

testant minority in the province of Quebec, you are bound, to make provision for the Protestant—who is just as honest in allegiance to his creed and maintenance of his religious belief as is the Catholic—to give to him a place where he will not be constantly under the watchful and persuasive power and teaching of the Catholic Church. I am not going outside of the record in saying that. When you talk of toleration, I want you to think of that. And, now take the other case. Here is a Protestant child in Ontario. He goes to the public school. From the time he enters the school at nine o'clock in the morning until he goes out of it at four o'clock in the afternoon, there is no vestige of denominational or clerical teaching or influence. The Catholic child comes from the bosom of a Catholic family and returns to the bosom of that family at night absolutely unassailed and uninfluenced by any dogma denominational or clerical which is against his belief or against the course of his religious training. That is to say, in Ontario there are national schools. Now, the only ground you have to stand upon in objecting to this system in Ontario, is that it is the very absence of dogmatical teaching that you object to. Then, if you object to that, but not to any direct teaching or persuasion, that is the limit of your plea. But you cannot say that the Catholic child is under perverting influence. In the province of Quebec it is absolutely different from what it is in Ontario; do you not see that?—and consequently you must not stretch this claim of your toleration too far.

Mr. BOURASSA. Will the hon. gentleman allow me a word?

Mr. FOSTER. Certainly.

Mr. BOURASSA. I would like to impress upon the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Foster's) mind the point of view we take;—we say that it is as unjust to compel a Catholic child to go to a non-sectarian school as it is to compel a Protestant child to go to a Catholic school. And that has been acknowledged by the highest Protestant authorities in England.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not dissent from the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Bourassa's) statement of the Catholic position. But what I answer is this: Is it as unjust to have a child forced by necessity, or by environment, to go to a national school in the province of Ontario where he is not perverted, as it would be if these national schools taught Methodism or Presbyterianism from morning until night and perverted your child? We must take all these things into the consideration.

Now, we go back to the compact. And I may say that whatever may be the similarity of words, I see a difference between the compact of confederation and the British North America Act. By whom was the

compact made, and where? The compact was made in 1864 by the representatives of Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, and Prince Edward Island. These representatives met together to form a confederation. They made what we call the constitution. In that constitution you find two divisions of powers. One division puts certain things exclusively under the control of the province, and the other puts certain things exclusively under the control of the Dominion. Now, read these over, and do you find anything in the list of powers given to the exclusive control of the Dominion which has the remotest relation to or connection with education? You cannot find it. What was the dominant idea in the minds of all the representatives? The dominant idea was that education was a local concern, and the Dominion must keep its hands off.

And that was Mr. Oliver Mowat's original resolution, what was afterwards added was only an incident. Do not let us confuse the incidental with the essential. One is the powers themselves. The other comes from an after thought, viz: Granting those powers, can they be used to prejudice the rights of the minority? If so, let us put on a check. That is the incidental, but the other is the essential. Now the essential thing is that the province should have exclusive control of its education. But those wise men sitting there in Quebec city said: Here is Ontario and here is Quebec: we have separate schools for Catholics in Ontario and for Protestants in Quebec, and a suggestion was made by Mr. McGee to this effect: Yes, we will give the exclusive power, but we will add this rider to it, 'save and except the minority rights of the two Canadas.' That is all that was done at Quebec. That is all to the very letter, and that was passed by the legislature of Upper and Lower Canada. There were present representatives from the maritime provinces and also the representatives from the two provinces of Upper and Lower Canada. That was their compact, and that was all of it. But this gave no right for anybody to say that, because they saved by that compact the rights of the minorities in those two provinces, when forty or fifty years later you make provinces out of the Northwest Territories, you are obliged on account of that compact, to establish separate schools for the minorities in those provinces. Not in the least. This compact in order to become law went to London. The Protestant minority, voiced by Mr. Galt, said: That compact does not suit the Protestants in Quebec; we are peculiarly situated; we have been trying to get certain amendments to our Act to better protect us; these have been promised us, but you have not been able to carry them out; now we cannot willingly go into confederation unless we