

been repeated by him just now, the law of 1875 provided for the rights of the minority throughout the whole province. That is, whether the minority was represented by a local majority or by a local minority. That is the main reason why I was in favour of clause 16, No. 1, and why I am opposed to clause 16, No. 2. The amendment which I moved last night covered that point fully and my only reason for voting for this motion—which if it were adopted I would ask the government to have framed in such way as to give full effect to the intention of the mover—my reason for voting for this motion is that I am not going to be recorded in this House as voting against a motion which affirms the principle of separate schools, and in favour of the amendment moved by the government which in the very words of the Minister of Justice abolishes separate schools for nine-tenths of the Catholic population of the Northwest Territories.

Mr. LEONARD. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, before voting upon this amendment, I would like to ask the hon. Solicitor General (Mr. Lemieux) if I understood him right last night, when he said that the amendment moved by the hon. premier was a compromise? Has the hon. Solicitor General said last night that the amendment moved by the premier was giving less to the Catholics in the Northwest than they had the right to ask under the law of 1875.

Mr. LEMIEUX. (Translation.) My hon. friend is a very able lawyer, with many years' standing. He has my speech before him, he may read it, and see what it means.

Mr. LEONARD. (Translation.) The hon. minister answers my question as he generally answers on the hustings of the province of Quebec in presence of a French audience, when there are no shorthand writers to take down his words. He answers my question in the same way he generally answers all the questions by raising the race cry, and I charge him here openly of having been one of the most vehement in that work in every general election since 1896, and even in by-elections. I remember that in the election of 1902 at Saint Martin, in the county of Laval, the hon. Solicitor General instead of discussing the political questions of the day, did nothing else but to ask the people to vote for my opponent because he was a candidate of Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, the great French Canadian. Notwithstanding his appeals to race prejudices, I was elected at that time. It was not my intention, Mr. Chairman, to pass any remarks upon this if I had not seen that the hon. minister was last night unable to answer a single word to the excellent and courageous speech of the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa), whom I congratulate for having had the courage to free himself of the party ties upon this

Mr. BOURASSA.

national question, and speak his mind openly. I regret to see the Liberal members of the province of Quebec, and I see some laughing presently, I regret very much, I repeat, to see them voting against this amendment without knowing whether the Catholic minority is sacrificed or not.

I would not at all be surprised to learn that the hon. premier and the hon. Minister of Justice have presently before them coming from the western provinces, many letters asking the government to grant to the Catholic minority of these provinces what this minority is deprived of by this amendment. Before going any further, I will be allowed to say a few words upon the nature of this Bill, in order to clear off certain misunderstandings and false impressions which becloud the question in the minds of some sincere people and divert the discussion. The ministerial organs in the province of Quebec made a great fuss about the approval more or less formal of clause 16 as amended, given by His Lordship Bishop Legal of St. Albert. A journalist, whose elegant pen is easily recognized, told his readers that this prelate was the bishop of the Territories in which are included the new provinces and that they were entirely under his jurisdiction. That is not so. The Territories are divided into four dioceses. Regina, the capital, and the greatest part of Assiniboia are in the diocese of St. Boniface. Thus, the approval of Bishop Legal, even if it was true, would lose much of its weight. Archbishop Langevin and his two other suffragans, condemned and disapproved of this clause 16, and with them the question is clear and there is no doubt possible. Till we have the exact words of the statement given by Bishop Legal, it would be impossible to say how far and how much it differs from the well known statements of his predecessor, the revered Bishop Grandin of St. Albert, who has strongly condemned the ordinances 22 and 23 (of 1892 and 1893) which are the basis of the school system it is intended to perpetuate by this famous clause 16.

The statement of the government upon the meaning and the bearing of the two clauses 16, has caused an agreeable surprise. We were not accustomed to so much frankness. The discussion will thus be easier, and the ministerial papers will be no more able to continue their campaign of falsehood. In this discussion in which we had to answer to the windy and empty sentences of our opponents, their last cry was: 'Let the provinces be free; give them their exclusive rights of legislation in matters of education.' But I will make this distinction: You may about educational matters maintain or abolish the minority rights, you may respect or violate the natural rights of the parents and of the conscience, but these things are not properly matters of education, and when the constitution says that