

with purity, but once they become masters of the English language they place at a disadvantage those of us who can speak but one language.

Mr. BOURASSA. You will have to go to a separate school.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Not at all.

Mr. BOURASSA. Yes, if you want to be on an equal footing there.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I am sure that our young friend was educated in a national school. If the same harmony could be maintained in regard to the affairs of this country as that which has been manifested by our young friend in regard to the English and the French languages, the people of Canada might look forward to a great future for this Dominion. Unfortunately we find that gentlemen who speak that language, who are of that grand race, a race with which I claim kindred just as much as hon. gentlemen who sit on the other side of the House, displaying a different spirit outside of this House. If these gentlemen would be moderate and show the same spirit on the platforms and hustings in Quebec and up and down the side roads of that province, and if they would confine themselves to the same tone as that in which they address this House it would augur well for the future of this country. One would imagine from the remarks of the young speaker, that we were discussing the province of Quebec. I understand that these Bills with which we are dealing are for the purpose of erecting two new provinces in the Northwest of the Dominion of Canada and that the province of Quebec has nothing to do with this any more than any other province in the Dominion. No attack is being made on the rights and liberties of the province of Quebec; these rights and liberties are guaranteed by the articles of conquest and by the Confederation Act.

The question now before the House, simmered down to a nut shell is as to the authority, the duty, the policy of this parliament to enforce separate schools on the Northwest Territories. The right hon. the leader of the government told us that this was a question of the constitution, but his colleagues have told us that it is not a question of the constitution in any sense whatever. One of the ministers ventured to think that vested rights should be considered but that plea was abandoned when it was found that although the Roman Catholics have had every facility for years to establish separate schools there are only ten such separate schools as compared with over 1,000 public schools in the Northwest Territories. Therefore, the question simmers itself down to one of policy. Now, let us suppose for a moment that it was our clear duty under the constitution to establish separate schools, would our best method be to proceed with

Mr. SAM. HUGHES.

a bludgeon in the shape of this Act of parliament held over the people of the Northwest to force separate schools upon them? Would it not be better to omit from this Bill altogether any provision with regard to separate schools, and leave it to the people of the new provinces to carry out the constitution, for until the first meeting of the legislative assembly of the new provinces the Act of 1875 will be continued in force, and would remain in force unless repealed by the assembly. Sir, when the Bill now before the House becomes law it will force on the people of the new provinces the full enactment of the School Act of 1875, and nothing but mischief can result. If the Prime Minister is right in his argument, that by the constitution we are bound to give the new provinces separate schools, then the provinces cannot repeal this law and it will stand forever on the statute-books. If the Prime Minister has any confidence in his contention, why should he not withdraw his educational clause altogether from the Act and avoid all the bickering, the heart burnings, the contentious spirit that permeates the Dominion of Canada to-day. If it is a question of policy, and we maintain that it is, then coercion—I think that is the proper term to use in relation to this clause—coercion is not in conformity with provincial rights; it transgresses the principle of provincial rights at the very outset. This is not good legislation, as I shall prove from the Prime Minister's own lips. It interferes with the rights of man as well as with the rights of provinces, but over and above all this question of coercion there stands another issue. The Prime Minister has instructed the House on some of the principles of the Roman Catholic religion; he has told us that in addition to the pure question of religion there is the great question of dogma which enters into the notion of those that hold that faith. With the question of religion, with the relationship existing between a man's conscience and his God I have nothing to do. I never allowed any other man to interfere in the relationship existing between my conscience and my God, and I never insulted any man by interfering with him in that respect. But in relation of the question of dogma, that is the business end of the proposition, and when any church corporation—be it Methodist, Roman Catholic, Presbyterian or any other—just the same as any railway corporation comes before the people of this country for legislation, it is the bounden duty of every man who commands his own self respect to deal with it, not on the sentimental issue, not to bow down before the cry that the church is behind the organization; but to deal with it on the basis of what is right and what is wrong, and considering what is in the best interests of the Dominion of Canada and of her entire people. On these lines I purpose dealing with this question. Taking it as a