

systems. By the census of 1901 I find that the several religious denominations in the Northwest Territories stand as follows:

Presbyterians.. . . .	27,800	
Methodists.. . . .	22,151	
Baptists.. . . .	5,340	
Lutherans.. . . .	12,097	
		67,394
Roman Catholics	30,073	
Anglicans.. . . .	25,366	
		55,439
		15,949

Having those figures in hand, I find that there is a majority against the system of separate schools of 11,955 in comparing the relative strength of the two factions. Under these circumstances, and in the interest of peace and harmony, do you not believe that it is far better to settle the difficulty at once, by an honourable compromise satisfactory to all those who believe in moderation and fair-play?

We have been told the other day by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) that the Catholics of the United States were paying something like fifty million dollars per year, in order to have their separate schools. Is it not far better to enact the present legislation, which, although giving the minority their right to religious teaching of their own, brings their schools to the standard of the public schools system in secular matters? If you were to refuse them what they are getting by the ordinances, they would be left to their own private resources; they would be self-sustaining. How could they compete with the state-aided public schools? What interest have you to starve them? Surely the half hour of religious instruction should not debar the Catholics from government assistance.

I ask any fair-minded Protestant if he believes, in his heart and conscience, that my son can be taught history, for instance, in the same book as his son? Is it possible for an honest Protestant and an honest Catholic to think alike, and to see in the same light any of the historical events connected with say, the Reformation, Mary Stuart, Henry VIII, Queen Mary, John Knox or Thomas Beckett? Are there not, on such questions, deep differences which it is almost impossible to reconcile?

We are told that this legislation is an infringement on what is called provincial rights. As a consistent Liberal, I claim myself to be an upholder of such rights. After the battles fought by the late Sir Oliver Mowat and by the Hon. Edward Blake, we on this side of the House cannot but defend the rights of the provinces. But, as I have already demonstrated, the rights of the provinces are clearly defined by section 92 of the British North America Act. Section 93 gives also the federal parliament a jurisdiction on matters of education. At the time of the Equal Rights movement, when parliament was asked too to dis-

allow the Jesuits' Estate Act, we too invoked provincial rights, and we were answered by the late leader of that campaign, the late Mr. Dalton McCarthy, as follows:

The worship of what was called local autonomy, which some gentlemen have become addicted to, is fraught, I venture to say, with great evils to this Dominion. Our allegiance is due to the Dominion of Canada. The separation into provinces, the right of local self-government which we possess, is not to make us less citizens of the Dominion, is not to make us less anxious for the promotion and welfare of the Dominion, and it is no argument to say that, because a certain piece of legislation is within the power of a local parliament, therefore the legislation is not to be disturbed. By the same Act of parliament by which the power is conferred upon the local legislature, the duty and power—because where there is a power there is a corresponding duty—are cast upon the Governor in Council to revise, and review, the Acts of the legislative bodies. If you are to say that because a law has been passed within the legislative authority of the province, therefore it must remain, we can easily see, Sir, that before long these provinces, instead of coming nearer together, will go further and further apart. We can see that the only way of making a united Canada, and building up a national life and sentiment in the Dominion, is by seeing that the laws of one province are not offensive to the laws and institutions, and it may be to the feelings, of another—I will go so far as to say that they must be to some extent taken into consideration.

I have quoted the above extract in order to show that the principle of provincial rights is not always adhered to by those who are quite ready, when circumstances arise, to invoke it. Let me, however, give the opinion on this subject of one of the fathers of confederation. In an address to his constituents, October, 1864, Sir A. T. Galt said:

It was clear that in confiding the general subject of education to the local legislatures, it was absolutely necessary it should be accompanied with such restrictions as would prevent injustice in any respect from being done to the minority.

Now this applied to Lower Canada, but it also applied, with equal force, to Upper Canada and the other provinces, for in Lower Canada there was a Protestant minority, and in the other provinces a Catholic minority. The same privileges belong of right here, as belonged to the other right elsewhere. There could be no greater injustice to a population than to compel them to have their children educated in a manner contrary to their own religious belief.

Therefore, I say, Sir, that I am within the scope of provincial rights in asking that this parliament should protect the minority in the Northwest. But, there is something else than provincial rights. We, the Liberal party, stand for provincial rights. That was the policy of our old leader, Alexander Mackenzie; it was the policy of Sir Oliver Mowat; it was the policy of Mr. Edward Blake. It is still the policy of the Liberal party. But, Sir, with provincial