did not always practise what he preached. He had circulated a pamphlet some time ago, not without consultation, however, with Sir John Macdonald and Mr. Christopher Bunting, then a councillor of the party, entitled "Facts for Irish Electors," which was intended to inflame the minds of the electors with sectarian prejudice. In 1833 he said few men would care to raise what was called a sectarian cry, yet a crisis had arisen in which it was desirable the cry should be raised. The crisis was simply the desire of the Conservative party to get into office, and they wanted to get the votes of the