

history of our countrymen in this Dominion of ours. Let him read the history of the union from 1840 to 1867. His great and noble ancestor, Mr. Louis Joseph Papineau, after his return from exile, accused Lafontaine of being too timid, of being a tool in the hands of the English majority because he had formed an alliance with Baldwin. What did Lafontaine answer? He said: 'The days are gone by when the fight is to be made with bayonets or guns. We are working now under the constitution which has been freely granted to the inhabitants of this country. True it is, I have not obtained for the French Canadians everything they have claimed, but notice since I have formed this alliance with my English friend Baldwin, what has happened: The French language, which has been expunged from the records of the House, has been restored; the French language is now the official language. Political exiles had been sent to Australia and the Bermudas, but through concessions, because I have learned the policy of conciliation, I have been able to obtain the return of the exiles to their country.' And what other reforms did not Lafontaine mention? My hon. friend is not playing the right game in saying to the public, to his fellow-countrymen, that in this confederation, in this wide Dominion, with two great races facing each other, the French Canadians are ill-treated and are trodden upon. No, for my part, I have a better opinion of the majority. It is true we have not obtained in the present instance all that our bishops wanted to obtain, but in conclusion I would say: Let us follow the advice which has been given us by a great writer, Sydney Smith, in his essay on Catholics, when he said:

Wait. Do not add to your miseries by a mad and desperate rebellion. Persevere in civil exertions, and concede all you can concede. All great alterations in human affairs are produced by compromise.

Sir, when this confederation was brought about, when this great Dominion was formed, George Brown, Sir John Macdonald, Alexander Mackenzie and Sir George Etienne Cartier, all stated that the new confederation was the result of a compromise. Sir, mutual concessions were made, and I say that it is on honourable compromises, on honourable concessions from both sides and both nationalities that the great work of this country can be carried on.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. As I seconded the motion proposed by the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa), I may be allowed a few words. Of course, it will be understood that my position is rather difficult coming after a speaker who has made such a passionate and political appeal as the Solicitor General (Mr. Lemieux). But, Sir, I cannot let pass the sentiment uttered by the Solicitor General, that the hon. member for

Labelle and myself were pulling with the member for East Grey. Sir, I am very sorry to have to say it, but if anybody is pulling with the member for East Grey it is the government. My hon. friend for Labelle and myself have not changed on this question, and we stand to-day as we stood before the whole of this House on the 21st of February last. If anybody has changed, and if the law which is presented to us has changed, it is not because the member for Labelle or myself have changed, but because the policy of the government has changed. To-day the member for Labelle and myself are accused by the Solicitor General of calling for revolt in Quebec. Are we calling for revolt in Quebec because we ask fair-play at the hands of our fellow-countrymen? Is it an appeal to revolt because we believe that if we make an honest appeal to our English-speaking friends full justice would be granted to the minority in the Northwest Territories? I ask any man in this House, I ask the Solicitor General, if there is any appeal to revolt because we trust more than he does to our broad-minded English compatriots of this country than they do themselves? We take no other position to-day than the one we took on the second reading of this Bill, when the whole House, by a majority of 81, asked that full justice be granted to a minority in the west, when every one recognized that we had a moral obligation and should render justice to the Northwest. What are we claiming to-day more than that? We claim nothing else than what we should have by the constitution, that the minority in the west may be treated in the same way as if they were the majority of the district. I ask you, Sir, and I ask any member if it is asking too much, and if it is an appeal to revolt, to say that if we had presented the question to our English-speaking compatriots in its true light, as it should have been presented, we would have had more justice given to us? That is the justice that we have a right to expect. The right hon. leader of this House, speaking on the 8th of June last of the difference between clause 16, No. 1, and clause 16, No. 2, said:

The difference is simply this, that in clause 16, No. 1, the law of 1875 was enacted, giving to the minority—I suppose the Roman Catholic minority—the control over secular education as well as the control over religious education, whereas the new clause brings into force the existing law of the Territories, the ordinance of 1901, by which the state has absolute control over the secular part of education, and the people have control simply of the religious part of education from half-past three in the afternoon. I have for my part agreed to the new clause 16, and in so doing I know that I have restricted my fellow-religionists in regard to some of the rights which they think they have at this moment. I shall explain in due time why I agreed to do so.

Well, Sir, I listened this afternoon to the right hon. leader of this House, and I did