

(b) Separate schools for pupils between five and twenty years of age, in which instruction shall be given in the elements of an English and commercial education.

Why call it a separate school? Is this not irony? Why not have only the one school? Was it for the sake of giving some gentlemen an opportunity of saying that by voting for the amendment of my hon. friend they are keeping separate schools in the Northwest? It has only to be read to be understood. That was done on the 31st of December, 1902, and it was the law and in fact it is the law brought down to the ordinances 29, 30 and 31 of which I shall speak later on.

I have shown what is to be taught in those schools. Clause 36 reads:

After the establishment of a separate school district under the provisions of this ordinance, such public school district shall possess and exercise all rights, powers, privileges and be subject to the same liabilities and method of government as is herein provided in respect of public school districts.

The very same thing. It was called a separate school but we found it was a public school, and I am not surprised that my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) and even the ultra-Protestant member for Brandon, (Mr. Sifton) have changed their minds after their little stampede. The opinions of those in this House who do not believe in separate schools, who were honest about it, I respect just as much as I want them to respect mine. I know as a matter of fact that there are men who are sincerely convinced that public schools would be better, just as I am convinced that it is imperative that separate schools be maintained if the views which I hold are to be carried out, that is to say that the children of our country are to be brought up in the way their parents desire. To those who are voting for the amendment of the Prime Minister, because it is in favour of separate schools, I would quote this section:

83. All schools shall be taught in the English language and instruction may be given in the following branches, viz.: Reading, writing, orthography, arithmetic, geography, &c.

84. Any school the officers of which shall knowingly allow such school to be taught or conducted in violation of the provisions of this ordinance or of the regulations of the council of public instruction, or of the superintendent of education, shall be liable to forfeit all rights to participate in any of the grants provided by this ordinance to aid the schools of the Territories, and, upon satisfactory evidence of such violation, such grants may be withheld.

85. No religious instruction, such as Bible reading or reciting, or reading or reciting prayers (except as hereinafter provided), or asking questions or giving answers from any catechism, shall be permitted in any school in the Territories, from the opening of such school at nine o'clock in the forenoon, until one-half hour previous to the closing of such school in

Mr. BERGERON.

the afternoon, after which time any such instruction, permitted or desired by the trustees may be given.

86. Any child attending any school shall have the privilege of leaving the school room at the time at which religious instruction is commenced as provided for in the preceding section or of remaining without taking part in any religious instruction that may be given, if the parents or guardians so desire.

And these are called separate schools. This is the ordinance of 1892. I may be asked: Why was not that vetoed? I need not tell hon. gentlemen that there was a great deal of agitation at that time in the Territories. I need not say that Monseigneur Taché, whose words were read the other day by the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton), and others, who took a great deal of interest in the educational affairs of that country, did everything they could to repeal that ordinance.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Has that clause been repeated in the ordinance, chapter 29?

Mr. BERGERON. I am coming to that.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Can you not reach that now?

Mr. BERGERON. I am getting to it by degrees.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. You might forget it.

Mr. BERGERON. It might please my hon. friend if I did forget it. It may be said: Why was there not an appeal or, why were not those amendments vetoed by the government at Ottawa, and the name of Sir John Thompson has been brought into the discussion. Sir John Thompson's opinions were well known on such subjects. I would not like to trouble the House with a great deal of reading, but I wish to point out first of all that when the effect of the ordinance of 1892 was felt it was found that it was an enactment of something which had been decided in 1891, and that the time within which it could have been disallowed was past.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. What, what, what, what? I am sure my hon. friend is mistaken.

Mr. BERGERON. I will give very good testimony in support of what I am saying.

Mr. BRODEUR. That is not the reason given by Sir John Thompson.

Mr. BERGERON. This comes from the Privy Council and it is correct. There were many reasons given. My hon. friend does not want me to read the whole thing. I am bringing something before the House that, I think, will impress itself upon the minds of the hon. gentlemen who are listening to me. I have here a memorandum of Monseigneur Taché. He adds his demand to the prayer of those who came down here to obtain re-