

sible for the government of the day to settle this question, because, he held up to Greenway the guarantee that the great party he led in this country would stand by him resisting a settlement of that question. And now what do we find? Well, it reminds me of an anecdote. And, perhaps we have been too serious in this debate, so, this anecdote may not be out of place. There were two ministers, one very successful in his vocation and the other unsuccessful. The second man went to his successful neighbour to ask the secret of his success. And the other man said, 'You don't know how to fish. When I go fishing, I take a delicate hook, a slender line and a long pole; and I put on a nice bait and let it down into the water where the sun can shine upon it, and I catch fish. But when you go fishing, you take a beam for a pole, a pot-hook for a hook, a scorpion for bait and you bring it down into the water ker-slash!—'Bite or be damned.' And that is what the right hon. gentleman has done in this case. He was fishing in 1896, and he had the nice delicate hook, the slender pole, the twinkling line and the enticing bait. And he caught fish—he got into power. But now he is in power, and he brings the bait down upon the water ker-slash!—bite or be damned; that is what he says to the west. There are no 'sunny ways'; the sun has set so far as these things are concerned. It is a most unfortunate thing for our country that this question has been thrown into the political arena. It is against the interest of the schools and the harmony of our people. And the right hon. gentleman is not excusable upon the ground that he was not aware of what would take place. He referred to it in the speech with which he introduced the Bill. I quote from the right hon. gentleman's speech on the 21st of February, as reported at page 1526 of 'Hansard':

I now come to the question of education, and this question is perhaps under the existing circumstances the most important of all that we have to deal with. There are evidences not a few coming to us from all directions that the old passions which such a subject has always aroused are not, unfortunately, buried; indeed, already, before the policy of the government has been known, before the subject is fairly before the people, the government has been warned as to its duty in this matter, and not only warned but threatened as well. The government has been warned, threatened from both sides of this question, from those who believe in separate schools and from those who oppose separate schools.

In the face of that statement the right hon. leader of the government is willing to throw this country into a commotion over this question. He was warned, forewarned in fact, of what would be the outcome and it ill becomes hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House to get up and speak about the agitation of the country and try to

charge the fact that there is an agitation upon hon. members on this side of the House. The right hon. leader of the government had the agitation, no doubt, within his own ranks. That is where the commotion was because nobody else seems to have approached him. He must have felt that there were contending parties within his own household on this question. Notwithstanding that the right hon. leader of the government is willing to run the risk of throwing this question into the political arena, let the contention and the commotion be what they may.

There is another matter that I wish to speak about and I do not intend to speak long. There has been a great deal said about the intolerance of Ontario. Ontario has a broader tolerance than the men who accuse her of intolerance and I will prove it. In the first place, take the public school of Ontario; the public school of Ontario is a school that any man's child may go to, Catholic or Protestant. Can you say that about the majority school in the province of Quebec? As a matter of fact the school nearest the public school of Ontario is the Protestant school of Quebec and the Catholic school of Quebec is not a school that a Protestant can very well send his child to. And they say: What business has Ontario to talk about this question which affects the west? Well, there has been a good deal said by some of our French friends on the opposite side of the House about the intolerance of Ontario, about attacking their religion and all that. The hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) invoked the whole history of his church in this discussion. He went back to the missionaries of 250 years ago and invoked their whole history in the discussion of this question and in reference to their schools as well. If there is any criticism upon this proposition it ill becomes him or any of his friends to get up and speak of intolerance on the part of anybody. I find that in the province of Ontario fifty per cent of the English Catholic children are attending the public schools. That proves two things—that the English Catholic people are satisfied largely with the public schools of Ontario, and further that they receive treatment that is satisfactory to them in these schools or their children would not be there. In many instances the most active, energetic and efficient trustees, secretaries and workers in the interest of public schools are the English Catholics of Ontario. I can speak of my own town of Morrisburg. Perhaps there is not a town of its size in Ontario that has a collegiate institute of higher standing than Morrisburg. The secretary of the school in that town for thirty years has been a Roman Catholic Irishman who has been an effective worker in the interest of the public school. The Roman Catholics have been approached by their church authorities and requested to start