

might act as we should see fit, on the merits, but the fact that this parliament has for thirty years permitted separate schools to exist and has repeatedly passed enactments, continuing these separate schools, seems to me to impose an obligation—it may be only a moral obligation, but certainly it imposes a limitation—on this parliament, and according to my way of thinking makes it imperative upon this parliament to permit the minority to continue to be safeguarded in the rights they presently enjoy. I feel that it is of the highest importance that this parliament should keep faith with itself. I feel that, not only the minority in the west, but throughout this whole land, considers that this parliament has gone on record in favour of a limited separate school system in the west; I feel that if any portion of our community conceives the idea that parliament can or will break faith with them, that breaking of faith will be a shock to such and to the whole country that will be a serious injury to all. Although this parliament may find itself in the position of him 'who sweareth to his hurt and changeth not,' still it seems to me that if this is good doctrine for the individual it is the same for the parliament of Canada. I know that there is a strong feeling of western pride that resents the imposition of the slightest limitation on the powers of the new provinces. This is what would be expected of those who breathe the free air of the western plains. But let it not be forgotten that these new provinces when they come into our sisterhood of provinces, where they will enjoy the advantages of confederation, also assume their full share of responsibilities, and must also be expected to bear their share of the burden, sacrificing for the common weal some of their privileges. So in this particular case, while we are prepared to grant them the fullest autonomy, we must still ask them to protect, to a certain extent, the engagements and obligations which this parliament in the last thirty years has incurred. A short time ago the legislature of British Columbia passed legislation discriminating against the Japanese coming into their country and against those already there. This legislation was promptly disallowed by the imperial parliament. Why? Because the imperial parliament was on friendly terms with Japan, because the two nations were in close alliance, and because any act of this kind would tend to weaken the bond of unity between them. We have a somewhat similar case here. British Columbia may re-pass that legislation, but ultimately British Columbia must consent to restrict her own liberties to that extent because she is a part of the Canadian federation, because she is a part of the British empire. And so these new provinces may be called upon—and I think would cheerfully respond—to sacrifice a certain modicum of the liberties which they would otherwise enjoy, in order

Mr. AMES.

that the common weal of the whole country may be served.

I wish to say a few words as a representative of the Protestant minority in Quebec. Most of what I had intended to say was stated by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) this afternoon so that it will not be necessary for me to make my remarks very lengthy. It is not necessary for me to remind this House of the way in which the legislation of 1869 came to be passed, how it was enacted in the fulfilment of the of the agreement which Cartier had made prior to confederation, and how that law of 1869 established fully and completely as satisfactory a system as the minority in Quebec could ask, a system that has been practically unchanged down to the present day. In fact, Mr. Speaker, we in Quebec, in many ways have been given more than was in the bond of the Act of 1869 and its subsequent amendments. We have the Council of Public Instruction, of which I have spoken, two-thirds of whom are Catholics and one-third Protestants. At the time the law was passed the Protestant minority in the province of Quebec constituted one-sixth only of the population, to-day they constitute 13·3 per cent or one-eighth, and yet their representation on the educational council is the same as it was 35 years ago, and there is not the slightest expectation that that representation will be reduced. In the matter of the amount voted annually by the provincial government for schools we again have generous treatment. The money which is received for superior and for elementary education is divided according to population in absolute strictness on the basis of population as shown by the last census. But, when we come to the normal school grant of \$42,000 per annum, we find that the Protestants are getting one-third and the Roman Catholics two-thirds. Yet, this is in direct contravention of the law of 1869 and the settlement made where it is stated, according to the French version which I have here :

(Translation).

—the grants to the normal schools and all other grants whatsoever for educational purposes and all expenses of the government for educational purposes shall be divided between the Roman Catholic and Protestant institutions, and for the benefit of Roman Catholics and Protestants respectively, in proportion to the Roman Catholic and Protestant population of the province, at the then last census.

That is to say, according to the law of 1869, which has remained as the standard of our statutes, we were entitled to but one-eighth of the grant for normal schools; but it was early recognized that we could not carry on a normal school with \$5,250 a year, so we were given \$13,866 to be devoted to that purpose. There was at one time a grievance in the possibility of the alteration of school boundaries. At one time they could be altered on the demand of the ma-