

out in all its bearings. If the compulsory ballot were applied to the City of Toronto, what would be the result? In the first place, over 150 polling places would be used, some 30 or 40 in each ward, for the machinery of Public School elections would have to be used. That might be fair enough for Public School elections, where the electors formed seven-eighths or more of the entire voting population, but for the Separate Schools it would mean the appointment of over 30 Returning Officers for every ward, even if the trustees were elected by acclamation, and at present they get along very well with only one or two in a ward. That would be one bad consequence. Then these Returning Officers would be appointed by the machinery of the municipalities, and these bodies might be opposed to Separate Schools, and, in order to bedevil them, might appoint certain men Returning Officers for the express purpose of making trouble. That showed the difficulties which would be entailed by the adoption of the system. In these ways, the rights and privileges of the minority would be invaded.

Mr. Meredith—What would be the difference?

Hon. Mr. Fraser replied that if the House could do these things, it could do a great many other things that would go far towards crippling and destroying the Separate School system.

MR. MEREDITH.

Mr. Meredith spoke briefly, holding that the effect of the argument that the compulsory ballot would be an infringement of the rights of Roman Catholics would be that the changes of the law which had already been made by the House had been equally unconstitutional. Among those changes was the one which changed the status of Roman Catholics from being supporters of Public Schools until they formally changed over to the Separate Schools, to that of prima facie supporters of the Separate Schools until they expressly changed over to be Public School supporters. Mr. Fraser's argument proved too much, for it made the one change as unconstitutional as the other. However, the decision of ex-Vice-Chancellor Blake was that the machinery of the Separate Schools was in the control of the Province.

Hon. Mr. Fraser asked if he would say that it would be in the constitutional rights of the Province to have the Separate School Trustees appointed by the Municipal Council, provided that the same change was made in the case of the Public School Boards. Or, to take another case, if the Public Schools were to adopt the system of cumulative voting, would it be in the power of the Province to force the Roman Catholics to try the same system for their elections?

Mr. Meredith thought the first contingency was impossible. But Mr. Fraser rejoined that it was in the power of the Province to make such regulations as regards Public Schools, and that it was the system in use in England. As for the second, Mr. Meredith would not favor that at all. It would be against the fundamental principles, he thought, in that each man would have three votes or ten votes. Mr. Fraser's argument would be that no power short of the Imperial Parliament could change the machinery of the Separate Schools.

Hon. Mr. Fraser—Quite so.

Mr. Meredith thought that would be a cast-iron system; it would be to put the Roman Catholics in a straight-jacket. Every change of machinery would be forbidden, even as to the notices required. He did not believe that it was the intention of the framers of the B. N. A. act to inflict such a cast-iron constitution on the Roman Catholics.

Hon. Mr. Fraser—Then the Province can abolish the Separate School system altogether.

Mr. Meredith—No, it has been given to us.

THE VOTE.

The vote was then taken, and resulted in the bill being carried by 52 to 30, Mr. McNaughton voting with the Government and Mr. McCallum and Mr. Campbell (Durham) voting with the Opposition.

The vote stood:—

Yeas—Messrs. Allan, Awrey, Balfour, Barr (Renfrew), Baxter, Bishop, Bronson, Cardwell, Carpenter, Charlton, Clark (Lanark), Cleland, Conmee, Dack, Davis, Dryden, Evanturel, Ferguson, Field, Fraser, Garrow, Gibson (Hamilton), Gibson (Huron), Gilmour, Guthrie, Harcourt, Hardy, Harty, Kirkwood, Lockhart, Loughlin, McKay (Oxford), McKay (Victoria), McKechnie, McMahon, McNaughton, Mack, Mackenzie, Moore, Mowat, O'Connor, Paton, Rayside, Robillard, Ross, Smith (Peel), Snider, Sprague, Stratton, Tait, Waters, Wood (Brant)—52.

Nays—Messrs. Barr (Dufferin), Bush, Campbell (Algoma), Campbell (Durham), Clancy, Clarke (Toronto), Glendinning, Godwin, Hammell, Hiscott, Hudson, Kerns, McCallum, McCleary, McColl, Magwood, Marter, Meacham, Meredith, Miscampbell, Monk, Preston, Reid, Rorke,

Ryerson, White, Whitney, Willoughby, Wood (Hastings), Wylie—30.

Mr. Conmee then moved that the bill be committed to a special committee. In doing so he took occasion to observe that the expressions traitor and Judas fell with a remarkably bad grace from the lips of a gentleman who was himself an annexationist.

AFTER RECESS.

When the House reassembled, according to agreement Mr. McCallum's bill was taken up. Mr. McCallum introduced his bill in a brief speech. The object of his bill, he said, was not to effect an absolute abolition of the Separate Schools, but to remove certain objectionable features of the law at present. At some future date the House might deal more radically with the question. Some might argue that the Province had no right under the B.N.A. act to deal with the question, but he took it that the House had power to deal with the subjects which he had touched upon in his bill. Afterwards there would be time to approach the question as to whether the interests of a section of the people were to override the interests of the whole people. One of the objects of the bill was to carry out the purpose of the original act of 1863. Its preamble stated that it was to bring the Separate and Public Schools into harmony with each other, and this bill was designed to bring the Separate Schools into harmony with the progress which had been made since then. He thought that the Attorney-General could support this bill consistently, for he had had much to do with the introduction of the ballot in the country, and, while he might not be ready to go so far as to consent to the election of Sheriffs or Registrars, he might allow school trustees to be elected. He was in favor of the compulsory ballot, and remarked that in any case the question as to the use of the ballot should be left for the candidates to decide, instead of the trustees who had got in by the opposite system. The compulsory ballot could not be a hardship, for the schools in which it prevailed were the best managed of the Province. Open voting brought in coercion, and was unfair. Another section of the bill brought the Separate School elections under the same conditions as the Public School elections. It was urged that the Roman Catholics did not want the ballot, but until it was granted it would never be known whether they wanted it or not. The bill, also, by omitting the word "agent" obliged Roman Catholics to make personal application to effect the change of status, and it made them prima facie Public School supporters. The Legislature had no right to assume that a man could be permanently taken from the support of the national schools. There were also provisions for wholesome text-books. He thought that the greatest misfortune the country had known had been the imposing of the Separate School system upon it, and he hoped the day was not far distant when the national schools would be the only ones in use and when the House would grasp with a firmer hand this important question. This, however, was but to do away with some of the unjust legislation which had been enacted since the passing of the original act.

A FRENCH MEMBER'S SPEECH.

Mr. Evanturel followed. He congratulated Mr. McCallum upon the mild and dispassionate manner in which he had introduced the bill, and contrasted it with the violent and worked-up speech of another hon. gentleman much higher in place, a gentleman who had been invoking passions which would crush him at the coming elections. He took it that as Mr. McCallum was the first of the P. P. A. to represent that association in the House, he had been chosen as the most learned and able member in its ranks. He confessed that he had thought that Dr. Ryerson should have been the leader and Mr. McCallum the follower, but after comparing the two he saw that it was perfectly justifiable that Mr. McCallum should be the leader and Dr. Ryerson the follower. Dr. Ryerson might have the more martial appearance, may be able to bstride a charger to greater advantage, but he would take 25 or 30 years more of experience to take any rank as a debater. Mr. Evanturel then entered into a defence of Mr. Ross, remarking that he was at one moment charged with pandering to the Roman Catholics and at another with being their worst enemy. He denied both charges, and held that the commission which Mr. Ross had appointed to examine into the condition of the French Schools had shown the charges to be false. He dealt for a few moments with the question of inspectors, and denied that the Roman Catholics would be content to have their schools inspected by an inspector like Mr. J. L. Hughes, whose every public word outside of his official duties was a slander of the Roman Catholics. What would be said by these gentlemen if in Quebec the Public School inspectors were to be appointed to inspect the Protestant schools in place of Mr. Rexford, the present Protestant School Inspector? He defended the French Catholics of Quebec