

den). But no one could get a categorical answer from him in 1896. In Ontario he was for investigation, he wanted to find out the facts; but one thing was sure, there would be no coercion. But in Quebec the Remedial Bill did not go far enough to suit him; if it were true that the schools were Protestant schools, he would do more than the Conservatives could do to remedy the grievance of the Catholics; only put him in power, and when he was in power everybody would be happy; if he could not settle the question by conciliation, he would take strong means to provide by the constitution. And he came into power. And what has he done? He has satisfied that element which led him to take the position he did on the Remedial Bill; he has satisfied the strong Protestant element, which is honestly convinced that the future safety of this country lies in keeping the French Canadians and Catholics in a secondary place—or, as I say, there are people of that kind, and those the right hon. gentleman has pleased. And to-day—yes, this very moment, while I am speaking—the Catholic minority in Winnipeg are obliged to pay a double tax for education. In the first place, they must pay for the support of the separate schools; and, as they cannot conscientiously send their children to those schools, they must pay for the education of their children elsewhere. And the Prime Minister knows that these people have had no redress of these grievances. He knows also that in the other parts of the province any rights that the Catholics enjoy with regard to education are not guaranteed by the law—but only exist by tolerance—I hope that the situation will not grow worse. The present provincial government is Conservative, and I hope that they will secure to the Catholics what they already have. But I am convinced that if a Liberal government got into power in that province, in twenty-four hours they would take away the privileges, such as they are, which the Roman Catholics enjoy. But there has come a day of reckoning. When the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) was charged with the duty of establishing two provinces in the Northwest, he said—probably prompted by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick)—we must try to redeem ourselves in those provinces; our case has gone bad in Manitoba, and we cannot rehabilitate ourselves there. He had promised that he would send Mr. Mowat to Manitoba. 'Father of all the Roman Catholics of Ontario,' they used to call him in Quebec; no one so good as Mr. Mowat. But he never went; but they sent another gentleman there. Well, the Minister of Justice and the Prime Minister decided that they would do something for the people of the Northwest, and so they introduced this Bill with its original clause 16. Now, the original clause 16 was good. It expressed the first idea of these

hon. gentlemen, their spontaneous sentiment. And yesterday the right hon. gentleman presented his amended clause. Now, let us not play upon words. We have been trying here for weeks to find out what is the difference between the first clause 16 and the second clause 16. And that is going to be a great game in the country. In Quebec they will say that the two clauses are the same thing. And that is the reason for my amendment—I want to make it clear that there will not be any mistake about it. And in Ontario they will say, as the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) and the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) and others have said, that there is really nothing in clause 16 as it is now amended. Why, the hon. member for Centre York not only said that, but wrote it. He told his friends: Don't be anxious; don't lose sleep over this thing; even ultra-Protestants need not fear; of course, we had to put something in the Bill about separate schools, but this means nothing at all, and in three or four years there will not be a single separate school in the Northwest Territories.

And what is the reason why the Prime Minister has proposed this amendment? It seems to me that what he has done—to use a favourite expression of his own—is to give a stone for a loaf of bread. I know that what I am now saying will be used to help the Liberals in Ontario—they will say that the member for Beauharnois himself declared that there was nothing in this amended section. But we are here to speak the truth concerning matters that come before the House. If my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) wanted to be candid—and I wish he would be—he would acknowledge that he was frightened into this act. I am convinced that had he stood up for clause 16 as it was originally drafted he would have carried it. But he got frightened. The hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) left the cabinet. But that was not what frightened the Prime Minister. My right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) is a lucky man; he was born under a lucky star. I think it was a good thing for him to get rid of the hon. member for Brandon; and when the opportunity of doing so occurred, he took advantage of it in a very clever way. I do not want him to smile at that, because he must not show approval of what I say. But when my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) showed his teeth, that was a different thing. The Minister of Finance is spoken of as the coming Prime Minister when my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) claims his right to rest. He is considered the strong man in the cabinet. There is no comparison between the one who left and the one who threatened to leave.

My hon. friend the Finance Minister—and I want the French Canadians to know that as soon as possible, in case he may