

an extract from an interview given about a month before the amendment was known—that is, given about the time the Prime Minister brought in his Bill and made the speech of which all fair-thinking people of this country thought so much. What Bishop Legal approved, and what the Catholics want, is not merely these nine paltry separate schools, not merely the half hour of religious instruction in these schools. The Catholics of this country are under a false impression, as they have been kept under a false impression as the people of Quebec are being kept, by the government's organs. They believe that what is being given is the guarantee of the continuance of what the Catholics in the Northwest enjoy to-day. That is a widespread impression. A friend of mine from Ontario told me only to-day, that it was unreasonable for us to expect to get more than we now have. Why, Sir, give us what we have, even though it may not be one-quarter of what the minority in Quebec are guaranteed—I admit that it is useless to ask for a French-speaking minority anything like what we have been ready to give the English-speaking minority of Quebec—and I would show my spirit of conciliation, by saying: I accept. Give these people the right to their separate schools, their Catholic schools, controlled by the government, where they are a majority as well as where they are a minority, and I will abandon the rest. I will even agree to the keeping of the uniform system which the Prime Minister has declared would be an act of infamous tyranny if committed by the province of Quebec. I will say that in the Northwest it will not be an infamous act of tyranny. I am willing to trust to the generosity of the people of the Northwest if you give us separation. The reason is obvious. I think I know the English-speaking people; I know their good qualities. They may have the spirit of domination, but they have not the spirit of persecution. An Englishman will not go into your home to force you to adopt his ways of living. But if you live in the house with him, he will try to compel you to live his way. This is but an exaggeration of a good quality in the English—the strength of will and persistency of purpose. It is not surprising, that, having had large success in spreading their institutions and power over so many lands they should be convinced even in an exaggerated form at times, that their institutions are the best—that they should be convinced that because they eat roast beef nobody else should eat chicken. But as I say, the Englishman will not go to another man's house to persecute him there. So, if this principle of separation is recognized, I am willing that we should be deprived even of the provisions of the Act of 1875, and be submitted to provisions, which if enacted by the repre-

Mr. BOURASSA.

sentatives of the majority in Quebec would be immediately denounced as tyrannical.

I am ready to accept all that, but I ask you only this, give me the right to schools for the people forming the majority as well as the minority. Is that unreasonable? Was it really the intention of this parliament to say that if Catholics happened to be one-third of the population of a district they shall have a separate school, but if they happen to be two-thirds they shall not have a separate school? Did the Liberal members of this House, when they accepted this amendment, think that the effect of it would be to deprive nine-tenths of the Roman Catholics of separate schools? I am sure that if the Prime Minister, or even the leader of the opposition, yes, if the majority of the two parties were appealed to, they would say, let us give to these people what they have a right to. I say there are not ten members of this House who knew what the disposition of this amendment was. The first time I spoke of it, I was denounced as a crank, the government organs in the province of Quebec laughed at me, but the Minister of Justice acknowledged that my position was right, the Prime Minister acknowledged it; and consequently the government organs in Quebec changed their tune and now acknowledge that I was right. Now they say, What the member for Labelle said a month ago is true, but we cannot get any more because the English Protestants will not give it. Sir, what is done now in Canada in the name of conciliation, is of a strange character. I appeal also to this House on the ground of conciliation, on the ground of an honourable compromise. But what is conciliation? Is it what the Minister of the Interior has said it was in the province of Ontario? He said, we are told that we have abolished separate schools in the Northwest, why don't you do the same in Ontario? Is that the basis of conciliation? Now, what was the ground taken by the Minister of Finance? He says there are in this country 40 per cent Catholics, and therefore you must respect them. In the maritime provinces we give them separate schools, although they have no right to them. In the Northwest Territories we are bound by pledge of this parliament to keep separate schools. But we are entitled to the confidence of the Protestants of Canada because in violation of all pledges, we do not give to the Catholics of the Northwest what they are entitled to, that which we give to the Catholics in Nova Scotia who have no right to it. Is that the basis of an honourable compromise? Is that abiding by the spirit of the British constitution? At the same time the government organs in Quebec are saying that it is useless to ask from the Protestant majority any justice for Roman Catholics. Sir, I claim that both these positions are