

small, that the majority enjoy in the Northwest Territories. There are some hon. gentlemen on the other side of this House, the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) the hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) and the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Sam. Hughes) who profess to believe that religious instruction should be done away with in the schools. But, Mr. Speaker, though I have great respect for their opinions, I must say without hesitation that if those three gentlemen were put on one side, and on the other side you were to show me statesmen like Mr. Chamberlain, like Mr. Gladstone, like Mr. Balfour, like Mr. Guizot, I would have to throw in my lot with the great Englishmen. Now, Sir, the claim has been made in this House and out of it that the Liberal party has trampled upon provincial rights and provincial autonomy, that it has abandoned its principles of 1896, and that now the Liberal party is invading provincial rights and provincial autonomy. Well, Mr. Speaker, let me refer for a moment to what took place in 1896. What was the position of the right hon. the Prime Minister in 1896, when he moved the six months hoist of the Remedial Bill? He said: This parliament has a right to interfere; the remedy lies with us, but I think that remedy should not be applied until all conciliatory methods have been exhausted. Now, Sir, in 1896 we stood for conciliation. What are we doing today? We are still standing for conciliation, we stand for compromise on an honourable basis.

Mr. BERGERON. Would my hon. friend allow me to ask him a question? Did the solution of 1896 settle the Manitoba school question to the satisfaction of the minority?

Mr. BELAND. It did settle it to a certain extent which appears to be satisfactory to the minority. It may not be satisfactory to my hon. friend, who is known to be an ardent and devoted supporter of the Catholic church. But to my mind, and as a means establishing peace and harmony in this country between the different elements, it is satisfactory.

Mr. BERGERON. I hope I am not troubling my hon. friend. But how does he explain this trip of Mr. Rogers and Mr. Campbell down here to secure a more favourable settlement for the minority of Manitoba?

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. Was that what Mr. Rogers and Mr. Campbell came for?

Mr. BERGERON. That is what we were told this afternoon.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. I am glad to know it.

Mr. BELAND. I think I can satisfy the hon. gentleman on that point. Mr. Rogers is fond of notoriety, he desires to make himself and his party some politi-

cal capital in Manitoba, and he came to meet Monseigneur Sbarretti for the purpose, in my opinion, of procuring some arrangement by which he hoped to capture the Catholic vote of Manitoba. I think that the object of Mr. Rogers, in my estimation, and I think in the estimation of my hon. friend also, was to make political capital. Now, Sir, who is making a claim for provincial rights to-day? The hon. the leader of the opposition is making, from the rock of the constitution, as he said, a fight for provincial rights. We had an instance the other day of how hon. gentlemen will stand sometimes for provincial rights when the leader of the opposition criticised the Bill that was introduced a few days ago by the right hon. gentleman, and when he was asked whether the land should be left with the provinces or with the federal government, he was of the opinion that the land should go to the provinces. But then he bethought himself, I suppose, of the strong objection, for it was an objection, that I quoted a minute ago, that it would perhaps interfere with an effective immigration policy. But I will quote his own words:

May I not further suggest that even if there were any danger—and I do not think there is—it would be the task of good statesmanship to have inserted, if necessary, a provision in this Bill with regard to free homesteads and the price of these lands, and obtain to it the consent of the people of the Northwest Territories.

It is no more difficult than that.

Provincial rights, provincial autonomy as long as it serves his purpose! But, as soon as it does not serve his purpose, let us invade provincial rights and send a postcard,—I suppose that is the system in vogue in Toronto now—to every member and to every citizen in the Northwest Territories saying: Do you approve of that? If he says he does, all right, and if he says he does not, well, where will he be?

We, of the province of Quebec, we, the Catholic minority of this Dominion, are bound to change our mind as to the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden). We had always thought that he was a broad minded Englishman, we had always thought that he was animated by that spirit of fair dealing and kindly forbearance that have distinguished English institutions for the last fifty years. The other day he pronounced upon us a beautiful eulogy. He said that he had traversed the province of Quebec from one end to the other and that every man he had met there was well read, intelligent and sociable and a moment afterwards he moved the amendment which is now before the House. The hon. gentleman, I am afraid, has missed his vocation. He has missed his profession. He should have been a surgeon because he would have made a very skilful one. When I listened to him I could not refrain from thinking that when he pronounced that eulogy, when he uttered