

armaments and rifles? No, it relied on still more effective means. Were there then any cries raised about the powerful domination of the hierarchy? No, the Prime Minister of that day, Sir John Macdonald, begged Archbishop Taché, who was then in Rome, for Heaven sake, to come back at once to Canada and establish peace in the Red River settlement. There is no hesitation to call in the hierarchy, when we can benefit by its aid. As the editor of 'La Patrie' very happily put it the other day: What we are denied is not our right to pay. Oh, no, it is our right to have full freedom. Archbishop Taché acted at once on this appeal. He abandoned his functions at the Ecumenical Council at Rome and came to the Red River settlement, and on his way stopped at Ottawa to meet Sir John Macdonald. 'Take any steps, said Sir John to him, to appease the Indians and the half-breeds.' Archbishop Taché however did not want to impose any pledges on politicians which perhaps they would not be strong enough to keep, and all he promised the native population was that the division of their lands would be respected and that they would have the free exercise of their religion and the schools they preferred for their children. What has become of those pledges? The lands were divided against the wishes of those people and a second rebellion took place—a rebellion which has been justified by no less an authority than Colonel Denison who will not be charged with disloyalty and French demagoguery.

What has become of the religious liberty, of the liberty of teaching of the Catholic population of the Northwest? It has been abolished in Manitoba, against all pledges, against all words of honour; and the author of that legislation can gain applause in this House by saying: 'If I have a title to the approval and support of the people of Canada, it is because I have gone back upon the pledges given in the name of the Queen of England to a law-abiding and peaceful population.' This, Mr. Speaker, is what we have come to. And now we are called upon to bow to this storm of feeling that has been aroused and to allow a still greater invasion of the rights of the people of that territory. It is time to face the storm. The powers that have raised that storm do not deserve that we should acknowledge their sovereignty. The principle of provincial rights is against them. The constitution is against them. The law is against them. Past pledges are against them. I will go further and say that a religious principle is at stake in this matter.

Under the terms of the capitulation of Montreal, in 1760, and of the Treaty of Paris of 1763, the free exercise of the Catholic religion was promised to the settlers who remained in Canada. And I say that there is no free exercise of the Catholic religion unless the Catholic parent has the full right to give to his child the education he wishes to give according to his conscientious be-

Mr. BOURASSA.

liefs. It is strange that there should exist in this country a prepossession in the minds of some people to the effect that in matters of education Roman Catholics have nothing to complain of if, in the public schools aided by the government, there is no sectarian education. As against this, let me put the authority, not of Roman Catholics, not of French Canadians, not of Canadian politicians, but of members of the Privy Council. During the appeal cases on the Manitoba school question this argument to which I have referred was brought forward—that there was no injustice under the laws of Manitoba, that the Catholics were on exactly the same footing as all others with respect to education, because education in the public schools was perfectly non-sectarian. What did Lord Watson say about that?

These kind of questions were more or less burning questions in Great Britain about the year 1865 or 1866, and during the whole of that period, as far as my knowledge and experience goes, there were large classes of Protestants, and especially Presbyterian Protestants, who I am glad to see are recognized as Christians in Manitoba, who were in favour of secular education, and think that religious education ought to be imparted in the family, or by the church, and not in a secular school, where they are learning the rudiments of knowledge. On the other hand there are a great number of Episcopalian Protestants who take a different view; but I have never yet met a Roman Catholic who took that view.

And what did Lord Morris say later on? The point had been urged that the Catholics ought to accept these schools, and Lord Morris said:

But what is the use of discussing other matters? Nobody can deny that Roman Catholics cannot avail themselves of the system.

And Lord Watson, speaking especially of the idea of the denominational school in the mind of the Roman Catholics, said:

I rather think that the original idea of denominational schools is a school of a sect of people who are desirous that their own religion should be taught in it, and taught in their own way—a doctrinal religion; and not only taught because religion is taught in a non-sectarian school, but, in the view of those who founded denominational schools originally, the theory was that their views of religion and teaching of their religion should permeate and run through all the education given in the school—that, whether it were rudimentary science or anything else, there should be an inoculation of the youthful mind with particular religious views.

And, in the judgment that was delivered in the second case, Lord Herschell said, speaking of the public schools system of Manitoba:

While the Catholic inhabitants remain liable to local assessment, for school purposes, the proceeds of that assessment are no longer destined to any extent for the support of Catholic schools, but afford the means of maintaining schools which they regard as no more suitable for the education of Catholic children than if