

nership of interests, in which anybody may have a share in the stock. In the case of a partnership of persons, you would take into consideration the religion of the persons, but not in a partnership of interests.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I am only pointing out that in the province of Ontario, were this stock held by people of the Roman Catholic faith, every dollar of taxes on that stock would go to the support of separate schools.

Mr. L. P. DEMERS. Yes, but any stock can be sold to any person.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. And any business can be sold just the same. In the Montreal 'Gazette' of March 25, 1905, I find that a gentleman of the name of Alderman Deserres rose and said :

I have secured from the city comptroller, a statement showing the following proportion of commercial property owned in the city:

Roman Catholics . . . . .	\$ 634,900
Protestants . . . . .	5,577,800
Neutral . . . . .	21,522,420

The amount which the Protestant business houses have to pay to the 'neutral' fund exceeds by \$4,900,000 that paid by the Roman Catholic business houses. This sum at 40 cents a hundred dollars, gives a sum of \$19,600, which divided pro rata according to population, gives the Roman Catholic schools the sum of \$16,200, which according to the claims of my fellow alderman should belong to the Protestant panel.

I am merely pointing out that the Protestant majority of the province of Ontario have been unjustly charged—not that we care anything about it—with being intolerant, I assert that the laws in Ontario are more favourable to the Roman Catholic minority there than the laws of Quebec are to the Protestant minority of that province.

If my hon. friend from Labelle were to remove from his speech all that he says about rebellion, toleration and intolerance, there would be a very little left of it. He makes the mistake of supposing that the privileges of the English-speaking people of Quebec were granted to them. On the contrary, the concessions were granted to the French people of that province, as England always grants concessions to any people in any country where she has the management of affairs—the right to use their language and the right to observe whatever religion they choose to follow. These concessions the British government granted to our French friends in the province of Quebec, and all honour to her for so doing. And, should any attempt ever be made to deprive our fellow-countrymen of the province of Quebec of the right to use their own language or their right to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of their own consciences, they may rest assured that my hon. friend here (Mr. Sproule) would be one

Mr. SAM. HUGHES.

of the first to go down and resist any such injustice to them.

Mr. SPROULE. Hear, hear.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I do not want to hurt the feelings of my good friend from Labelle. His history, of course, was absurd. All through his address he talks as if the people of Quebec, and they only, owned the Northwest. The French Canadians in the province of Quebec, toleration, intolerance—these are the stock-in-trade arguments of the hon. gentleman. He says :

I may remind my English-speaking friends that three centuries before there was anything like English civilization, Catholic Spain had covered the world not only with physical power, but with civilization and enlightenment—with schools of higher education and primary education and with a knowledge of all human sciences that were available at that time that no nation has since surpassed.

Let me tell the hon. gentleman that Spain has not been in existence for more than five hundred years. Prior to that time Spain was made up of a lot of free republics, and later free monarchies.

Mr. L. P. DEMERS. What date ?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. At the close of the fifteenth century. It was not through the schools of Catholic Spain that the arts and sciences and learning were maintained there, but through the schools established by the Moors in the old Iberian peninsula, before the dark ages swept over Europe. The hon. gentleman is entirely wrong in his history. Another mistake made by the hon. member for Labelle was in speaking of the United States, where, he said :

People recognize that what must save the United States from the social plague which is going to involve all nations between the crushing burden of capitalism and the equally crushing burden of standing armies, is the influence of the Catholic Church on the working classes.

Well, if the hon. gentleman wants to belittle his Roman Catholic co-religionists, it is none of my funeral ; but let me tell him that I would hesitate a long time before I would offer to the Roman Catholic people such an insult. In the United States there are only 10,000,000 Roman Catholics to 70,000,000 who are not Roman Catholics, and if the hon. gentleman says that these 10,000,000 are going to lead the anarchical, socialistic and revolutionary movements, he is paying a poor compliment to the people of that faith.

I would not dream of insulting the Roman Catholic people in any such way. Let me tell him that what is going to save the United States is her free public school education, given throughout the length and breadth of that great nation, and not any church or system of separate schools. He says that never in the province of Quebec