

people if they are willing to accept it. Imposition means an unwillingness on the part of the receiver, and a major force on the part of the one who imposes. Now what did this Bill impose? It merely confirmed a principle that these people in the Northwest Territories had imposed upon themselves. The imposition, if any, was made by the local legislature of the Northwest Territories and sanctioned here. Therefore if there are any shackles being put on the people, they put them on of their own free will.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the hon. gentleman not admit that by the Northwest Territories Act, 1875, they were compelled to do certain things? Now what people are compelled to do is not done voluntarily, is it?

Mr. BUREAU. Why, Mr. Speaker, they were compelled to respect the rights of the minority, as we want them to do now. Now let me go on with this circular, and I will show you where the imposition comes in. It says:

It behooves every lover of liberty, and especially every Orangeman, to give a helping hand to prevent this injustice being perpetrated.

Now, Sir, 'it behooves every lover of liberty.' I think if we read the past history of the people of this Dominion we do not have to go to any sect or to any organization to find lovers of liberty. I have travelled over this Dominion from the Atlantic to the Pacific, I have lived on the western plains, I have lived in the east, and I have found among all the people where I have lived, I have even found in the city of Toronto where I had the pleasure to stay for a few weeks—I found lovers of liberty. Why, Sir, it is the Orangemen who wish to make of this measure a question of religion and a question of race. Well, the Orangemen are a much abused lot if we are to accept as true what is said of them as being opposed to Catholics.

Mr. SPROULE. I ask the hon. gentleman if there is a word about race in the circular?

Mr. BUREAU. No, Sir, but this House knows it to be a fact, it is known in the streets, that the Orangemen and the Catholics are antagonistic. Does the hon. gentleman deny, for instance, that the Orangemen are unsympathetic towards the Catholics?

Mr. SPROULE. Yes, I deny emphatically that there is any antagonism between Orangemen and Roman Catholics—on the part of the Orangemen. And what is more, they have usually worked harmoniously together.

Mr. BUREAU. I am asking if they are sympathetic to the Catholics?

Mr. BUREAU.

Mr. SPROULE. Yes. I say that according to the principles of the Orange order they must be kind, humane and sympathetic towards Roman Catholics.

Mr. BUREAU. And so, in order to bring them closer together, the Orange order allows its members to intermarry with Catholics, to bring up their children in the Catholic faith, or the Papist faith, and to send them to Catholic institutions. Is not that forbidden?

Mr. SPROULE. It is.

Mr. BUREAU. Is not that one of the obligations they take?

Mr. SPROULE. Yes.

Mr. BUREAU. And is that a mark of sympathy with the Catholic religion, to forbid them to intermarry with Catholics?

Mr. SPROULE. Is it a mark of inhumanity?

Mr. BUREAU. Between inhumanity and sympathy there is a wide difference. I say that when you talk of the protection of the minority in the Northwest Territories, it is the Catholic minority that is meant.

Mr. SPROULE. I want to ask the hon. member this question. Does the Catholic church allow their people to intermarry with Protestants?

Mr. BUREAU. I do not know anything about the theological side of the question.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman is a Catholic and he does not know that.

Mr. BUREAU. I am a Catholic, and I am a member of Catholic societies, and in not one of them is there any denunciation made of people of any particular faith, in not one of them is there an obligation that prevents a member from marrying a Protestant girl, or from educating his children in the Protestant faith, or in Protestant institutions.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it not a fact that within the last year there have been cases where Roman Catholic children were taken out of the public schools, and their parents were told it was wrong to send them there, and they were compelled to send them to separate schools? Yet the hon. gentleman says that educational intercourse is not prohibited.

Mr. BUREAU. The hon. gentleman is shifting his ground. It is not a question of whether Catholic people are justified in sending their children to Protestant schools; it is a question of finding out whether a particular sect is sympathetic to Catholics or not.

Mr. SPROULE. I am answering the question the hon. gentleman raised.

Mr. BUREAU. Not at all. Why prohibit intermarriage if you are sympathetic?