

of the present premier of the Northwest Territories?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. He was.

Mr. BERGERON. Colonel Haultain from Upper Canada. I believe he was the father of our Mr. Haultain. This is what he says:

I am aware from personal intercourse with many gentlemen belonging to that section of the community that they do feel a very strong aversion to this scheme because, as they say, it will place them at the mercy of the French Canadians . . . and I must say, for my own part, that I do think the Protestant minority have some grounds for this fear. . . . I speak what I know when I say there is a feeling of distrust on the part of a great many of the Protestants of Lower Canada.

These men have all gone. If they were living to-day, would they not be here to thank the majority in the province of Quebec and to offer their most sincere congratulations to that majority for the way their people have been treated since 1867? We do not deserve any credit for that. If you were to meet a French Canadian in Quebec and say to him: I am glad to see that you are treating the Protestants well in your province, he would shrug his shoulders and he would think it quite natural that they should be so treated. I have seen parishes in the province of Quebec in which there was only one Protestant and he was the mayor. I have seen parishes where there were only a few Protestants and where the mayor was an English speaking Protestant. They would not come down to think of a thing of that sort.

Later on, some promises were made to the province of Manitoba besides those which I read a few moments ago. I desire to say only one word en passant because this is part of another discussion in respect to the rights and privileges that these people have in the list of rights. Article X was as follows:

Article 10. That the English and French languages be common in the legislature and courts, and all public documents and Acts of legislature be published in both languages.

This is another promise which has been broken. Now, I have spoken of the demands of our English friends in Quebec before confederation, and I have said that these are sentiments which we cannot question. This brings me to ask this question: Should religion be taught in the schools? In 1896, it was rumoured that my right hon. friend the leader of the government—I do not want to say that it was true—was convinced of one thing and that was that it was better that there should be no religion in the schools. Of course, he would not say that in the province of Quebec, but it was said somewhere. I say that is a non-Catholic proposition. You cannot be a good Catholic and be an observer of your religion if you are of opinion that there should

Mr. BERGERON.

be no religion taught in the schools. I will go further than that. I am saying this to our English Protestant friends. The teaching of religion in the school is part of our religion and I am going to show it.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That is theology.

Mr. BERGERON. No, I am not going as far as that. I will take the statement of His Lordship Bishop Taché, of Winnipeg, who spoke for the bishops, as he says, for the clergy and for the Roman Catholics and my hon. friend the Minister of Justice may contradict that if he sees fit to do so.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Hear, hear.

Mr. BERGERON. Monseigneur Taché, and this is given under affidavit, says:

Roman Catholic schools have always formed an integral part of the work of the Roman Catholic church. That church has always considered the education of the children of Roman Catholic parents as coming peculiarly within its jurisdiction. The school, in the view of the Roman Catholics, is in a large measure, 'the children's church,' and wholly incomplete and largely abortive if religious exercises be excluded from it. The church has always insisted upon its children receiving their education in schools conducted under the supervision of the church, and upon their being trained in the doctrines and faith of the church.

In education the Roman Catholic Church attaches very great importance to the spiritual culture of the child, and regards all education unaccompanied by instruction in its religious aspects as possibly detrimental and not beneficial to children. With this regard the church requires that all teachers of children shall not only be members of church, but shall be thoroughly imbued with its principles and faith; shall recognize its spiritual authority and conform to its directions. It also requires that such books be used in schools with regard to certain subjects as shall combine religious instruction with those subjects, and this applies peculiarly to all history and philosophy.

Later on Archbishop Taché says:

When in the foregoing paragraphs I speak of the faith or belief of the Roman Catholic Church I speak not only for myself and the church in its corporate capacity, but for its members.

That is the pronouncement of Archbishop Taché, and that is good sound Catholic doctrine. I come now to glance at the system of education in England, that great Protestant country; and surely we cannot expect the Protestants of Canada to be more Protestant than the Protestants of England. When people talk about the independence of Canada, I always think that after all the best thing for us here is to stick closely to the British connection, because in the mother land we find the principle of freedom of religion exemplified in its most perfect form. I do not say this as a reproach, but I do believe there is more fanaticism in Canada against Roman Catholics than there is in all England. That may be due to want of knowledge on the part of those