

future statesman of Canada, but it is no harm for the peace of the country, it is no harm for the good of our land, that should prejudices exist between creeds and nationalities, every Canadian statesman, whether he be weak or strong, whether he be popular or unpopular, can always find a shelter under the constitution of our country and be able to point out to all men that there is laid down in our constitution the clear written principle that equal justice exists for all and that Catholics as well as Protestants have the right to live in this country.

It may be said: But what is all this trouble about? The minority in the west is satisfied; it is only the hierarchy, it is only the Quebec crowd who are trying to impose their will upon the Territories. Sir, that is one of the most cynical arguments that has been used so far. We have the testimony of the member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton), who ought to know, that when the ordinances abolishing separate schools were passed in the Northwest, a protest was made. The member for Brandon—I do not know if it was in a moment of forgetfulness, or if it was because he also has been drawn into the dangerous abyss in which some gentlemen opposite are having such a fine time these days—but the member for Brandon said the protest came from the Roman Catholic clergy and in order to convince us, he immediately gave the opinion of two of the most eminent laymen of the Northwest Territories; two fathers of families, two representatives of the people, one the Lieutenant Governor to-day and the other a judge of the Supreme Court. These were the members of the hierarchy quoted by the hon. member for Brandon. These gentlemen came here and they said: 'An injustice has been done us; we are deprived of the right of giving to our children the education which our conscience binds us to give; our money is taken for the support of schools we cannot attend.' But, they were sent away from Ottawa; they were not numerous enough probably to obtain justice. Then they went to the provincial assembly and again they laid their case at the foot of the Crown—as the Crown was represented there—and again they were found to be too weak and too few. Because they did not rebel in arms, because they accepted the established state of things; a state of things which was a breach of the compact, a state of things which in the words of Sir John Thompson and the words of the member for Brandon, constituted a legal encroachment upon their rights; because they did not rebel in arms; because they followed the advice that has always been given by the hierarchy to the Catholics of this country to be peaceful; now they are told: 'You are satisfied; ask for nothing more because you can't expect it.' To my friends who are saying to us:

'Be conciliatory; let us cut in two what remains.' I shall cite a little illustration which may perhaps help some of them to realize the situation. Suppose that Canada stands in the position of a father having two sons, big Peter and little Paul. He gives \$4 to big Peter and \$2 to little Paul and he says: 'Now, boys, agree together, work together, do the best you can with the money I gave you.' Once they are on the street big Peter gets after little Paul, beats him and takes \$1.50 of his two dollars. These gentlemen opposite stand up and say: Don't tyrannize big Peter; but force little Paul to give Peter the 50 cents he has left. And hon. gentlemen on this side of the House get up and say: Be conciliatory, take those 50 cents left to Paul, and divide it with big Peter, for after all big Peter is a good fellow.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Little Paul comes from Nova Scotia.

Mr. BOURASSA. I am not going to be dragged into provincial limits just now. Now, Sir, there is another subject which is much talked of in the public press, but which has not been treated of in this House and I think one voice at least should be raised in parliament to protest against it. It is said: 'Admitting that the constitution allows you to grant separate schools to the Northwest, yet you should not fasten upon these people such a bad system of education which has made of Spain, of Italy, of France, of all Catholic countries, the scum of the earth.' And we are told: Look at the province of Quebec, look at the south of Ireland, a degraded population, a low-minded ignorant people.

I propose to deal for a few moments with the subject of Catholic education, with what it has done for the world, in what way it has succeeded and why it has not always succeeded. Here again I am tempted to ask: What kind of history is taught in the public schools of this country? I know as well as any man, and I have learned to know in the Catholic schools where I was educated, that there is such a thing as the evolution of nations, that nations in our own age as well as nations in the past, and as well as nations to come for all time, have and will have their periods of prosperity, and their days of decadence.

The race from which I sprung has done so much for the enlightenment and civilization of this world that I can, without undue baseness, admit that the Anglo-Saxon is now ahead among the nations. But I may remind my English speaking friends that three centuries before there was anything like English civilization, Catholic Spain had covered the world not only with physical power, but with civilization and enlightenment—with schools of higher education and primary education and with a knowledge of all then available sciences that no nation