

schools in itself. Those who have spoken have declared in favour of allowing the people to have whatever system of schools they please.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) allow me a question?

Mr. BERGERON. Yes.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. Was the hon. gentleman in the House when the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) said that the system of separate schools was a bad one?

Mr. BERGERON. I did not hear the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) say that.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the hon. gentleman for Montmagny (Mr. A. Lavergne) refer to separate schools as they exist in the Northwest?

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. I asked my hon. friend if he contended that the system of separate schools in that province was a bad one and he answered yes.

Mr. SPROULE. I said that that system, in my judgment, was not a good one. But I added, in connection with the schools in the Northwest, that our fight was not against the people giving separate schools if they desired to do so, but against interference with their rights to have any system they chose.

Mr. BERGERON. I accept the word of my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) and I would remind my hon. friend from Montmagny that it could not be otherwise, as the separate schools in the Northwest are, for all practical purposes, the very same as the public schools. Now, the amended Bill of my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), in my opinion, will prevent altogether the establishment in the Northwest of separate schools such as I would like to see. He perpetuates the provision of the ordinance now existing. And the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) has declared that the schools under these ordinances are entirely public schools. Put this upon the statute-book and you prevent for ever the establishment of separate schools in the Northwest provinces. On the other hand, the position taken by the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) leaves it open to the provinces to establish any system of schools they desire.

Now, I fear I have kept the House too long. I had intended to speak much more briefly. But hon. gentlemen will pardon me because this is a very important question, and I hope that it will be long before we shall be called upon to speak on any such subject so delicate and so dangerous. When I am called upon to address the House again, I hope it will be on some question upon which members of the same party can agree. Still, though this is an unfortunate question, a dangerous question, I wish to

pay this compliment to my colleagues in this House, on both sides of the House—that the newspapers of the country might well take a leaf out of 'Hansard' for they will find there that every man who has spoken has been able to express his opinion frankly yet in such a way as not to hurt the feelings of any of his fellow-members. Hoping, as I have said, that we shall not have again such questions to deal with, but that we may all unite for the best interests of Canada, I am reminded of the words of Tennyson, with which I close:

Let Whig and Tory stir their blood,—
There must be stormy weather;
But for true results of good
All parties work together.

Hon. N. A. BELCOURT (Ottawa). Mr. Speaker, will my hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) permit me to extend to him my congratulations, and to assure him of the pleasure which I share with other gentlemen upon this side of the House, because of the fact that he will give his vote on the measure before you in support of the government of to-day. Whatever may be thought of the reasons which the hon. gentleman gave as justifying that conclusion, it is a gratification to know that, on this occasion, he will vote with us. He said that the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) had devoted most of his speech to remarks antagonistic to the course of the government, and still concluded by declaring that he would vote with the government. I am afraid that the hon. member for Labelle has found a very ready imitator in that respect, in the person of the hon. member for Beauharnois—in fact the hon. member (Mr. Bergeron) has gone the hon. member for Labelle one better: the whole speech to which we have just listened, has been—I say it without offence—a tirade against the government of the day. He did not say at the end how he would vote, but I presume he will vote against the amendment.

Mr. BERGERON. I may have forgotten to say that. I will not vote for the amendment.

Mr. BELCOURT. Then, what has been said has been well said. The Canadian national family will extend to the two new provinces in the west their hearty congratulations when, on the first of July next, they take their place in the family circle and around the family table. I hope that by that time the note of discord which has been heard in one part of this country will have ceased to sound—I believe in fact that that will be the case, and that even if it still sounds, it will not mar the chorus of pride and satisfaction with which all Canada will extend a welcome to the two new sisters in the west, with hearty good wishes for their progress, prosperity and happiness. In discussing this Bill I do not