

claim. Now, almost every hon. gentleman who has spoken on the government side of the House has mentioned the fact that Mr. A. T. Galt was instrumental in getting the separate school clauses introduced into the Confederation Act with regard to Ontario and Quebec. That is quite true. But Mr. Galt was then seeking to legislate for a different set of circumstances altogether from the circumstances of the Catholic minorities in the other provinces. It is a well known and admitted fact that in the province of Quebec the national schools are not such as Protestant children can attend. That is not the case in the other provinces, because there is nothing in the national schools of the other provinces which prevents any Catholic child from obtaining an education in them. Of course there is the sentimental objection on the part of our Catholic fellow citizens to allowing their children to go to such schools. But I tell hon. gentlemen in this House that in the great majority of the towns and villages of Ontario separate schools do not exist, and Catholic children go to the public schools. As an instance, I can mention my own town, containing something over 4,000 inhabitants, where there has never been a separate school. The Catholic boys and girls are educated in the public schools side by side with Protestant children, and I venture to say that they become just as good citizens, just as good Catholics and just as good people in every sense of the word, as children who are educated in the separate schools. I tell hon. gentlemen opposite that in the town where I reside I do not believe there is a single illiterate child, either of the Catholic or of any other persuasion. They all get the same education, they are all satisfied with it. My hon. friend from Leeds (Mr. Taylor) said last night that the same state of affairs exists in his town, and I am sure that it exists in hundreds of towns and hundreds of municipalities in the province of Ontario. Therefore, I say that there is no parallel between the need for the insertion of a separate school clause in favour of the Protestant minority in the province of Quebec and the need for the insertion of a separate school clause in favour of the Catholic minorities in the other provinces.

Now both these hon. gentlemen indulged yesterday in an attack on the Orange order, the hon. member for Welland (Mr. German) has done the same thing this afternoon. That seems to be a considerable part of the stock in trade of these hon. gentlemen; they endeavour to fix upon the Orange order the responsibility for every protest that has been made against the educational clauses of these Bills. I can tell these hon. gentlemen that I have been an Orangeman for a great many years and I am proud of it, and I am no bigot. I may mention that in 1889 when a motion was made in this House to disallow the Jesuit Estates Act passed in the province of Quebec, I had the honour of a seat in this House, representing a strong

Orange constituency; yet I voted against that motion and in favour of the principle of provincial rights, allowing the province of Quebec to deal with this question as affecting its educational institutions. I had no reason to believe that it was not right that the province of Quebec should deal with that matter without interference by the federal government. I think that the same principle should prevail now in regard to the educational clauses of these Bills, and that we should allow these new provinces the same right to deal with their educational institutions. It does not follow, as some hon. gentlemen on the government side of the House seem to think, that if absolute provincial autonomy is given to these provinces separate schools are going to be abolished. That result does not follow at all, and is not likely to follow. Surely if you can trust to the province of Nova Scotia, to the province of New Brunswick, to the province of Prince Edward Island, to the province of British Columbia, to deal justly with the minority in respect to education, you can trust these great new provinces in the Northwest to deal justly with the minority also. I think we may safely assume that the men who are at the head of the government in those provinces now will continue the same rights to the minority that exist at the present time. But it is the principle that we oppose, the principle of refusing to those new provinces absolute autonomy, the principle of dictating to them what sort of schools they shall establish for themselves. If the right hon. gentleman the Prime Minister were here I think he would excuse me for saying that the kind of autonomy he wants to give those provinces is this: You can do as you like as long as you do what we tell you. That is the sort of autonomy this government wants to give to these new provinces.

As I have said, attacking the Orange order seems to be a part of the stock in trade of hon. gentlemen opposite. Another favourite pastime with them is to attack the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster). His record has been raked up by nearly every hon. gentleman who has spoken on the other side of the House. My hon. friend from Shefford (Mr. Parmelee), in speaking yesterday, said that the hon. member for North Toronto had swallowed his principles, and he followed up that statement by saying that the place of the member for North Toronto was on the other side of the House. I entirely agree with him that his place would be on the other side of the House if it were true that he had swallowed his principles, or was capable of swallowing them. Now these hon. gentlemen go on and appeal for justice to the minority. Sir, that is what we want to give to the minority, we on this side of the House want to give them absolute justice, we want to give them just the amount of justice which is given to them by the constitution of this country; and if the amendment of the leader of the opposition is

Mr. WARD.