rights there are other rights which are under the care and protection of the Reform party. These are the rights of the minority of whom Mr. Edward Blake once said in this House that it should be given not only a fair measure, but an abundant, an overheaping measure of justice. Sir, I shall not refer to the hierarchy and the Quebec ecclesiastics. I think this question has been threshed out in the masterly speeches of both my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) and of my friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa). I do not wish to pose as the defender of the Roman Catholic clergy in this House. As a Liberal, I have, during the few years that I have been in public life felt at times the interference of the clergy in politics. I will say nothing however in condemnation of the clergy of my province, as they acted within their rights as citizens, but I can say this, that the history of the Roman Catholic clergy in this country is its best vindication. My hon. friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) recalled what has taken place in 1774 and in 1812. I will invite the hon, gentleman who spoke the other day, the member from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) to come to Montreal. I shall-ask him to pass with me along Notre Dame street at the seminary of St. Sulpice. He will see there, an old gate and an old sun dial. I will remind him that in 1774 the American rebels despatched to Montreal a young ecclesiastic, who later on became Bishop of Baltimore. That young ecclesiastic passed under that historic gate in order to ask the old French priests, the Sulpicians, to induce their flocks to join the American rebels. Sir, what was the answer given by the superior of the Sulpicians? There at that very gate near the old sun dial? Carroll, who had been despatched here by Lafayette and Washington was answered by the old superior that he could not stay one hour more in the country, that he would not be allowed to induce the French Canadians to become rebels to His Majesty's government. This is only one of the chapters of the history of the Roman Catholic clergy in my province.

I regret to have to quote in conclusion the very caustic remarks made by a man who resides in the city of Toronto and who bears a name which should be a protection and a shield against any such vituperation. I read, Sir, the interview given the other day to a newspaper by Mr. Sam. Blake, of Toronto. What does he say:

Why, he asks, should the Dominion, while awarding provincial rights of these new provinces, try to strangle them in their birth by insisting on the trail of the Jesuit surrounding the vital matter of the education of their children?

This is the language of Mr. Sam. Blake, the brother of that great Canadian statesman, the undaunted friend of the minorities Mr. LEMIEUX.

in the British Parliament as well as here in Canada, the man who enacted the very legislation of 1875. This is the language which Mr. Sam. Blake has used towards the province of Quebec and the Roman Catholic clergy. Sir, I will not answer by my own words. Let me quote in answer to Mr. Blake the words uttered by the Archbishop of Canterbury who visited this Dominion last fall. Speaking in Quebec in that old church of the Recollets, now the Anglican cathedral of Quebec, the Primate of England said:

But you, who know far better than I the varied story of Quebec, are recalling to-day the earlier memories which-in a larger than any technical sense-gave imperishable consecration to this place, which links it back along a chain of quite peculiar pathos, and interests to the work done centuries ago by members of the fraternity of St. Francis of Assisi, and along with them for a little while, at least, to the devoted men who, in a very different 'soclety, a society whose very ame became a catchword for a policy of behaviour which we condemn—did yet show to the whole world an example of missionary enthusiasm and a steadiness of perceavering faith in face and ness of persevering faith in face of persecution and suffering which, while the world standeth, will encircle with a halo of glory, the memory of the Jesuit missionaries of 250 years ago. In the words of the foremost historian of the colonial church—a historian of whose staunch Protestantism none can make question-at every season and in every place the unwearied French missionary was seen winning his way to the Red man's home. Sometimes lost amid the trackless snow or forests, at other times hurried in his light canoe down some fearful rapid, he perished and was never heard of more. Of some, the tidings came that they had met with death more terrible than this, tortured by every art of savage cruelty, burnt or scalped or starved or mutilated in every limb. Yet none quailed or faltered. New men instantly pressed on. As we mark the steadstantly pressed on. As we mark the stead-fastness of the faith which animated the hearts of Goupil and Jogues, and Lalement, and Bre-bœuf and Daniel in their martyrdom, we feel that we should violate the truth did we with-hold, or only with niggard and reluctant spirit, acknowledge the praise which is their due.

This is my answer, this is the noble answer of the Archbishop of Canterbury to Mr. Sam. Blake. In conclusion, Sir, let me repeat the words of the great Protestant writer Lecky. Speaking of the Catholic priesthood he said:

No other body of men have ever exhibited a more single-minded unworldly zeal, refracted by no personal interests, sacrificing to duty the dearest of earthly objects, and confronting with undaunted heroism every form of hardship, of suffering, and of death.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY (Calgary). Mr. Speaker, I do not desire to give a silent vote on this question, nor do I intend at this late hour to be led into a discussion of the statements of different newspapers. It seems to me that there are matters of greater importance to be considered in the discussion of this Bill. There is just one matter