

before that letter was written. Three candidates were in the field. The Liberal candidate was an Irish Canadian without a drop of French blood in his veins. The Conservative candidate was a Scotch Presbyterian without any trace of French Canadian blood. A third candidate came into the field and appealed to my fellow-countrymen, saying: 'This county is two-thirds French Canadian; you should not vote for an Irishman or a Scotchman; you should vote for me, a French Canadian.' And what was the result? The French Canadian who appealed to racial passion in that county, notwithstanding that the voters were brought up under this priestly education, notwithstanding that they were educated in schools where they were 'taught that Protestants were a curse to the earth'—this French Canadian lost his deposit. The Irish Canadian was elected. And the Scotch Presbyterian received the strongest Conservative vote that had been cast in the county for years and years. And, in the city of Hull, where the whole population is under 'priestly education,' where the teachers are not merely the ordinary parish priests, but priests who belong to the monastic orders, some of these 'abominable orders' of which the Reverend Scott is so afraid; in the city of Hull where the schools are wholly in the hands of friars and nuns, and where any man who spent his childhood there has received no other education than that given by these friars and nuns under the control of the hierarchy; in that Liberal Catholic and French Canadian city of Hull the Scotch Presbyterian Conservative candidate had a majority of the votes. Sir, the province of Quebec, where you may so frequently notice Protestant Englishmen elected by a French-speaking majority, is the only province where you find such proofs of toleration and breadth of view. And the same has been true since confederation and long before confederation.

Mr. Speaker, may I be allowed to speak of a little experience I have had in this relation? It shows the working of the school laws in my province. There is a small country newspaper in the county of Quebec which has declared that the result of the separate school law in Quebec was to drive the Protestants out of the province. I refer to the Huntingdon 'Gleaner.' And the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) has re-echoed that declaration. I passed most of my life—and my happiest days, because they were before I entered public life—in a small village on the borders of the Ottawa river forming one municipality of eight hundred souls. This village was separated municipally and for school purposes from the parish in which it was situated and which also contained some eight hundred souls. In these two municipalities there were three English-speaking Protestant families. The father of one family was the

head of a large lumbering firm and the fathers of the other two families were the other's clerks. These three families lived in the village. They organized a separate school under the law. Then the lumbering company bought immense properties in the parish. Under our 'priest-administered' law, the Protestant ratepayers—as they were entitled to do by law—annexed this property to the village for school purposes, thus depriving the Catholic ratepayers of the parish of all the receipts of their schools on account of that land. But there was not a word of dispute. There came a time when the separate school was not carried on according to law, because, in our province as in others, it requires a certain school attendance to make a school under the law. There came a time when all the taxes paid by the Protestants went to support a school where there were only five or six children, which is only half or one-third of the number required under the law. One of the Catholic ratepayers suggested: 'Why don't we abolish the separate school and get all that money?' I put my foot upon the proposition at once. I said: 'My friend, if you think as I do and as, I believe, the people of this parish and of this village do, you will never ask a man, rich or poor, to contribute a cent to the maintenance of a school system in which he does not believe.' And the whole population was with me. That whole 'priest-ridden population'—and they were poor farmers—preferred to pay twice as much as they otherwise would rather than ask these Protestant ratepayers to contribute, as they were legally bound to do, to the maintenance of any other than this separate school. Show me such an example in any of the English-speaking Protestant provinces of this Dominion, and I will admit that the separate school system cannot develop a national spirit.

Let me refer my hon. friends to the example of a country, that, perhaps above all the nations of the earth, has done most for the development of ideas of liberty and toleration: the little republic of Switzerland. There is in Switzerland a population composed of three nationalities with clearly marked differences of religion. They have the Protestant Germans and the Catholic French and Italians. After their common struggle for liberty, they fought among themselves for years and for centuries—the Germans to impose the German language and the Protestant religion upon the others and the French seeking to impose the French language and the Catholic religion upon the Germans. But the day came when they found out that only principle under which they could maintain their union was that every man should be free to worship God in his own church and to educate his children in his own school. And upon that principle of toleration they have carried on their schools; and to my mind, their national