

a separate school in that town, but the Roman Catholic people, many of them wealthy men, some of whom have passed to their long reward, in days gone by have felt and now feel perfectly satisfied with the condition of things which they have there. The priest is a member of the school board, and if you go to any entertainment in that town given by the young people of any of the churches there you will find all classes present, Catholic and Protestant together carrying out the programme. No one will question the devotion or sincerity of the Roman Catholic people in that town as far as their church is concerned. I think this condition of things ought to be more general than it is. Then, hon. gentlemen opposite say: You are prejudiced against the Frenchmen. No matter whether you like the French or not you have to use them well. There is no great harm in that. Out of 24,000 children in the high schools and collegiate institutes of Ontario there are 13,595 studying the French language. Does that look like prejudice against the French people? Nearly two-thirds! Mind you, it is not compulsory; it is optional and yet out of 24,000 over 13,000 are studying the French language in our high schools and collegiate institutes. I would like some hon. gentleman who talks about intolerance to show a like condition of things on the other side.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I am going to ask the hon. gentleman a question. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if he is aware that the high schools of Ontario are common to all children, that the separate schools of Ontario apply to the public schools only, but not to the high schools? Where there are separate school boards in Ontario Roman Catholics have the same privileges as members of that board as the Protestants. Where there are no separate boards the separate schools and the common school have one common board and the Catholics have the right to have one representative on the common school board.

Mr. BRODER. That has been the law for so long that I thought everybody knew it. I did not make any distinction. I was speaking of the fact. Of course the public school is common to everybody as well as the high school or collegiate institute, but the point I was making was this, that, in the collegiate institutes and high schools of the English province of Ontario, there are 13,595 pupils studying the French language. That does not look as if there were a prejudice against the French people. When you come to sift matters you will find that Ontario's tolerance is as broad as anybody's tolerance, and there are none who know that better than the Roman Catholic people living amongst us.

Many of the people of Ontario are disappointed with the conduct of the right hon. Prime Minister and they have a perfect

Mr. BRODER.

right to be. What was done when he formed his government? When he made his second speech on this Bill he told us he was standing on the rock of the constitution. Well, it is a new formation. It is a Siftonian formation that he is standing on, something that will not last through the ice period if we ever have it again in this country. When the right hon. gentleman formed his government he took in the hon. ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) who has spoken so strongly against separate schools in this country. He held him up before the people as a finger board, so to speak, that this question would never again disturb the different elements in this country. Then he went down and took the hon. Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) who had spoken equally strongly against this very question and he held him up in the east. While this was being done as an object lesson to the people of this country he sent Russell over to the Vatican to inform them there that the question was not yet settled and that only one instalment had been given. Now we have a perfect right to feel that the country has not been fairly dealt with by the right hon. gentleman who should have taken the people into his confidence and not have held up the wrong finger board to lead them in the wrong direction. Where are these men today? Oh, well, you say, Ontario has no right to talk about this western question. Western representatives have said to us: In what is it your affair; we are western people. When the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) brought this question into this House of Commons he made it a subject of discussion all over this country from east to west, from north to south. Ontario should have some interest in that western country. I find by the census of 1901—and if I had the figures of to-day I am sure they would only strengthen my argument,—that the number of Ontario-born dwellers resident in the western portion of this country was as follows:

In British Columbia.. . . .	23,642
Manitoba.. . . .	67,566
Northwest Territories.. . . .	30,243
Total.. . . .	121,451

Has Ontario then no interest in that country, and no right to speak on behalf of these people? Hon. gentlemen opposite lay stress on the fact that a missionary who went up there 200 years ago happened to be a Frenchman. If any hon. gentleman had a right to speak on behalf of that country because a missionary visited it so many years ago, we certainly have a right to say something on behalf of Ontario, speaking in reference to the 121,000 Ontario people who are there. While I am on the missionary question, I might say that nobody appreciates the efforts of these self-sacrificing men more than the men who, not being religiously in sympathy with these entertain