

Roman Catholic church. What did the hon. gentleman mean when he said that certain races, such as the Galicians and the Doukhobors, had come to Canada to escape the tyranny of their church in the old land.

Mr. HENDERSON. The Doukhobors are not Catholics.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. What did the hon. gentleman mean when he said that we were seeking to make use of the old cast-off tattered garments of the church in the old world as the swaddling clothes of these young giants in the west? Was that not an attack on the church and an appeal to passion?

Mr. SPROULE. It was an appeal to history.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. That was not the occasion to give us history. It was an occasion for an appeal to the constitution. At all events, it is interesting to see the methods pursued in different parts of this Dominion.

We have in the province of Ontario a campaign denouncing these amendments as being concessions to the hierarchy. On the other hand, in the province of Quebec, the Liberal party is attacked by the Tory newspapers because the government are doing nothing for the Roman Catholics. Surely both these contentions cannot be well founded. Let me read from a couple of the leading Tory papers published in the city of Quebec in what terms they speak of what they declare to be a surrender of the rights of the minority. In 'L'Evenement' of the 10th March, 1905, which is one of the organs supporting the opposition in the province of Quebec, I find the following article:

The Northwest Territory Schools—A deep treason.

The rights of the Catholics of the Northwest are shamefully sacrificed.

The Liberal press has just received from Ottawa the pass-word and is cleverly preparing the electorate to accept and approve what Mr. Laurier and Mr. Fitzpatrick are asking parliament, the shameful sacrifice of the rights of our fellow men and co-religionists in the Northwest Territories. Mr. Laurier and Mr. Fitzpatrick are giving away before fanaticism, and in a retreat without glory they cowardly abandon rights which they themselves declared to be inalienable fifteen days ago. We ask our readers to read attentively what follows, and to seriously study the question which we will treat, and to open their eyes and see the deep treason of which French Canadians and Roman Catholics in the Territories are victims.

It is Catholic Laurier and Catholic Fitzpatrick who, for the purpose of retaining power, do not fear, do not hesitate, powerful as they are, to crush under the heels of their boots the French Catholic minority of the new provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan.

That is a Tory opinion for consumption in the province of Quebec, and the article proceeds in equally violent language to the

end. Another paper of the same kind, published in the city of Quebec, 'La Verité,' in its issue of the 18th March, has the following editorial:

Treblely deplorable.

In our article of last week we qualified as truly deplorable the letter of Sir Wilfrid Laurier to an old friend of George Brown, the full text of which we published at the time.

This letter is treblely deplorable, disastrous, heart-rending, we say, after having re-read this document calmly.

From a political point of view, a national point of view, from a religious point of view, it is all that; and it is inconceivable that a chief of a party, a French Canadian and a Roman Catholic could have made up his mind to make public such a document.

Then it proceeds to say:

By his cowardice and blindness, Mr. Laurier is on the way to depriving for ever his co-religionists in the west, of separate schools, thoroughly Catholic. No, there is no possible comparison between the work of George Brown and that of Wilfrid Laurier, as political men on the educational question. The former has done for his people a work as durable as granite. The latter, of his own free will, places his co-religionists in a position of manifest inferiority. Such was the work of both men from a purely political point of view.

Further on the writer says:

The separate schools of the far west will be so little separate, so little French that the teaching will be in English.

Lastly, a word as to the religious aspect of the question; it is clear that Sir Wilfrid Laurier, as a Catholic statesman, is perfectly satisfied of practically neutral schools for his co-religionists. Read over again attentively the description which he makes of the so-called separate schools which exist in the west, which his Bill proposes to maintain, which our people must accept, and which the Protestants are humbly requested to tolerate, and you will see that they are really neutral or national schools, because, in the mind of Sir Wilfrid Laurier the two terms are synonymous.

Where is the separation in these schools from a religious point of view? It does not exist more than it does from the national point of view. They are institutions which are neutral, neutral, absolutely neutral.

The famous half hour of religious teaching at the closing of each class does not change the essentially national and neutral character of the class itself. Mr. Laurier proclaims this with persistency, and he is perfectly right.

Instead of this measure being a surrender to the Roman Catholic Church, which is the charge made against it in the west, it is denounced in the province of Quebec by our opponents because it simply allows the minority to enjoy what we call national schools. Both these contentions cannot be true. Either the contention of my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule), that we are surrendering to the Roman Catholic minority, is wrong, or the contention of his allies in Quebec that we are not doing justice to