

Apr 25

for about twenty minutes, Mr. Fraser was a second time overtaken by physical exhaustion, and with the remark, "It is useless for me, Mr. Speaker, to try to continue," he took his seat.

The Attorney-General in a minute exchanged a word or two with him, and then announced that the Commissioner was anxious the debate should proceed without any further remark by himself.

MR. CLANCY'S SPEECH.

Mr. Clancy, on rising to speak, first expressed his sincere regret for the unfortunate circumstances which had obliged Mr. Fraser to cease speaking. However, he must say that he dissented from the ground that the hon. gentleman had taken. He believed that he was sincere in his opinions, and claimed the same right for himself. He would say at the outset that he personally had no objection to the ballot. He believed that the open vote was the more manly kind, but, on the other hand, would say that if the Roman Catholics of the Province were willing to accept the ballot he would have no objection. To him it was not a question affecting any man's religion; if it did it would be the duty of every man, Roman Catholic and Protestant alike, to oppose any act of the Legislature which would interfere with the rights of any sect or religion whatever in the country. Mr. Conmee had delivered a speech which had been very profuse, in which he had exhaustively proved that the Roman Catholics were loyal. Had the Roman Catholics of the country come to this, that the hon. gentleman must apologize for them and assert their loyalty? He disdained to discuss their loyalty, and did not know why they should be singled out for defence or apology. Mr. Conmee offered a gratuitous insult to the Roman Catholics in trying to defend them from a charge which no one that the speaker knew of had made at all; if it was made it came from quarters which should ensure it nothing but contempt. If Mr. Conmee wanted an optional ballot why did he drag in the animosities and hateful things of the past? He could see no harm in Roman Catholics going to the polls and casting their ballots, in their voting in accordance with a principle which had been so long in practice in the Province, and to which no man could be found to object. There was talk of its being forced upon them, and the House had been told that bigots were in favor of it. No sane man would, even if bigots also asserted it, deny that two and two make four; no man's course should be changed because bigots also held it. The contention that the ballot should be rejected by Roman Catholics because it is given them with ulterior objects Mr. Clancy regarded as far-fetched and lame.

Hon. Mr. Fraser—My view of the ballot cannot be disposed of till after my ideas on the constitutional point involved are known. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. gentleman.

Mr. Clancy, continuing, asked if the Protestants were in a minority in the Province, and if the Roman Catholic majority were to ask the Protestant minority to accept the ballot, would that minority resist it? If the Protestant minority were unable to point to overt acts of the majority, but, nevertheless, suspected the purity of its motives, would it on that ground be likely to refuse the ballot? He was unable to come to any conclusion that it would. If there were a vote under the secrecy of the ballot as to the rights of others there would be good reason to oppose it, but that was not the question. Surely no one would say that the Roman Catholics misuse their ballots. Nor could he see that anyone could point out that the introduction of the ballot would lead to anything further, or would affect the status of the people of the Province, or would impair the efficiency of the Public or Separate Schools. Therefore, when his side of the House suggested that a principle which was not new, but well tried, should be extended to the minority, why should such an outcry be raised? If they were the inventors of the ballot, if it were not in use, if they were trying to give it to the Separate Schools first of all, there would be some ground for objection. But if it was wrong for Roman Catholics, why was it not wrong for Protestants?

Under the constitution, Mr. Clancy went on, certain rights were assured to the minority. Keeping that in view, why should anyone be open to the charge of having hidden motives for voting for the compulsory ballot, while now Mr. Conmee was bringing in a bill for a permissive ballot, thereby giving force to the charge that the Roman Catholic hierarchy have coerced the laity? The purpose of the ballot was that all men might, in their vote, be free and emancipated from the circumstances of daily life which might influence their votes—from the influence of neighbor and employer as well as of clergymen. He could cite cases in Public School open voting where men had been prevented from voting because of the pressure at the polls of neighbors, and he could not see why men should not be free from that. He could not see any difference between voting in Separate School

elections and in municipal and legislative elections. So long as human nature existed so long would it be well to allow citizens to vote secure from the inspection of anyone, whether pastor, employer, neighbor, or enemy. There was no reason why Roman Catholics should be less anxious than others for this privilege. He would not say that the clergy were in the habit of coercing their people, but he would say that men in that or in any other similar position would be able to exercise a certain influence if they wished to do so; and he thought it well to protect all against this species of mild coercion, whether by word or look. This he thought an answer to that objection.

The charge that the Opposition desired to destroy and cripple the Separate Schools Mr. Clancy declared to be unfounded. The ballot would not impair their usefulness, and there was no conscientious objection to the principle of secret voting; no one could urge that he would be kept from the polls because of it. Mr. Conmee had dragged in all the old animosities he could, and had tried to make out that the Conservatives were opposed to the Separate Schools and trying to force the ballot upon Roman Catholics. Perhaps three-fourths of the members of the House were opposed to Separate Schools, and nearly all of the Cabinet. He ventured to say that the Attorney-General himself would not establish Separate Schools to-day if he had the power. With such a feeling on his own side of the House it was clap-trap to try to assail the Conservatives as opposed to Separate Schools, and it was done for some end. Though the majority of the House, and likely of the people of Ontario, were opposed to Separate Schools, however, he thought that they would respect their rights and would deal justly by them. The question was a difficult one, and great responsibilities rested upon the man who discussed it; but he thought that the Government were the ones who were responsible, who had excited the feelings of the minority, who told them that they were attacked, and who said that the motion to give them the ballot was made with hidden motives. The Roman Catholics were honestly alarmed, not because anything was in sight, but because they were told that the Conservatives were trying to destroy Separate Schools.

Hon. Mr. Fraser—What would my hon. friend say to the platform of the Orange Grand Lodge? Does he contend that the Orange body is not in favor of the abolition of Separate Schools? Does he not admit that the members of the Orange body are nearly all Conservatives? Will he say the P. P. A. is not intending to abolish Separate Schools? Is it not therefore idle to say that there is no section of the community against Separate Schools?

Mr. Clancy said that he knew nothing of the Orange body; he believed that once the Liberals laid down a platform of opposition to Separate Schools, and Mr. Fraser had stayed in the party.

Hon. Mr. Fraser—I was but a lad going to school then. Surely my hon. friend will not say that I was in the Liberal party at that time.

Mr. Clancy said he was not discussing the Conservative party; if it included the Orangemen in its ranks, he was glad. But the opposition of the Liberal party to Separate Schools had not ceased until Mr. Fraser became a man.

Hon. Mr. Fraser said that he had never cast a vote nor had anything to do with the Liberal party during that struggle. During his connection with the party there had not been one syllable in favor of abolition of the Separate Schools. Mr. Clancy would not be so free with his challenges were he in a condition to take care of himself.

Mr. Clancy reiterated his statement that the Liberal party had at one time opposed Separate Schools, and that Mr. Fraser had been reared in the cradle of Liberalism.

Mr. Fraser again denied Mr. Clancy's charge.

Mr. Clancy went on to say that the attitude of the Liberal party had not changed, and that the Attorney-General would not at present take the responsibility of establishing Separate Schools. It was not the view of the Orange Grand Lodge alone, but of the majority of the Liberal party. Both political parties were opposed to Separate Schools.

Hon. Mr. Fraser said that he did not know of any Liberal prepared to say that he was going in for the abolition of Separate Schools; he did know of thousands of Conservatives who would say that.

Mr. Clancy repeated the opinion that the majority in both parties would like to see the abolition of Separate Schools. While he did not agree with that view, he believed that they were honest in that opinion. If the Roman Catholics have an enemy in the Province it was the Minister of Education, who had alarmed them and made their interest a football, and who, with no sympathy at all with them, was telling them that the Conservatives were trying to deprive them of their rights. The question was not one of religion, and religious issues should not be introduced. If the permissive ballot were adopted the same