

is it not a fact that where our Protestant brothers are in the majority in any part of the province of Quebec they can have a separate school of their own? Is it not a fact that, even though in any district they may be in the minority, they can establish a separate school if they have the certain small number required by the law? And is it not a fact that even where the Protestants have not the legally required number, the French Canadians are broad enough to allow their Protestant brethren to have schools of their own? But is it not a fact—and I wish the hon. member for North Toronto were here to answer—that wherever the Catholics are in a majority in any district in the Northwest, they have not the right to establish a separate school, but are obliged to go to the public schools? The treatment meted out to the minority in Quebec and in the Northwest Territories cannot be compared. Sir, it is as bad to force the Catholic to send his child to a school where no religion is taught as to force him to send that child to a school where a religion opposed to his own is taught. That is the Catholic doctrine; I wish that my hon. friend would understand it once for all. We object, not only to being obliged to send Catholic children to Protestant schools, but to being obliged to send them to schools where no religion is taught.

Sir, as a French Canadian who has studied and learned something of British institutions, and who is loyal to the institutions given this Dominion by the mother country, because he has studied them and believes in them, I may ask my hon. friend from North Toronto what is British liberty if the Catholics are not allowed to have their own schools? Is not that political liberty the pride of Englishmen, inclusive and widely tolerant? Is it a selfish and narrow liberty, in some sort Protestant and privileged, and which is only a means to better shackle some of the people with the heavy chains of an intolerable despotism? Where is the British liberty, I ask these hon. gentlemen, if the minority, because it is a minority, cannot enjoy the liberties which were promised them in the name of the Sovereign, and which have been formally declared in the mandates of that Sovereign? Sir, if this House were to follow racial appeals, the appeals made to prejudice by the hon. member for East Grey, it would only serve to remind us that we were the vanquished in 1759.

MR. SPROULE. I desire at once and flatly to contradict the hon. member (Mr. A. Lavergne), and to repeat, what I have said before, that I never made an appeal to either race or religion. I call upon the hon. member to withdraw his statement.

MR. A. LAVERGNE. I expected that denial, and now I am going to prove what I have said. There is a newspaper called the 'Sentinel' published in Toronto. It claims to be the organ of the Orange Order,

with which, I understand, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) has something to do. Of course, I do not wish to say anything against the character of my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule). In the province of Quebec, it is true, that he has a bad reputation, I must say; but we who know him know that he is a good man, and know that he would not hurt a fly. But in my province we are often asked: 'You know the member for East Grey better than we do; is it not true that the Yellow Pope has certain Peter's pence and is obliged to earn his money, and that is why he is so violent against the Catholics and the Romish Church. In this organ of the Orange Order—the 'Yellow Hierarchy,' as my hon. friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) calls it—in its issue of March 16th, 1905, I find Brother D. Pritchard, grand treasurer, quoted as follows:

I have always been an advocate for public schools, believing that by the national schools more than by any other means we may hope to build up a united people. One school and one language taught in the same should be the motto of every loyal Canadian.

And he adds, the English language is to be the one to be taught. Well, Sir, what does that mean? Does it mean that the French language, which is an official language in Canada as well as the English, is to be abolished by the Orange order when they get into power? I can make nothing else out of it. On February 23, 1905, the Reverend Brother Hughes—no, not Reverend Brother Hughes, M.P., at a banquet in Brantford, gave the history of the Orange movement and its fight against the Romish church, and asked all the members to maintain their principles, even if the occasion demanded that they fought for them. Well, Sir, I do not say that a man has not a right to fight for his principles, but I am not quite sure that the hon. gentleman means a constitutional fight. I am afraid that he is appealing to the Orange lodges to fight another battle of the Boyne. Well, here is something more. If there is one right of a British subject which has been claimed by the hon. member for East Grey on many occasions during this session, it is the right of petition. After the province of Quebec began to petition like British subjects for the maintenance of separate schools in the Northwest, the 'Orange Sentinel' of March 23, 1905, contained the following, under the title, 'The glove is thrown down':

After saying that 'it was Quebec assuming to dictate to the Dominion, or rather is the arbitrary and intolerant ecclesiastical oligarchy dominating Quebec, making a supreme effort to tyrannize the democracy and the Protestants in Canada,' it says:

The gauntlet will be taken up, the fight will be accepted. For our own part we are right glad that it has been precipitated just now. Sooner or later it had to come, and the sooner the better for all concerned. Sooner or later