

april 24

which hon. gentlemen fought the last election in the utterances of the hon. the leader of the Opposition in his London speech, when he said: "Is there not a great danger to the State in this solid compact of the minority, and in the great heat there is between parties swaying from one side to the other, and exacting from that other what that other, in conscience, could not give without the support of that compact minority? I say that is one of the dangers to modern civilization. I say that this method of a solid compact, by which both parties are willing to throw down their arms, is one of the great evils we have to contend with in Parliamentary government, and against which both parties should unite, unite against the common enemy, for there is danger in the community." He speaks of the solid mass of a religious body. How about the solid mass of the Orange body, whose support he has had? There are honorable exceptions, it is true, but I say that he has had a more united support from that body than has had the Liberals from the Catholics. And what about the solid vote of the new element, the would-be defenders of Protestantism from behind tiled doors? Has he thrown down his arms before it? Or, rather, are not his hands up in obedience to its demands? Does he see no danger to the State in this movement? Is there no evil in the country by reason of it? Has he now the courage to speak out? Is there not here a common enemy, of which he should, to be consistent, give warning? How was that platform and these resolutions and principles he is again to inscribe on his banners understood at the time? Here is what The Mail said of it: "If the reader will examine the speech of Mr. Meredith which he delivered in London on Monday evening he will perceive that not only has The Mail policy been approved, but it has been adopted in its entirety—not a single plank rejected." The Mail's policy, then and now, is very close to the policy of the hon. gentleman opposite, and the people know what that policy is. His main attack was made upon the Separate Schools in 1890, when, with a view to making political capital out of this agitation, several amendments were proposed by hon. gentlemen opposite to the Separate School act—one to force the ballot, and to take away the right of appeal in case of dispute, leaving the Catholics to the mercy of the Town Clerk, moved by the member for London; another, to force the examination of Public School teachers on the members of religious orders teaching in our Separate Schools, moved by Mr. Creighton; and another to take away the privilege now enjoyed by Separate School Boards to appoint one member of the High School Board of Trustees. But he and his propositions were then rejected by the Legislature, and by the people to whom he appealed in that year to sustain him on the grounds he had taken.

1890 AND 1894.

The hon. gentleman now thinks that the leaven he has taken so much care to beat up has been working, and that he may get a better rise this time. But he may find that the lump has gone sour on him and that he will be unable to digest it. As he and his proposition were rejected by the people in 1890, so I predict they will be rejected for 1894. The people are not yet prepared to accept a party without a policy and without material, who have on more than one occasion been willing to barter away the autonomy of this Province in return for political support. There are still great constitutional questions pending. The rights to our fisheries, of which friends of hon. gentlemen opposite at Ottawa are seeking to rob the Province, are as important as any that have gone before. The people are not yet prepared to dispense with the services of the tried and eminent statesman who has so well and so faithfully guided their affairs for twenty years, and who has won for them many great and lasting victories, and who has maintained all the sovereign rights of the Province against both external and domestic enemies, and who has made the inheritance of its people something to be proud of. But is there anything in the change that has taken place in the Catholic vote to warrant the assertions and insinuations that have been made? In the early history of the country we find the Catholics with Baldwin and the Reformers of that time. This speaks well for their love of liberty. They were gradually drawn to the Conservative side on the Separate School question. They were whipped out of the Reform ranks in those days by the Hon. George Brown, just as they have been whipped out of the Conservative ranks by the member for London and some of his followers. In those early days the Conservatives were forcing the Separate School system upon the Province for the same reasons they are now seeking to abolish it, namely, power.

The bulk of the Catholic vote was with the Conservative party in 1871, and again in 1874, and so continued down to 1879, and even in 1883 they got the majority of that vote. Even in the elections held since that time that party got a large Catholic

vote. The hon. gentleman still has two Catholic members behind him in the House. So that, from all the evidence before us, it is clear that there was no foundation for his declaration of war upon the Catholic hierarchy. The Catholic vote that he has lost has been lost to him by his own course, and that of his own party. The only wonder is that he retained any support from that quarter. The hon. the Minister of Public Works, speaking in 1890, put the case clearly, and showed that in the Parliament that ended in 1883 hon. gentlemen had five Catholic members supporting them in this House, a greater number than was to be found on the Reform side at that time, and that down to 1886 they had a full half of the Catholic vote. While the hon. gentleman had a majority of that vote, he was orthodox on the Separate School question; it is only since he has, by his shifting and vacillating policy, lost the majority of that vote, that he has got new light as to the danger there is in the community. The hon. gentleman has shifted on the ballot question just as he has on most other questions. In 1873 he voted against the ballot for Parliamentary purposes. In 1873 he spoke against school elections being held at the same time as municipal elections, on the ground that it would introduce political feeling into educational matters. Now he advocates what

he then condemned. In 1882 he voted against the motion of Mr. Bell, then the member for West Toronto, for the adoption of the ballot in Separate School elections. In speaking on that occasion, he is reported to have used these words:—"Mr. Meredith said at the time the Roman Catholics were asking for Separate Schools it was the Conservative party that supported them in their claim, and obtained for them at the risk of loss of seats and influence their now recognized rights." Further, on he states:—"He did not favor forcing the ballot system upon the Separate School supporters if they did not want it, but he supported the proposition to extend the ballot to the Public School electors."

When speaking in 1883 his tone was very different to what it has been of late. This is what he is stated to have uttered in that year:—"I recognize the right of the Catholics in this country to fair play—anyone who would adopt any other course was not a true Canadian. I recognize the right of the Catholic authorities to give their advice and to make inquiry with respect to what books are used in our High Schools, in which the children might be taught." He was for fair play in 1883. One wing of his party are now advocates of foul play, and he utters no protest.

In view of all this evidence, is it not manifest that there was no foundation for the assertions and insinuations that have been made? The change in the Catholic vote has come from such causes as would have resulted in a similar change in the vote of any one of the great Protestant denominations if they were similarly attacked by the leaders of a political party. In view of the declarations at London, and of what has occurred since that time, and the declarations in this House, is the hon. gentleman not in accord with the platform of the P.P.A. party? If not, will he, as a public man, the leader of a great party in this country, condemn that platform?

The leader of this Government, as became a public man, occupying the high position which he occupies, has condemned it, and advised his countrymen to have nothing to do with it. Will the hon. gentleman be manly enough to declare himself? Will he give the people to understand clearly what his views are as regards the policy of that wing of his party? I tell him that he has come to the parting of the ways; that he can follow both courses no longer, nor can he evade the issue. By silence he is understood to be allied with that party. Two of his supporters in this House have declared themselves as exponents of its principles; another, the member for Muskoka, has declared in his speech in Peel that there was a combination between that party and his. With all these evidences confronting the hon. gentleman he is silent. Silence under these circumstances will mean consent, and he will be so understood unless he makes a clear statement. Assuming that to be his position, can he expect the support of Catholics, or does he deserve the support of any man who has a regard for the future of this country? For what purpose did he introduce his resolution? What was his object? Could it have been the improvement of the Separate School law, and thereby the advancement of the Separate Schools? Is it the desire of the hon. gentleman to make them better schools, so that they may become more firmly rooted in this Province? If that was his object, why could he not contain his soul in peace until my bill came up, and then move an amendment to it if he wished to improve it? But if the desire of the hon. gentleman really was to advance the interests of the Separate Schools and of the Catholic people, he would have accepted my bill as sufficient, at least for the present. If this is really the desire of the hon. gentleman, he will care to be careful, or he will burst the