

gentleman in this House, who has stood up and repudiated those statements. I want to say that so far as I am concerned I believe they are exaggerated, I do not believe that they represent the true condition of affairs so far as the priests of the Roman Catholic church are concerned.

Now, Sir, hon. gentlemen opposite preach to us a great deal about tolerance. We have had many lectures read to us on tolerance, but I wonder if you can find anything that has been said on this side of the House during this debate so intolerant as the speeches of the hon. member for Brandon. Yes, I will go further, and ask hon. gentlemen to quote anything that has been said by Conservatives inside or outside of this House that would equal the utterances of the hon. gentlemen themselves in 1896. So far as I am concerned, I can point to my record in the county in which I live, and no one can say that I have not been tolerant and just towards the people of all denominations. I believe that in that county there is no man more respected than I am by the Roman Catholic people, because I have been their friend and they have been my friends. I want to say, Sir, that in the county of Haldimand, the Roman Catholic people are among the best citizens we have in a social way and a business way. When you talk about intolerance at the last general election in the county of Haldimand, let me tell you that Michael McConnell, a splendid type of Irish Roman Catholic, was the candidate of the Conservative party, and was loyally supported by that party. We live there in perfect harmony, there are no religious cries, no religious differences. Although the Catholic people in Haldimand and Monk have some of the best churches in the county, I am glad to say that there are no separate schools in that county, their children all go to the public schools. That, I believe, is the proper system, and I want to place myself on record as being an advocate of a public school system in this country. I do not believe that separate schools are in the interest of the Roman Catholic people any more than they are in the interest of the Protestant people. I believe the children of both Protestants and Catholics should go to school together, should play together, and grow up side by side, without any differences whatever. I had an evidence of the friendship formed in boyhood days in the last general election in my county. I met a man coming out of the polling booth, he was a member of the Roman Catholic church and I said to him: 'I thought you were a Conservative.' 'No,' he said, 'I have always been a Liberal, and my father before me; but when I think of the days that you and I used to sit together in school, the friends that we were in our boyhood, when I come to vote I always vote for you, regardless of my politics.' That, Sir, is a sample of the friendship formed in earlier days between school boys, and that is the right kind of

friendship. I believe it is in the interest of this country that the children of all denominations should go to the same school.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we are told that the Bill now before the House simply means that in the Northwest Territories the children of Roman Catholics will go to the same identical school as other children, with the same books, with the same curriculum, the same school inspector, the same qualified teachers—that everything is the same in the two systems of schools, only that one is a separate school and the other is a public school. Now, I want to say that I consider that is the most absurd feature in the whole Bill. I say that the Prime Minister might better have stood by his first Bill than to give us a Bill which is such as they now describe it to be. I want to say, as I have already said, that I do not believe that such is the case. If, as some hon. members say, it is simply a duplication of the public school system, why, in the name of common sense, should there be two schools, and these schools exactly alike? If you had granted a church school, then the question would have been settled for all time to come, and the Roman Catholic minority would have been satisfied, but I claim they will never be satisfied with schools such as hon. gentlemen opposite declare them to be, and we have evidence of that in the fact that the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) has been holding public meetings in the province of Quebec and declaring that the people of Quebec would not be satisfied with that kind of a school system. Whether he was sent there to do that by the Prime Minister or not I do not know. It may have been that he was sent there in order that the people of Ontario and other provinces would think that they were dissatisfied. I say it is ridiculous to have two school-houses, one on one side of the road and the other on the other side of the road. One is a red school-house at which the children belonging to all the denominations of the Protestant sects go to school, while on the other side of the road there is the school attended by Roman Catholic children. The children of one school will say: You are not good enough to go to our school, so you will have to go to a school of your own. I say that is the most ridiculous feature of the whole Bill; it is a duplication of the whole system; we have two schools exactly alike, as hon. gentlemen opposite have told us, one on one side of the road for Catholics and the other on the other side of the road for Protestants. That is a ridiculous feature of the Bill, and if there were no other reason than that for opposing the Bill, it should of itself be a sufficient reason. Hon. gentlemen talk about the separate schools of the province of Quebec. The separate schools of Quebec are the public schools, and they are entirely different from the public schools of Ontario and of the other provinces. There is