

Ontario, all that required to be done to break that school up would be that a Protestant teacher should be engaged in the school section adjoining. The people after having gone to the expense of building a school and taxing themselves to engage a teacher, if the school section from which they had separated themselves engaged a Protestant teacher that instant their school closed up and the people were put to great loss. Section 8 of the Ontario Act says :

No Protestant separate school shall be allowed in any school section, except when the teacher of the public school in such section is a Roman Catholic.

If the adjoining school section engaged a Protestant teacher it closed up the Protestant separate school, and the people were out the money they paid for it. We fought against these things in Ontario and we were right in fighting against them. We fought against this injustice and we were called intolerant and fanatical in the press and on the public platform, but we stood to the fight and although as history shows, we were swindled out of election after election, we taught the people of that province what it is to be freemen. Another injustice was this : There is a clause in the Ontario Act, and it is a good one, which allows a Protestant tenant of Catholic property to determine that his taxes shall go to the public school, and the Catholic tenant of Protestant property to determine that his taxes shall go to the separate school. We never objected to that in principle, but when I tell you that my own taxes for two years went to the separate schools you will see that there was a necessity for a change in the law. The clause in the Act is as follows :

Every person paying rates whether as proprietor or tenant, who by himself or his agent, on or before the first day of March in any year, gives to the clerk of the municipality notice in writing that he is a Roman Catholic and supporter of a separate school, situated in the said municipality, or in a municipality contiguous thereto, shall be exempted from the payment of all rates imposed for the support of public schools.

We objected to that because the Catholic landlord could give notice that he wanted the taxes applied to the separate school and for years in the province of Ontario that was done, and although the Roman Catholic tenant of a Protestant property could send his taxes to the separate school the Protestant tenant of Catholic property could not in very many cases do so. I will give you another instance: At the village of Downeyville in the county which I have the honour to represent, the people were living in peace and harmony until a few months ago. There were only four Protestant families in the whole school section and some forty odd Roman Catholic families. Thirteen or fifteen of these Roman Catholic families yielded to the influence of the Roman Catholic clergyman of the place and they went in for

a separate school. The balance of the Roman Catholic people objected to the establishment of the separate school, but they were all obliged to come into line and to-day there are four Protestant families in that school section who cannot afford to get a teacher of their own, and who either cannot send their children to school or have to drive them miles to an adjoining section. And because we objected to this sort of thing some gentlemen stand up and brand us as intolerant and tyrannical, and not in favour of equal rights to all. Such a statement is absurd. Another assertion made by the member for Labelle was this :

I wish to be able to point out to all men that here is laid down in our constitution the clear written principle that equal justice exists for all and that Catholics as well as Protestants have the right to live in this country.

Will he point to any Protestant country where Protestants and Catholics have not the right to live side by side ? Will he point to any country over which the British flag floats where liberty is not equally given to the Roman Catholic and Protestant subject ? That is one of the principles for which my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) who sits beside me contends. We have heard some jeering about him lately, but he is a man who during his life has striven for that principle. My hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) is head of an order in which he as well as the humblest in its ranks is sworn to give to his Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen the same rights and privileges as he claims for himself. Is there anything tyrannical or intolerant in that ? You cannot show, in the history of the Dominion of Canada, where any gentleman pretending to live up to the principles I have enunciated has refused to grant what I have stated. I could show in the city of Hull, in the province of Quebec, the Protestant stock of four companies—the E. B. Eddy Company, the Ottawa and Hull Power Company, the Gilmour and Hughson Company and the George Matthews Company—every member of all these companies being Protestant, pay \$8,966.50 of taxes, of which the Protestant schools of Hull receive only \$695. In the province of Ontario, were this stock held by companies, every dollar of taxes upon that stock would go to the support of the Roman Catholic schools, if the stockholders were Roman Catholics.

Mr. L. P. DEMERS. If my hon. friend will permit me, to-day that stock may be in the hands of Protestants, and to-morrow it may be in the hands of Catholics ; and where would you be if there were not a law to distribute the taxes proportionately ?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. There is a certain date fixed by statute in the province of Ontario on which it is determined where the taxes shall go.

Mr. L. P. DEMERS. In this instance it is not a partnership of persons, but a part-