

be given the full rights to which the right hon. gentleman says they are entitled. We find the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) going to the province of Quebec and telling the people there: Oh, this Bill does not give enough, it is not satisfactory. But that, Mr. Speaker, is no doubt only intended as a bluff in order to pacify and set at ease these fellows from Ontario who are supporting the government. It gives them some excuse for saying: We are not giving anything; it does not amount to anything. But, Mr. Speaker, that is not an honest way of dealing with the question. If you are giving the minority any rights, give it to them like men. If the constitution does not give you the right to deal with that question here, as the leader of the opposition says it does not, let us leave the people in the Territories to settle their own differences in the general interests.

It is impossible for an Ontario man to understand the condition of things perhaps in the province of Quebec. We find there a very large majority voting for the First Minister, although the right hon. gentleman turned his own compatriots down in the province of Manitoba. Here are three fingers. The first represents religion, the second language and the third nationality. The right hon. gentleman finds that the two representing language and nationality are more sacred than the other one. But where does the English Catholic come in? He has just got the little finger, religion, and the others have the other two. We find right here in Hintonburg that the English Catholic has difficulty in getting his full rights in the minority schools. Why? Because the French majority say: You must learn in the French tongue. We find the same difficulty in Montreal, and it is high time that somebody should speak up for the Irishman, who I think has as good a right as anybody to have his views respected. But his rights are overlooked in the great cry of religion, nationality and language in the province of Quebec. I say that the man in that province who has only his religion ought to have some consideration as well as the man who has besides the other two fingers, language and nationality. Give this man who has only a little finger in the pie, the English Catholic, a little chance.

Before I sit down I want to say that in a new country like this, where the possibilities for a man's success are largely from within and not from without, it is what a man prepares himself to do and what he is able to do in the world which makes him successful or otherwise. That being the case, in this great country of ours, full of great possibilities, every man in it ought to be fitted to the fullest possible extent for the business of life. No man understands better than does my right hon. friend, that business competition, that competition in every vocation of life, is so keen that it behooves our public men should take an

interest in the preparation of our young generation for that fight.

And, Sir, that being the case, this question of schools is an important question to every man. Whether he thinks as I do or not is his own business, not mine. All I say is, that, in a new country, we ought to be careful about making mistakes that will affect the future. In 1896, I said to my people: There is a grievance, because an agreement with the Manitoba people has been broken. And I took the responsibility of that issue. I met the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) speaking against me, I met Mr. Dalton McCarthy, I met Mr. N. Clarke Wallace, I met Sir Richard Cartwright, all speaking against me. And you talk about the tolerance of Ontario. But let me tell you that, in that strong Protestant riding I was elected on that issue in spite of the opposition of all these gentlemen. But one thing I thought I might have been spared. When I was willing to take my political life in my hand, in defence of the minority of Manitoba, I thought I might have been spared the active, personal opposition in my county of the hon. gentleman who is now Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). But, the hon. gentleman's visit did no harm. This question is one in which the people have a living interest. It is a great pity that any question of religion should intervene in political affairs. But sincere men on either side can respect their sincere opponents. I will never find fault with any Roman Catholic for supporting his religion; all I ask is that whether a man is Roman Catholic or whatever may be in his religion, he shall be sincere. The man who is not sincere is not of much use. I regret deeply that these questions should be again forced to the front of our political discussion. If you ask a man who is advocating separate schools whether a school trustee is an officer of the church or the state, what will he tell you? Some will tell you that he is an officer of the church, others that he is an officer of the state. It has come to the point where the people resent the encroachments of the church, whether Protestant or Catholic. This question of separate schools was a burning one in Ontario for years. When the question of the clergy reserves was settled, in the very Bill in which that settlement was embodied, was a clause declaring that this Bill was to do away with all possibility of connection between church and state. And the people thought they were done with these questions. And who stood up and fought for the rights of the minority in Ontario—though, perhaps, he did not believe much in the principles which seem to them so important? The man who fought for the interest of the minority was Rev. Egerton Ryerson, a Methodist minister. He was a man of statesmanlike ability and moulded in the strong mould of theological discipline. And we can name similar men from the Catholic side, such as Bishop Connolly, of

Mr. BRODER.