

us know exactly what we are doing—I think that this is what we are doing and all that we are doing. This section preserves the right of the Protestant or Roman Catholic minority to have their school, a separate school in name, but a public school in fact, in a separate building if they wish. That is the right it preserves. It preserves, secondly, the right of the Protestant or Roman Catholic minority in such school to have religious teaching from 3.30 to 4 o'clock in the afternoon.

Before I conclude, I desire, Sir, to put myself personally on record as being strongly in favour of religious instruction in the schools. I hold that opinion myself, and it is the opinion of the church to which I belong. I believe it is good for Catholic children; I believe it is good for the children of all religious beliefs, that religion should have a place in the schools. I believe that the character of the child can be better moulded in the love and fear of God than by any other training. I believe that youth is the proper time to inculcate the knowledge between right and wrong. But, Sir, I do not believe that this Bill would conserve that great principle. I believe that the law existing to-day in the Northwest Territories gives the minority of that country rights at least equal to those embodied in the Bill. I fear that there will be retaliation against the enactment of this measure, and I believe that if this Bill were never enacted the legislatures in the new provinces would at once have a revision and consolidation of their laws, and in that revision and consolidation they would have inserted the re-enactment of these school ordinances, which, after all, is all that this measure provides for. I believe that for all time to come the minority would be under the protection of section 93 of the British North America Act; and I believe, Sir, that the minority in these provinces would in future stand a better chance of obtaining concessions from the majority, and that there would be greater amity and greater harmony among the people of that country if they were left to themselves to settle whatever differences might arise. And if these Bills should ultimately be held to be ultra vires, what a spectacle will be witnessed. The feeling that prevails here to-day, if it has not already extended to that country, will certainly spread there, and mutual distrust and mutual ill-will may arise. Taking it all in all, I believe that it is best that the provinces should be left to themselves to legislate on the subjects mentioned in the amendment proposed by the leader of the opposition. It is my opinion that the Catholics in the Northwest, will in the end be granted greater rights and more extended privileges if that amendment is acted upon. The minority in Canada do not want to wrest from the majority anything more than they are by law entitled to obtain, and the law is there for the protection of minorities and majorities alike. There is no church; there is no organization, civil or religious, ex-

Mr. MACDONELL.

isting in the world to-day which obeys the laws of the various countries in which it is established than does the Catholic church. Throughout the civilized world the Catholic church is planted and is flourishing, and I challenge a denial of my statement, that no matter what the law may be, no organized body is more obedient to that law than is the Catholic church. I believe that the minority in Canada will be willing to take what the law gives them and what the constitution guarantees them, and that is what they will get under the amendment of the leader of the opposition. Just one word in conclusion. It is not a question of separate schools or no separate schools; it is first of all a constitutional question, and, for the reasons I have given, I believe that the constitution as it stands to-day must in the end be applied to these new provinces. When I say it is not a question of separate schools, or no separate schools I say so for this additional reason: that the establishment of separate schools is a matter that is already concluded, because the history of the question in the United States, in Great Britain and elsewhere is that if the minority wants separate schools they will have them, and the question is simply a matter of whether the minority are going to pay taxes for their own schools and taxes for the public schools, or whether they will have their schools separate and apart, as we have them in the province of Ontario, and as we would have them in the new provinces of the west for all time to come if the amendment of the leader of the opposition is adopted.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. J. B. KENNEDY (New Westminster). Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that this question is being debated in rather a peculiar manner. As I understand, on the second reading of a Bill the main principle of the measure is discussed; but in this case we have been discussing one clause almost altogether. However, I suppose that must be right, for we have heard no objections made to it so far. Before I go any further, I want to define my position personally with regard to the educational clauses of this Bill, around which the whole debate has centred. Personally, I have no use for separate schools. As I understand it, our public school system exists for the purpose of training our young people for the battle of life—preparing them to do business, not only with those of their own religious persuasion, but with all comers. Now, fancy a young farmer coming to market with his first load of produce, and saying to his first customer, 'Before I do any business with you, I want to know what church you belong to.' Or imagine a young merchant opening up his shop, and seeing