

field in my county, there is an English Protestant college called the Gault Institute. In some remarks which I made in this House on a previous occasion I expressed the idea that there was not much religion taught in Protestant schools. I had in my mind more than anything else non-sectarian schools. I received immediately the curriculum of the Gault Institute and I found there was lots of religion in it and the religious features were marked so that I would not overlook them. In scripture I find in different classes the following items :

The Acts of the Apostles, the Gospel of St. Luke, Life and Words of Christ, Selections from the Life of Christ, Selections from the Life of Christ, Selections from the Life of Christ, Stories from the Life of Christ.

I do not believe the majority in this House are in favour of having no religious instruction in schools. I know very well the majority of the members from Quebec cannot be in favour of that. If you must have religion in the school, what kind of religion will you have? What is taught in the Galt institute is very good religion, but is that the way that French Canadians would like their children to be taught in religion? My right hon. friend knows very well they would not. More than that, my impression is that it is forbidden by the bishops to let the children go to schools where another religion is taught. Whether they are right or wrong that is the position, and for that reason I say that in the Northwest Territories by your amendment you are giving what? Schools where no religion at all is taught, except that half-hour after school. That will be taught in the way I have read in the Protestant schools and in another way in the Roman Catholic schools, after the classes are over. My right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) knows very well that is not the spirit of Roman Catholic schools, but he will do as the member for Gloucester (Mr. Turgeon) did last night, make apologies, saying it is true we would like to give more, but we cannot do it. Is that the way that those who built up this country spoke? Is that the way Cartier spoke when he wanted to get the Militia Bill passed and was threatened with defeat in consequence? He introduced the Bill, he was defeated, he brought it on again and was returned and carried the Bill, and my right hon. friend could have done the same; he could have done better than Cartier, he could have carried his measure and he knows in his heart it is the only measure that could be carried that could do justice to that minority and not only that but to the Roman Catholic element in Canada. If my hon. friend has done that because he expects to have more peace in the future, if he has done it as the only thing by which he could have peace he has made an awful mistake. I do not know in the little of history I have read that injustice has ever lasted very

Mr. BERGERON.

long; nothing but contentment will last. This amendment will never stand until there is redress to the amendment he has proposed. I wish to refer to an article from a paper which I read the other day. There are in Quebec some papers which reproduce extracts from papers in Ontario in order to inflame the population of our province. This practice was deprecated by some hon. gentlemen opposite last night and I join them in that. We have a press which does a great deal of harm by reproducing articles from papers in Ontario, articles which I do not defend but which I think very bad. A great many of these papers are not party papers, and of course no party can be held responsible for their actions. The papers I want to speak of are in the same line. I have seen it stated that Catholic teaching and separate schools had a tendency to diminish the loyalty of the people. Mr. Chairman, you know better than that. Anybody who has read the history of this country knows better than that. I will take the contrary proposition. I say give to Roman Catholics their schools, treat them as England has treated them after the cession and you will have the same results that we have seen in the past. In 1875 when the rebels in the United States wanted to take Canada, when they came here and wanted to take from England these immense possessions of which we are now so proud, who was the man of authority who stood by the British flag and who held the French Canadians by his suasion and influence? It was Monseigneur Jean Olivier Briand, the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Quebec.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Bishop of Quebec?

Mr. BERGERON. Bishop or archbishop, he was the highest ecclesiastical authority at that time.

In 1812, when 300 or 400 Canadians, most of them French Canadians, defeated the Americans at Chateauguay, who was the bishop who issued a mandement to the people of this country to stand by the British flag and the British constitution if it was not Mgr. Joseph Octave Plessis, who was then the highest Roman Catholic authority in this country?

In 1837 when some of our people rightly or wrongly—this is not the place to discuss that—though they should rise in rebellion against the British government, or rather against the Canadian government, who was the bishop—and he has been censured very often by some politicians in Quebec—who told the people to keep cool, to go back to the laws of the country, to go back to the flag that was protecting them and not to rebel against that flag, if he was not Jean Jacques Lartigue, first bishop of Montreal?

I am saying this to show that those who contend that separate schools or the Roman Catholic religion tend to take away the loyalty of the people are making an awful mistake. I shall now say something which is