

and it brought education down to the political arena. This ordinance further says :

The Lieutenant Governor may appoint such officers, clerks and servants as are required for the proper conduct of the business of the department and for the purpose of this ordinance, all of whom shall hold office during pleasure.

Now, here is what this Department of Education is authorized to do :

The commissioner, with the approval of the Lieutenant Governor in Council shall have power to make regulations for the department.

(2) To authorize text and reference books for use of the pupils and teachers in all schools hereinbefore mentioned as well as such maps, charts, and other apparatus or equipment as may be required for giving proper instruction in such schools. To prepare a list of books suitable for school libraries and to make regulations for the management of such libraries.

There shall be an educational council consisting of five persons, at least two of them shall be Roman Catholics, to be appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council, who shall receive such remuneration as the Lieutenant Governor in Council shall determine.

We see from this that the board of education consists of a member of the executive council with two Catholics and two Protestants appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council, but these gentlemen have not the right to vote. I think I have given the information which my hon. friend (Mr. Brodeur) asked for as to chapter 29 of the ordinances, which is the law in the Territories to-day. I have read to the House clause 16 of the original Bill as submitted to parliament by the Prime Minister.

Clause 16 to my mind was what it should have been, and I would have supported it, because it was giving the minority in the Northwest justice. Of course, I am speaking for myself and expressing my own views. I am in favour of separate schools; I believe in separate schools—not merely in the word 'separate,' but in the tuition which children get in separate schools. I want religion to be taught in the schools. I want the child to hear of God and to pray in the school—not all the time; but I want it to be understood that the name of God shall be mentioned there. I have heard men who are very sincere say: 'You are a broad-minded man; why not let all the children go to the same school together, with the national flag floating from the top of the building? Of course, there would be no prayer in the school, because it would offend the Roman Catholics, the Methodists, the Presbyterians or the Baptists. There would be no religion taught. The children would simply go there and learn what is necessary to earn their living. They would play together, and would grow up to respect each other.' I do not believe in that kind of school, and I do not believe that is true. I remember that when I was attending college there were some Americans

there, and it was not very long before we were separated. Our differences would come out without thinking about them, and, though we commenced by playing, we would finish up by fighting. My hon. friends opposite know the college—it is the Jesuits' College. They have now a separate college for English boys. The cause of difference between the boys was not religion only; it may have been something else; but, at any rate, we fought together. As men we are surrounded by friends who have been brought up in different schools, and we appreciate one another; but that appreciation is not developed in children. A man appreciates in another man certain qualities for which he respects him, but a child cannot do that. I do not want to convert anybody to my opinions, because I know that those who have opposite opinions are as sincere and honest in holding them as I am in holding mine. But I am explaining my opinions; and, holding them, when clause 16 of this Bill was brought down I hailed it with pleasure, and I was happy at the deliverance which my right hon. friend made on that occasion. It did not last, however. Why did it not last? My hon. friend from St. John and Iberville (Mr. Demers) says we are not doing what we would like to do; we would like to do more, but we do what we can in a country like this. This is not the way our forefathers talked. This is not the way the men who built up Canada talked. When Sir John A. Macdonald, in 1863, voted for separate schools in the province of Ontario, the province of Canada at that time, he was not doing what he himself preferred, for he was in favour of public schools; but he did so because he thought it was the best thing that could be done in the province of Canada at that time, on account of the different nationalities and creeds in Upper and Lower Canada. We have often seen occasions of the same kind. Shall I speak of something nearer to us? In 1896 we had before parliament a question very much like the present one, except that we were dealing with a state of things which was existing at that time, whilst at present we are creating a state of things. In 1896 the Manitoba school question was before parliament. It had been before the country since 1890. I heard the other day the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) boast of having had a great deal to do with the Manitoba school business. I was sorry to hear him talk like that, although he gave some reasons, in a very clever way, which hid, if I may use the word, the odious part of the business. He declared that the separate schools were not efficient, that they were not what they should have been, and that money was squandered on them. I need not tell the House that those statements have been refuted time and time again. There may have been some abuses, as there are in most things, but on the whole the