

year to support a teacher. It was found after a while that the revenue from the island was not sufficiently large to pay expenses and they transferred it to the town on condition that the town would pay the expense and that was the first school supported by direct taxation at which education was given to the children of the people whether they were able to pay taxes or not.

That was away back in 1639. They went over into New Hampshire, crossed the Green mountains of Vermont, through Connecticut, away up through the Dutch settlements in New York, out to the valleys of the Mississippi and Missouri, thence to the sources of the Oregon river and on to the Pacific coast to where the Oregon rises on the Pacific coast, and they planted the school and the church. If you look up the history of these people who are charged with religious zealotism, you will find that the crime in the United States does not rest at their door, but at the door of the foreign element coming to the United States and from countries where there were no public schools either. Not only is that the case, but the crime is due largely to the civil conditions and the race complications that exist in the southern states. When the northern flag was unfolded over the south, the public school was instituted. Previous to the civil war the south had the advantage in higher schools and colleges because the planters were wealthy and they wanted to educate their sons and daughters, but the common school was neglected and not until the northern army was victorious was the public school system established in the southern states. I think that the right hon. gentleman made a mistake in charging against the public school system of the United States, the crime which exists in that country to a greater extent than in Canada. But the right hon. gentleman forgot another fact. To hear him speak you would think that there was not a religious school in the United States. That is not so. So far back as 1846 the brothers of the Christian schools—a branch of the order in Ireland, I believe, which controls most effective schools—the brothers of the Christian schools were sent to the United States and established themselves in the city of Baltimore. In 1848 they came to New York, in 1852 they went to St. Louis and to-day there are 35,000 pupils attending these schools in the United States. Have these schools no deterrent effect on this crime which we hear so much about? The right hon. gentleman did not cover the whole situation when he charged the public schools in the United States with the undesirable conditions which exist in that country.

The hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) went back a great many years to prove the attitude of the hierarchy of Quebec towards the British Crown. He spoke of the loyalty of the bishops from 1774 to

the present time, but he failed to cite one instance in which they took a part in favour of law and order in this country. There is not the slightest doubt that in 1774, when the bishops of the Roman Catholic Church in the province of Quebec were approached by emissaries of the United States, then in rebellion, and amongst others by Benjamin Franklin, the bishops resisted the offer of the American emissaries and proclaimed their loyalty to the British Crown. It is possibly due to the attitude of these bishops that we belong to the British Crown to-day, and neither Protestant nor Catholic will refuse to give credit where credit is due. But, do not the bishops of Quebec owe something to this country as citizens? It is their home, it is the land of their birth, and they owe to its institutions a loyal and cordial support. You would not think it strange if I were to go out and fight for my country, you would expect me to do it, but the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bourassa) wants to take a great deal of credit if men of his race go out and fight for their country. Why should they not be willing to stand for the welfare of Canada as well as any other citizen? As I have said, the hon. member for Labelle forgot to mention one instance in which the bishops of Quebec were anxious to stand by the rights of their people and in respect to which they were resisted by the right hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier and his friends. In 1896 the bishops felt they should stand by the rights of their people in Manitoba, and the Minister of Justice saw fit to sign a promise to his bishop, that he would do certain things if certain other things were not done, and several of his political friends followed his example. But the moment the Prime Minister was returned to power and the Minister of Justice and his friends got into office, they undertook to override the wishes of these reverend gentlemen who certainly ought to know more about their home affairs than a man who would come from a foreign country. Anyhow, the bishops were overridden in their wishes and for some reason or other they have been kept quiet ever since. I wonder why it is that the hon. gentleman from Labelle failed to let us know what all this meant, and why he neglected to give us an explanation, if that be possible.

A great deal has been said in this House from time to time about the Manitoba school question, and the Prime Minister and his friends have often told us that it was settled. We are now told that it is not settled. The Liberal party sent out to this country certain campaign pamphlets, called 'Pointers No. 1,' and 'Pointers No. 2,' and all kinds of pointers. In Political Pointers No. 2, issued in 1900 with the picture of the right hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier on the title page, I find this statement as the very first thing on the pro-