

lics, the latter being the most numerous. But he, speaking for the Protestants, was in a position to say that we did not want that protection. In this case it was proposed that the national machinery should be used for the imposition and collection of taxes upon persons of peculiar denominations for the support of schools of their kind. It was an attempt to enforce upon that country peculiar views with regard to education.

The 'Mail' goes on :

We fear Mr. Brown is no better lawyer than his friend Mr. Alexander Mackenzie. We do not doubt that Senator Miller took the correct view when he said that the clause referred to by Mr. Brown applied only to the provinces which were in the union at the time the Act was passed. Every one may see how fortunate a thing it would have been if the school question had been put on a stable basis in New Brunswick, and if by the Northwest Act the government should have prevented future burnings on educational matters in the great new country which belongs to us in the far west, they will have done a good work indeed. We cordially endorse their action in this matter.

Such was Sir John Macdonald's policy ; such was the policy he stood up for in 1890, when in this House, on the 17th February, he uttered the following words which I find at page 748 of the Hansard :

You might remember, Sir, that when the Hon. George Brown brought his immense force and ability and unsurpassed energy to lead the Reform party of old Upper Canada, his whole aim was oppression to the French. Every speech he made, every article that he wrote in the 'Globe,' every resolution almost which he moved, was a denunciation of the French law, the French language and the Catholic religion ; and because we, the Conservatives, opposed him with all our might and all our vigour, we were in a minority in our province. Again and again have the best and the strongest of our Conservatives been defeated at the polls, simply because we would not do injustice to our French fellow-countrymen. Again and again have we been put in a minority because we declined to join in that crusade against the French Canadians, against the Catholic religion, and against French institutions. Again and again have I been misrepresented and called the slave of popery, and told that I had sold myself to the French of Lower Canada and was sacrificing my own race, my own religion and my own people, because, without a moment of hesitation, without swerving for an instant, I and those who followed me—for even when I was not the nominal leader, I greatly directed the course of the Conservative party—declined, from no personal motive or desire of popularity—the popular cry was raised against the French Canadians in Upper Canada then as it is in Ontario to-day—to do an injustice to our French Canadian fellow-citizens.

And a little further on, same page :

Does the hon. gentleman not remember when the agitation was raised in Upper Canada on a very specious cry—the question of representation by population . . . . that the Conservative party opposed that cry, specious and

popular as it was ? And why did we oppose it ? Because the avowed object was to crush and oppress our French Canadian subjects.

On the day following the publication of the article in the 'Mail' to which I have just referred. The Toronto 'Daily Leader' published a letter from one Charles Durand, a French Protestant, presumably in answer to the 'Mail,' under the heading : 'Is the Conservative party in favour of the separate schools in the Northwest ?' In Mr. Durand's opinion, the only good political deed to be put to the credit of Mr. Brown since 1875, was the vote he had cast in the Senate against that clause of the Bill granting separate schools to the Northwest. That extremest even went so far as to blame Mr. Brown for permitting the establishment of denominational schools in Ontario, at the time of confederation. It is useless to add that this correspondent severely criticised those poor separate schools.

On the 21st of April, 1875, the 'Leader' took up once more the subject of separate schools in the Northwest, stating that the Conservative party of Ontario was in great majority opposed to such an objectionable system.

On the other hand, the Chatham 'Planet' expressed itself at the time in the same sense as the hon Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) did a few days ago.

Separate schools was a vexed question for twenty years, and now let us have peace.

On April 23rd, 1875, the 'Minerve,' that good principled organ, fearing lest it should lose its old vantage ground, religion, and forgetful of ministerial responsibility, claimed for the Conservative party credit and honour for having established separate schools in the Northwest Territories. The article reads as follows :—

Liberal newspapers are endeavouring to take advantage of the fact that separate schools are in existence in the new western province, and are claiming credit on this account for their leader. They forget that this clause was strongly objected to in the Senate by the leaders of the Grit party, Messrs. George Brown, Christie and Letellier, and had it not been for the assistance given by Conservative senators it would have been defeated.

The Toronto 'Mail' and the majority of the Conservative newspapers in Upper Canada have approved of this clause and of the principle of separate schools therein contained. The 'National' quotes from the 'Mail,' the organ of Sir John, in the following terms :

The article of the 'Mail' is just here reproduced by the 'Minerve.' On the 26th of April, the 'Minerve' realizing that the Mackenzie government had deprived it of its favourite weapon, again referred to the subject, in the following hypocritical fashion :

The 'National' persists in claiming credit for its masters on account of the clause of the Northwest Bill which provides for the es-