the Quebec College was seized and the pupils and professors turned out, and soldiers put in. For thirty years after representative institutions were given to us, we petitioned the British government to give us back those estates, not to return them to the Jesuits, but to use them for the purposes of education, and we were refused. For twenty-seven years we were refused any education law. In 1801 the government imposed on us a system of education under the control of the Anglican bishop of Quebec, through which Anglican students of theology were sent to all the Catholic centres with the avowed object—because at that time they had the frankness to avow the purpose of their operations—of turning young French Canadians into English-speaking Protestants. Naturally our people refused to send their children to those schools: but while the legislative assembly was voting money for educational purposes, the English governors handed the proceeds over to the Protestant schools and gave not one cent to the Catholics. That continued during 24 years until at last the legislative assembly passed a law which gave the Catholic church wardens the right to take a part of the revenues of their poor parish churches and devote it to the building and maintaining of their own schools. And at the same time the Protestant schools were kept up with the moneys paid by the Catholics and appropriated by the government. That went on until 1841, when the two provinces of Upper and Lower Canada became united. It was only then that the province of Quebec obtained its first school law. What was that law? It was a law which Lord Sydenham forced upon his advisers. Under it the whole school system was put under the municipal authorities, who were appointed by the governor personally, and the governor was careful to appoint a majority of English speaking Protestants to regulate the school system of a population, nine-tenths of which were French speaking Catholics. It was only in 1846 that we finally secured a system of schools satisfactory to our people. So that during 100 years we were deprived of the right of using our own money for the education of our own people. Is it then surprising that there should be some people in our province to-day who can neither read or write? While the English speaking immigrants who did not profess the Catholic religion, found on our shores, even in the Catholic province of Quebec, a system of education suited to their consciences, under which their own schools were entitled to their proper share of the public money, and while these people had come from the British Isles or the United States, from countries where there was an established system of education which suited them, for a hundred years the great majority of the province of Quebec were deprived of the opportunity of educating their children. Am I not then justified in saying that if you will compare the results of our education, which is only fifty years old, with those of the education in the English speaking provinces, which practically had no beginning, because it was simply the continuation of the American and English systems, we have no reason to be ashamed. As far as higher education is concerned—and that education with us is entirely in the hands of our clergy—let me give, not my testimony, but that of a professor of McGill University, Dr. Johnstone, who some years ago made certain comments upon the difference between the attainments of the pupils of McGill University who came from the Catholic colleges and those who came from the high schools. He was struck with the fact that there was always a preponderance of points secured by those who came from the Catholic colleges, and he said:

> There was no possibility of mistaking the superiority of the men with classical training. I was so struck with what appeared to be a marked difference between the two divisions of the classes that without suspecting what I now believe to be the true course of it, I, many years ago, assigned separate rows of seats in the lecture room to them, in order to make quite sure of the fact. Year after year there was the same invariable result.

May I also refer to the results of the examinations carried on at the Manitoba University, where the pupils of the Jesuits college of St. Boniface compete in the proportion of 1 to 15 or 18—three or five out of 80 or 100 altogether? Those pupils of the Jesuits' college generally carry off from thirty to thirty-five per cent of the points and medals given. True, we are not now discussing higher education, but primary schools. Well, if the primary school system be so rotten as it is said to be, surely it could not send to our colleges young men who are so successful when they come into competition with the students from the other schools. But I look at the question from another point of view. Suppose there should be a little less book-keeping taught in our primary schools than is taught in the public schools. I lay it down as a basis of social law that the right to educate the child belongs in the first place to its parents; and, therefore, when the state takes the place of the parent, it is bound to give that child the same moral education which the father would give it in his own house. Secondly, the duty of the government is to develop law-abiding, broad-minded citizens; and, thirdly, to give the child school knowledge. I claim if that rule is considered our system has given better results than any other. We never see in the province of Quebec or in any part of the country in which Catholics can have any control, the display of passion and prejudice which we are now witnessing among those who advocate public schools as against separate schools. We see in the outbursts to-day