

Mr. WARD. I am afraid hon. gentlemen opposite are evading the question. We will not press them further on that point. I am sure that if the hon. member for West Assiniboia had gone back to his constituents he would have met the same fate, that, I am afraid, the hon. member for Welland (Mr. German) will meet when he appeals also to his constituents.

Now, the hon. gentleman says that according to his reading of the British North America Act, that Act applies to these new provinces in regard to education, and that these provinces are to be saddled with these separate schools whether this clause appears in the Bills before us or not. Surely then, by following the course they have followed in this matter, the government are making it necessary for these two provinces to face and settle a disputed question which might as well be settled by a reference to the Privy Council, the highest court in the realm, before dealing with it in this House. And that is the course, which, I understand, the hon. gentleman himself favours, and in that I would agree with him entirely. The hon. gentleman says he does not believe in separate schools, yet he is in favour of saddling these two provinces with separate schools for all time to come. Where is the consistency of the hon. gentleman in that? I am glad to say that he approves of my hon. friend from East Toronto (Mr. Kemp) reading the 'Globe,' and says that if that hon. gentleman is sensible he will pay attention to what the 'Globe' has to say. Well, we on this side are paying attention to what the 'Globe' says, and most of us propose to vote exactly as the 'Globe' dictates on this occasion. It is not often that we can agree with the 'Globe,' but we read it very carefully and we are glad to find this great newspaper of the Liberal party in Ontario in accord with us on this question.

I listened yesterday, with interest, and perhaps, some little amusement, to the two hon. members from Quebec who addressed the House yesterday, the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Parmelee) an English Protestant, and the hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau) whom I may call a Catholic French Protestant. In so calling him I do not wish to apply a name which will be unacceptable to the hon. gentleman. His speech was made up of protests, and so he may be described as I have described him. The hon. member for Shefford, who, I regret to see, is not in his place, spoke of a contrast between the treatment of the minority in the province of Quebec and of the minorities in the other provinces. To be quite fair to the hon. gentleman, I desire to read his own words as they are found at page 5074 of the unrevised 'Hansard':

I find it difficult to refrain from making a contrast between the treatment accorded the minority in the province of Quebec and that accorded the minorities in the other provinces.

And so he goes on to tell how generously the minority are treated in the province of Quebec. All this is satisfactory to know. We Protestants from the province of Ontario are very glad to hear that the minority in Quebec are treated fairly, as I believe they are, and as I believe they always will be, regardless of what may be said in this debate. But the hon. gentleman stops there. He does not show that the minorities in other provinces are treated any worse than are the minority in the province of Quebec. He simply suggests a contrast and shows that the minority are well treated in Quebec, but does not show that they are not well treated elsewhere. But there is an innuendo, an insinuation, in the hon. gentleman's remarks, and that insinuation is that the minorities are not treated well in other provinces. Where is the hon. member for West Northumberland (Mr. McColl)? That hon. gentleman is a Roman Catholic and understands exactly how the minority are treated in the province of Ontario. And where is the hon. member for Kingston? (Mr. Harty). Why do not these hon. gentlemen stand up and tell this House and this country that the minority in the province of Ontario is basely treated, if such is the case. But, Sir, we have never had any complaint of the treatment meted out to the minority in the province of Ontario.

We have never heard any complaint regarding the treatment of the minority in the province of Nova Scotia which the Minister of Finance spoke of in his address. There is a province where, by law, separate schools do not exist, and yet the Minister of Finance stated without any contradiction in this House that the Catholic minority were well treated in that province, that though they had by law no right to separate schools, yet separate schools existed there, and were flourishing in the city of Halifax and other parts of the province. My hon. friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) was ungenerous enough to say, oh, well, if you have given separate schools to the Catholics in that province you did it because they were becoming so strong that you were obliged to. There is another instance. We find the Minister of Railways and Canals admitting that in the province of New Brunswick where there are no separate schools by law, yet the Catholic minority are treated fairly and justly, as they are in the province of Nova Scotia. Again I say there is no complaint from either of those provinces where separate schools do not exist by law, and I defy any one to report any complaint as to the treatment of minorities in any of the English provinces where there is a Catholic minority. When these hon. gentlemen get up day after day and laud the treatment of the Protestant minority in the province of Quebec and insinuate that the Catholic minority in other provinces do not get the same treatment, I think they should produce some evidence before this House to substantiate their