

province of Quebec then was: Put me in power and I will give the minority in Manitoba greater privileges than they can possibly secure from a Tory government. I will give them a Bill that will be of some service; while in the provinces of Manitoba and Ontario, the cry of himself and his colleagues was: Hands off Manitoba; no coercion of free men in the west; we must never bow to the Roman Catholic bishops of the province of Quebec; but must show ourselves free men. Much as I wished to follow my right hon. friend on that occasion, there was such great divergence between the position he took in Quebec and that which he took elsewhere that I was not prepared to give him the opportunity of coercing Manitoba and consequently voted against his resolution as I did against the Bill of my own leader. The stand I then took was that if the people of that province wanted separate schools, let them establish that system themselves; but if they did not, I was determined to defeat any attempt to place upon that province the burden of separate schools against its will.

We may very well ask whence comes this demand for this clause in the Bill. I have pointed out that the moment those Territories become provinces, they have the Act of 1875 on their statutes. Supposing the educational clauses should be withdrawn entirely from this measure, the Act of 1875 will still remain. Therefore if the contention of the First Minister be right, if the Act of 1875 is the constitution in those Territories to-day and will be the constitution of those provinces when created, what has he to fear? If on the other hand, the contention of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition is correct and it will be within the powers of those provinces to abrogate that law if they choose, why insist upon embodying it in this Bill. The Act of the First Minister is, I submit, irritating, illegal and unconstitutional.

The right hon. gentleman did not consult his Finance Minister in relation to the financial clauses nor did he consult his Minister of the Interior with regard to the educational clause. He did not consult the men behind him with regard to this measure. I am told that he did not dare to call his party together in caucus and consult them. Whom then did he consult? Is there any truth in the rumour that my right hon. friend had for his adviser a gentleman who does not owe allegiance to the Dominion and that he takes trips to the shores of the Rideau and there receives his inspiration? I have not the slightest fault to find with any church—either the Church of Rome or the Methodist church which is my own or any other—for taking all it can get from weak-backed politicians. Any church will do that. We have seen in the province of Ontario, Protestant churches taking sops from the provincial government and giving in return their support to the government. We have

seen the hierarchy of Rome do the same thing—and I make use of that word in the same sense as hon. gentlemen in that church use it. The churches are just the same as electric companies and railway companies and other corporations. They will take all they can get and ask for more. It is not the hierarchy of Rome but the leader of the government and his colleagues whom the people will hold responsible, and it is they who will have to stand the consequences. For my part I do not blame the churches for taking all they can get from weak-backed and weak-kneed politicians.

In his speech introducing the Bill now before the House, the right hon. gentleman alluded to the separate schools in the United States, and I must say that, as an old public school teacher, my blood boiled when he referred to that system in the United States in the way he did, and incidentally condemned public schools the world over. In the past the right hon. gentleman was more less inclined to look to American institutions. In the old days we had him and his followers looking to Washington until they got turned down, and I am satisfied that whatever may be or may have been his views with regard to that great nation in the past, he will not dispute one word I am about to quote from a well known authority regarding the value of the public schools of that country. But before doing that, I may take the liberty of quoting what Mr. Morley, a friend of the right hon. gentleman, says in the 19th Century of the great American republic. In a recent issue of that review, Mr. Morley says:

Of a democracy originally British, the most astonishing and triumphant achievement so far has been the persevering absorption and incorporation across the Atlantic of a ceaseless torrent of heterogeneous elements from every point of the compass into one united, stable, industrious and pacific state with eighty millions of population, combining the centralized concert of a federal system with local independence, and uniting collective energy with the encouragement of individual freedom. How does this stand in comparison with the Roman empire, or Romanish church, or the Byzantine empire, or Russia, or Charles the Great, or Napoleon?

These are the words of Mr. Morley about the great republic to the south of us—a republic which has taught the world how to mould together the different elements of various nationalities. In that country are to be found nationalities from Europe, who have been under the rule of parochial schools as well as those who have not been brought up under that system, and by means of the welding influence of the American public school system all these various peoples have become consolidated into one compact nation.

These are the people that have been made by the public schools of the United States. Now I will take the liberty of giving from the addresses of some of the presidents