

they liked, within the purview of the law. That did not prevent the government of the Northwest Territories any more than the government of Quebec from carrying their right of supervision over the schools.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Or vice versa.

Mr. BOURASSA. Any more in Quebec than in the Territories, but I am not now dealing with the school system in Quebec—in Quebec we have no such thing as church schools. You have them in Ontario, you have your Sunday school which is practically a church school. We have nothing of the kind, we have schools in which we allow and ask the authorities of the church to give religious instruction and conduct the choice of books from which religious instruction is to be given to the children. It is our right to do so and I think it is the best method by which religious instruction can be secured. The result is that out of these schools, under the pall of the church, under the domination of the hierarchy, we have no race of people growing up among whom exists that plague which has been denounced of late by the president of the United States, and by one of the Anglican bishops of this country, that plague of race suicide, which is so much spoken of. Perhaps if a little more church authority was brought into the schools and a little more religious teaching given in the majority schools of this country we would not have such denunciations as the chief statistician of the province of Ontario is bound to give every year in this connection.

Mr. SPROULE. If the hon. gentleman continues in his present mind there will be no danger of him raising up a race.

Mr. BOURASSA. I am not talking of that kind of process, I am not talking of the abstention process. The hon. gentleman knows that it is another kind of process that is carried on under our public school education.

In 1886 another ordinance was passed. This time they established what I may call as far as the system of schools is concerned, an ideal system, the system which gives full application to the intention of the federal parliament in 1875. Instead of having simply a dual system of schools, Catholic and Protestant schools, they established a triple system, public schools, non-sectarian, that were to be under the control of the full council, that is of the council composed of Protestants and Catholics alike. Then they had a system of public schools to be called Catholic public schools where the Catholics were in the majority and Protestant public schools, where the Protestants were in the majority, as well as Protestant separate schools and Catholic separate schools. Those schools not called either Protestant or Catholic were put under the control of the full council. The Catholic schools were left under the control of the Catholic section

and the Protestant schools under the control of the Protestant section of the council. It may be said that this meant a great mixing up of authorities. Not at all, the whole administration of the schools system was left to the full council, but with regard to religious instruction, with regard to the inspection of separate schools, with regard to the choice of text books, each section had to provide for its own schools, and this was the only way in which it was possible for every one to enjoy liberty. That is the system we have adopted in Quebec and which up to this time has worked so happily.

I come now to the question touched by the Prime Minister this afternoon with respect to districts. Under the ordinance of 1885 you could organize a Catholic public school district or a Protestant public school district and the minority could secede therefrom and organize a separate school—the Protestants in a Catholic section or the Catholics in a Protestant section. Under the ordinance of 1886 they restricted the rights of the minority to this extent that the minority could only organize a separate school when the majority had organized a public school. This was reproduced in the legislation of 1888, and was pointed out by Sir John Thompson as an invasion of the rights of the minority because it prevented the minority from organizing before the majority had organized. The right hon. gentleman pointed that out this afternoon as the essential feature in existence then but he will allow me again to tell him he has left aside an important fact. Theoretically Sir John Thompson was right but in practice this did not work much to the disadvantage of the minority because it was not probable that a local minority would be ready to have a school before the majority had established its schools. But under the legislation of 1886 as well as under the ordinances of 1888, 1892 and 1896, the right of the majority to organize a Catholic public school district still existed, and it was continued till the adoption of the ordinances of 1901. It is only in the ordinances which we are now asked to adopt as a basis for the future rights of the minority, that the right to establish Catholic public schools where the Catholics are in the majority is taken from them; and therefore it is only in the last four years that they have been deprived of this right. I find the evidence of that in what was quoted in this House the other day by the Minister of Inland Revenue. He said that the Catholic public schools were still acknowledged by the Northwest government, because in the report of the Department of Education for the year 1900, the year previous to the ordinance in question, they still recorded Catholic public schools. Although the rights of the Catholic minority had been abridged by the ordinances of 1887, 1888 and 1892, the rights of the Catholic local majority still existed, and they could still establish