

they were distinctly Protestant in their character. . . . It is true that the religious exercises prescribed for public schools are not to be distinctively Protestant, for they are to be 'non-sectarian,' and any parent may withdraw his child from them. There may be many who share the view expressed in one of the affidavits in Barrett's case, that there should not be any conscientious objections on the part of Roman Catholics to attend such schools, if adequate means be provided elsewhere of giving such moral and religious training as may be desired. But all this is not to the purpose. As a matter of fact the objection of Roman Catholics to schools such as alone receive state aid under the Act of 1890 is conscientious and deeply rooted.

Is it not a strange fact that in England, the centre and heart of Protestantism, where the Catholic population is but a mere handful, where the idea of Roman Catholicism is generally associated in the public mind with the Irish land question or the agitation in favour of home rule for Ireland—is it not strange that Protestant statesmen and lawyers should have a better understanding and a broader view of what the rights of Roman Catholics are than in this country, where Roman Catholics form two-fifths of the population, and where no man can point to an action, individual or collective, to the discredit of Roman Catholics so far as their loyalty, their observance of the law, or their national spirit, is concerned?

And this brings me to a question that has been lightly touched upon in this House by—I was going to say the yellow hierarchy—which has been lightly touched upon by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule). And—it is just as well to frankly admit it—this question is the very basis of this discussion. I wish to treat completely, if I can, the question of the influence of the hierarchy and the alleged sinister motives animating the Roman Catholics in this House. I have referred to the case of Archbishop Taché in 1870. That was only one instance. Let us take our history since the beginning; and I may say that when I read what is now appearing in the Ontario newspapers, I cannot help asking myself what kind of history can be taught in the public schools of Ontario? Eleven years after this country had been acquired by England by treaty, when practically the whole population of Canada was French and Catholic, when the English-speaking Protestant population consisted almost wholly of a few traders in the city of Quebec, as the House knows, some trouble arose in certain English-speaking Protestant communities to the south, and some regiments, entirely composed of Anglo-Saxons and Protestants, came to besiege Quebec. The Governor of that day was named Guy Carleton—I do not know whether his name is ever mentioned in the public school histories of Ontario. When it was known that these regiments were on their way to Quebec, Governor Carleton issued a proclamation requiring all those who were not loyal to the British Crown to leave the city, and

calling upon those who were loyal to the Crown to remain and defend it. Who went out? Who staid in? All the English Protestants left the city and went to the Island of Orleans to wait for the result. The French Canadians, who have been conquered twelve years before, remained there and saved Canada to the British Crown. Mind you, there were among the Anglo-Saxon rebels men of our race and creed. There were French regiments in the American army. Appeals were made to us by men of our blood, men whom the French race had no reason to be ashamed of. Among them was the Marquis de Lafayette. And what was our answer to the Marquis de Lafayette? Under the guidance of that dominating hierarchy, we declared that we believed in the pledge given us by the King of England. We declared: The free practise of our religion is guaranteed to us; and, so long as the King will not go back on us, we will never go back on him.

Thirty-six years later there was another little disturbance between the two great branches of the Anglo-Saxon Protestant family. Canada was again invaded; and remember that in those 36 years of time, the French Canadians had been ill-treated, their public men had been put in gaol because they wanted to have what? The same right that British citizens enjoyed in any other part of the empire. Their bishops had been threatened with the same treatment if they still dared to appoint parish priests instead of allowing Governor Craig to nominate them himself. In spite of that when the time of danger came, what did the representative of that obnoxious hierarchy say? He said: 'My brethren, it is true we have been ill-treated, but I still believe that the law of justice will be stronger with our King than injustice; stand by him, be loyal, be constitutional and the time of justice will come.' The French Canadians fought at Chateaugay and elsewhere and once again contributed to save Canada.

Twenty-five years later, the same ill-treatment having been carried on, some of our people rebelled, wrongly I think, not because their case was not just, but because, as their leader at the time, Papineau, told them, the rule of any British citizen was to carry on constitutional agitation but to avoid rebellion. In any case, at the request of an English speaking Protestant physician of the British army they rebelled in arms. Who stood out against the rebellion? The same obnoxious representatives of the hierarchy who asked the French Canadians to remain peaceful.

A few years later an annexation movement was started in Canada. By whom? By the hierarchy? By the Jesuits? By French Canadians and Catholics? No, by the very political fathers of the hon. gentlemen opposite, because the British Crown at last had opened its ears to the claims of its French speaking subjects and was beginning to grant justice, and as those gen-