

the minority here enjoys, namely, control by constitutional right of its own education. No doubt the two systems are different in character. The one is sectarian and sectionalizing and estranging; the other is unsectarian and uniting. The latter is without question, in our mind, the best; but our neighbours conscientiously take a distinctly opposite view. Each part of the community would prefer that its own system should be universal, but we can scarcely imagine how the minority of this province would feel or act if the system of the majority was forced upon it. The Protestants of Quebec would say that their religious liberty was invaded and would probably rise in revolt against such despotism. Determined to have their own conscientious convictions respected, they cannot but respect the convictions of their neighbours, however much they may deplore them.

What our correspondent asks is, that the majority in the new provinces should have the determination of all school questions absolutely in their hands. Our belief is that they would use such a power in a way as liberal to the minority as the Autonomy Act proposes. In fact what is proposed is to extend the system which has been brought into shape under local legislation.

I would like the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) to take note of that because he seems to be doubtful on that question. I am sure that if his mind is clear on that point, he will do as he promised in his speech and vote for the Bill. He is now not only getting the views of members on this side of the House, but he can take his authority from the editor of the Montreal 'Witness.'

But we cannot blame the minority for wanting to have the minority right constitutionally guaranteed, as that of the Protestants is in Quebec, nor can we think that for proposing to give them this security, a premier who is seeking only to be true and fair to all should be spoken of as guilty of the most audacious and treacherous act in our history.

That statement ought to be of some value to the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. La-  
lor) and I will read it again.

Nor can we think that for proposing to give them this security a premier who is seeking only to be true and fair to all should be spoken of as guilty of the most audacious and treacherous act in our history.

I do earnestly hope that when we see the very best amongst the newspapers of our country taking up the question in this way, the members of the opposition in this House will become more tolerant; they will show more respect for the minority in this country, and that they will not try to inflame the public mind into outbursts of passion between Roman Catholics and Protestants. I have been one of those who lived amongst Catholics all my life; I have Catholic neighbours on all sides of me; by jumping over the fence I can get into the field of a Catholic, and I can say this, and there are members of the opposition here who know it is true; we have lived together like friends, we have lived together like

brethren, and I ask: cannot we be allowed to continue to live in that way? Cannot the minority be allowed to have religious teaching in their schools as they have in Ontario, without anybody being the worse for it? I have lived in my township for 48 years and I cannot see where any Protestant has lost one iota because there are two separate schools in that township. I appeal to the members of the opposition in this House to come down to fair-play. I appeal to them to leave this intolerance aside and to frown upon the injustice perpetrated in this paper before me which contains the most scandalous cartoons which ever appeared in print. Let the incidents of the past couple of months be blotted out for ever, and let us as members of this legislature show that we at least are possessed of a good deal of common sense and that we have the spirit of fair-play and of wisdom about us. Let us not endorse the unjust warfare that the Toronto 'News' has indulged in for some time past with its tremendous headings: 'A free west, a common school, provincial rights, religious equality.' The idea conveyed by these headings is a false one. Who can deny that there is a free west, and who can deny that there are not common schools in the west? Where is the evidence that provincial rights are infringed upon? Are we infringing upon provincial rights before they have a province? We must create a province before they can have provincial rights, and I guarantee the members of this House that so far as I am concerned, that after the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan are created on the first day of July next, if there is any attempt to take away their rights, I shall be the first to jump up and defend provincial rights. But how can we defend provincial rights until they are provinces? The 'Witness' continues to say:

We should like to ask our correspondent to put to himself one question. Let him imagine, if he can, that the present prospect was that of a large Roman Catholic majority in one of these provinces, and of a large Mormon majority in the other, and then ask himself if, under such an outlook, he would be quite as sure as he is that the constitution guaranteed those majorities the right to legislate with regard to education just as they might like, and would be quite as sure as he is that they ought to have that unlimited power. If he finds his mind revolt against giving absolute power to the provinces in such a case, he will be able to see the attitude of mind of those who are demanding that some limit be placed on possible majority despotism. Practically the system of schools which prevails in the provinces, and which it is proposed to perpetuate, seems to us an excellent one.

I think these words are particularly applicable to the members of the opposition. They never have seemed to realize that fact, and if they will not take the word of the Prime Minister for it, if they will not take the word of any member of the government,