

to what must be a very valuable opinion as to separate schools in Ontario. I want to refer to the opinion of the Toronto 'Globe' expressed in 1895, at a time when, if my memory serves me right, there was an attack being made upon the Liberal government in Ontario in regard to the separate school question.

Mr. EMMERSON. Who was the editor?

Mr. GRANT. The editor of the 'Globe' in 1895? I would not like to say, but I rather think it was the present editor of the Toronto 'News.' However, the 'Globe' said this, speaking of separate schools in Ontario:

We advocate the Ontario system, not because it is fixed by the constitution, but because we consider it to be a good system. If this province were making a fresh start to-day, absolutely untrammelled by constitutional restrictions, we do not know that it could do better than continue that arrangement without any material change.

I give that opinion for what it is worth. The Hon. David Mills, in 1892, expressed his opinion of the operation of separate schools in Ontario, and I quote these expressions for the benefit of hon. members from Ontario who have seen fit during the progress of this debate to decry separate schools. I think that the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) expressed his opinion very adversely to separate schools the other evening. Mr. Mills said in 1892:

Certainly the course taken in the province of Ontario, on the whole, produced most satisfactory results on this continent of the educational question. I say there is no public school system on the continent produced more satisfactory results and that works out with less friction than the separate school system of Ontario.

Mr. Mills was a close observer. He was a man who did not express his opinions hastily. He was a man, who, when his opinions were expressed, stood by them and his opinions and observations are entitled to the very highest respect in this country.

Now, I fear, Mr. Speaker, that I have already trespassed too long upon the time, the attention and the patience of this House. The hon. member for Brantford, who, I am glad to see, has recently taken his seat saw fit the other evening to refer to the English Educational Act of 1902. He condemned, in very mild terms of course the English Educational Act of 1902. I agree with him in that condemnation and I say from some knowledge of what has gone on in England in the past two or three years that an outrageous wrong was perpetrated upon the non-conformists of England by the passing of the Educational Bill of 1902, and that perhaps more than anything else is tending at the present time to the overthrow of the Balfour government. But, Sir, when my hon. friend went across the water—it is a good place to go for precedent—

when he went so far to get a precedent in the matter of education I wish he had gone north of the Tweed, where he would have found a country in which, perhaps, they look after education and everything else a little better than they do south of the Tweed. If he had examined into the educational system of the little country called Scotland he perhaps would have been surprised. Scotland, Mr. Speaker, is a country, perhaps more than any other country which has valued education. The peasant of Scotland is a philosopher. The artisan in the mills at Paisley and elsewhere throughout Scotland is a scholar. This is mainly due to the splendid educational system that has obtained in Scotland for the past 300 or 400 years, a system which has produced men in all walks of life second to none the world over. Now, how do they manage this matter of education in Scotland? I find that in the year 1903 there were £722,000 spent on public schools; for Church of Scotland schools, the Presbyterian church, the Established Church nearly £27,000 from the public chest; for United Free Church schools, £25,000 from the public moneys; for Episcopal schools, £15,000; for Roman Catholics schools, £70,000; and that in Presbyterian and Protestant Scotland. I leave the consideration of that with my hon. friends opposite, and I say that Scotland, in that as in many other matters shows an example that should be emulated.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I support this measure believing it necessary to keep good faith; I support it because I recognize it as based on the sure foundations of equity and fair-dealing; because it honours the religious convictions of the minority without trespassing at all upon the rights of the majority, and because it appeals to me as in the true interest of all Canada inasmuch as it makes for unity, for conciliation and for peace. Let me close by quoting and commending to the earnest attention of the House the words of the late Principal Grant, used by him in paying a tribute to the memory of Archbishop Connolly, a revered prelate of the Roman Catholic Church in Nova Scotia, who died during Principal Grant's term as pastor of a Presbyterian church in that province. Said principal Grant of Archbishop Connolly:

He was a man of peace, ever seeking to build bridges rather than to dig ditches between men of different creeds.

Mr. E. GUSS PORTER (West Hastings). It has been intimidated to me by a certain hon. member on the government side of the House, that it is desirable to bring a public measure of considerable importance to the attention of the House to-day, and to have it disposed of if possible. Knowing something of the nature of that measure, at this late hour, I feel like not insisting upon my right to continue this debate but to give way