

sulted with the Papal ablegate with respect to the educational clauses of this Bill, and he has refused to answer that question. In view of that fact I am justified, on behalf of the people I represent, in saying to the right hon. gentleman that they do not approve of his course because it is against their religious faith, and we do not believe in that system of administering the government of this country. That is my position, and in making that statement I do not think my Quebec friends can take offence. Possibly, they believe that the first Minister has done quite right in consulting the Papal ablegate, I have no fault to find with them for that, they have a perfect right to their opinions and a right to express them, as I have a perfect right to express contrary opinions.

Now, much has been said about Bishop Taché and Mr. Ewart. I was in Manitoba when Bishop Taché was there, and I know something of the arrangement that was entered into with the minority in the province of Manitoba. When the Mackenzie government were in power, delegates came from Manitoba to Ottawa for the purpose of securing more money to conduct their government. The answer Mr. Mackenzie gave was this: Go back to your own province and see if, by wiser economy, you cannot administer your affairs more economically, then I may be in a position to grant you more financial assistance. The chief fault Mr. Mackenzie found with them was that they had two chambers, they had a legislative council and he thought a new province like that ought to abolish the legislative council, and he promised if they would exercise economy in that matter, he would be willing possibly to assist them financially. I was a government employee there at the time, and I remember the promise made squarely to the minority of the province, as represented in the legislative council that if they would vote themselves out of existence they would continue to exercise all the rights they had had up to that moment. Mr. Davis, who was prime minister, ex-Attorney General Clarke, who had been defeated during the session and others, pledged themselves that the minority should continue to exercise their rights for all time to come. But when the Manitoba school question came up in this House, I was here, and representing a strong Protestant constituency. I voted in favour of remedial legislation. And I want to tell my hon. friends from Quebec, that, while many of my constituents found fault with me for voting in favour of the legislation, I told them straightforwardly that if they elected me again and Sir Charles Tupper's government was sustained and reintroduced remedial legislation for Manitoba, I would vote for it as I had done before, to protect the rights of the minority. When hon. gentlemen opposite accuse the leader of the op-

position and his supporters of being unwilling to give the minority in Manitoba their rights, I want to tell them that one stands here who is ready to vote to secure the rights of any minority in this country, Catholic or Protestant. I was astonished to hear the ex-Minister of the Interior the other night utter these words, which I find reported on page 3253 of this year's 'Hansard':

Therefore, in 1896 when this settlement was made—and it was a settlement that hon. gentlemen opposite had refused to accept—although it was a settlement which led my right hon. friend the leader of the government out of a great difficulty and made his path smooth, yet the settlement has never been combated or criticised by any member of this House from that time up to the present moment.

There has never been a session since 1896 when reference has not been made to the Manitoba school question. How the ex-Minister of the Interior could have made such a statement I cannot conceive. I can only assume it as conclusive evidence that he is not well posted on what takes place in this House.

It is true that reference was had, as has been said, to Archbishop Taché and Mr. Ewart. We, as Protestants, do not object to that, for both Archbishop Taché and Mr. Ewart were citizens of this country. If the Conservative Prime Minister chose to consult them he had a perfect right to do so. The present Prime Minister would have the right to do the same. But we draw a distinction here—the papal delegate is not a citizen of this country. There are Catholic bishops who have the welfare of the church at heart as well as the Papal delegate, and if the Prime Minister, after consulting his cabinet, wishes to consult any of them, we have no fault to find. But when he goes outside, we believe, as Protestants, that he has gone beyond the proper line.

Now, I would like to say to hon. gentlemen opposite who differ with me in the matter of religion that it is not well to be too sensitive as to the way members express their views on this question. The question comes before us, as we believe, not in proper course. Had this Autonomy Bill been brought in minus the educational clauses, the people of the Northwest Territories would have continued to enjoy the same privileges in education that they now have, unless those privileges were curtailed by the legislature we might create. But, if the legislature made such changes we believe they would be within their rights. And I am prepared to vote against any interference with their freedom in educational matters.

Just a word or two with regard to the accusation that hon. gentlemen on this side are backward in expressing their views on this question. There are gentlemen on this side who do not agree with me on

Mr. INGRAM.