

—Subject to and in accordance with the British North America Acts 1867 to 1886 is entitled to and should enjoy full powers of provincial self government—

Now, under that I say you will rivet upon these provinces a separate school system such as is given by the Northwest Territories Act, section 14. Now, you have got the last two lines, and I fancy these are the lines that the hon. member for Beauharnois cavils at.

—including power to exclusively make laws in relation to education.

Now, if the hon. gentleman will supplement that by an amendment to this Bill, then he accomplishes what I am arguing for. I am going to support this amendment, notwithstanding the fact that I think the first part and the last part are inconsistent. I support it with the reservation that I am supporting the last two lines of the amendment and not the first three, because I believe that at this juncture we have plenary power to do what we like, that we should not shoot from behind hedges, that we should be prepared to say that we believe it is in the interests of this country either that a national school system is the best or that a separate school system is the best. Unless you are men enough to say that, I do not think you are discharging the duties cast upon you as representatives of the people and as members of this House. My position is difficult. I realize that I am not in a position to lead a crusade, I have neither the intellectual power nor the financial means to undertake that. But I am prepared to stand by my past principles and upon my past record, and I will vote in support of that amendment owing to these last two lines that are in it. I do not think it is effective, I think it is a sham, and I think the result will be that if the courts have to decide that they will decide that the province must accept a system of separate schools given by clause 14, unless you amend this Act as it stands to-day. The clause I suggest is that the province of Alberta shall unconditionally have exclusive right to legislate in matters of education. Unless you adopt such an amendment, you do not accomplish the purpose of these last two lines. If hon. gentlemen are going to follow it up in committee, all right; then we will have a division, and possibly we will have a division on the third reading. But six weeks is a long time to wait, and we have not yet had an announcement from the hon. gentleman as to what his policy is in this regard.

Now, I do not think it can be said that I have argued to-day in an intolerant way. I do not desire to be intolerant, I do not desire to be classed as a bigot, I do not think I am. I ask that the provinces be given the right to establish the system of schools it thinks to be in the best interests of its people. But I do not argue that we are not

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY.

taking away separate schools. We do not have to go so far as that, nevertheless I think hon. gentlemen know pretty well where I stand. I have no hesitation in expressing my views, I do say that if you are going to legislate that they cannot do away with separate schools, then you are imposing separate schools upon these provinces. My belief is that you should not have Godless schools, and my belief is that you should not have dogma schools. We can have schools where prayers could be agreed upon. I would be well satisfied to use the words of an eminent divine: That if they are taught in these schools simply that it is better to be chaste than licentious, better to be true than false, better to be brave than cowardly—then we will accomplish something upon which we can build up a nation, we will be tending towards unity and not separation. If we build up a homogeneous people, we will have a much more solid foundation for this country, and the west will flourish much better, than if you establish such schools, and if you have separation. I may be right or I may be wrong, but such are my views. Without desiring to trample upon the rights of anybody, I have spoken out in the way I have done. Such are my views, and they are the views which I think should prevail if you desire to build up a united Canada.

Mr. HAUGHTON LENNOX (South Simcoe). I will not attempt to follow my hon. and eloquent friend (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) through all the legal arguments and difficulties which he undertook to deal with. The particular object that my hon. friend had in view, I must admit, is not very clear to my mind. He started out upon a discussion which I imagined would lead him somewhere, but he, like some hunters, came out just where he went in. I will do no discourtesy to my hon. friend if I decline to accept the invitation to discuss with him or with the House the particular legal propositions which he enunciated. I did venture to call his attention to the fact that he was not giving a fair version or interpretation of the very able argument presented by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden), but notwithstanding that he still followed in the error of his ways and persisted to the end in giving his own interpretation of it. Well, Sir, if his interpretation of the law is not more reliable than his interpretation of the speech of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, I am afraid it is not such an interpretation as wise men would care to follow. I did notice that there was method—I will not say in his madness—but method in his argument to a certain extent and that was that he should tell us once again—and I hope this once again will be for the last time—the history of the McCarthy family. May I remind my hon. friend, and so as to do no injustice I except the vigorous living branch of the family of that gentleman who sits on