

up another rebellion in 1892. Take the rebellion of 1885; as I explained this afternoon, when the government wanted the few settlers at the village of Batoche to take the square mile survey in place of the long survey a rebellion broke out. This hon. gentleman claims that rebellion was justified, and he regrets that he did not bring on a rebellion in Manitoba at the time the Manitoba Act was passed abolishing separate schools there. There are occasions when rebellions are just. I think the people of the Northwest Territories fully appreciate their position and that they will make it rather warm for the right hon. First Minister and the government of Canada in connection with this Bill, first by a constitutional agitation, and then, if it is found out that this government, in spite of the constitution, are determined to insist upon forcing this clause upon them, I think it would be advisable for them to take the management of their own schools for their own ends.

Further on the hon. member for Labelle says:

When you speak of the liberty granted to the Roman Catholic to go into a non-sectarian school, there is no such a thing as liberty.

I have shown by expressions of opinion from the best Roman Catholics in the United States and Canada and from some of the finest Roman Catholics in the province of Ontario, that he is not talking for the Roman Catholic people of either Canada or the United States, and I shall give him one extract further from the Rev. J. O'Donovan—another gentleman and Roman Catholic Irishman, by the way—who takes the ground that public schools are what the people want. He says:

But the statement that state secular education has this effect has never been proved. In fact when one tests it by one's own experience in the immediate circle of one's acquaintances the assertion proves baseless. Several of my friends were educated in non-Catholic schools and colleges without the slightest injury to their faith.

I do not know the gentleman who writes this article—

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. Ask the member for Jacques Cartier and he will tell you all about him.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I have this to say, however, that if this gentleman were not what he should be the public would mighty soon know all about him. The hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) goes on to say:

When, by any measure in this House or in any provincial parliament you force a Roman Catholic to send his children to a non-sectarian school, you are committing an act of injustice just as direct, just as much against the conscience of the Roman Catholic, as if you would force the Protestant minority in the province of Quebec to contribute to Roman Catholic denominational schools.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES.

Here we have this young gentleman discussing the question of schools; he is a bachelor I believe, and it is peculiar that we find that those most ready to give an opinion on how to manage children are generally old bachelors, aged maiden ladies, or persons who have no children. The member for Labelle further says:

We ask you to stand by us and give the same protection to the Catholics of the western province that the Protestants have in the east.

He goes on to talk about Sir John Macdonald and Sir Charles Tupper and he praises them, but these two statesmen never had a more bitter opponent than the member for Labelle. He calls these schools Godless, and we have heard a great deal about Godliness and holiness although we do not see such an awful lot of it. I have always observed that: Holy life is more than rite, and spirit more than letter. You can step into a school where the Bible is read and prayers are recited and religious instruction given, but when you have not the proper spirit evidenced in the life of the teacher you have no Godliness. Place a school in charge of an honest-hearted, clean young fellow or any one of the thousands of noble young women throughout the length and breadth of the Dominion, and Sir, the very atmosphere of that school is holiness, purity and Godliness. To talk about these being Godless schools where the noble young women of this country are in control is absolute nonsense. This gentleman (Mr. Bourassa) speaks of his entry into the arena of Ontario provincial politics, and he says:

I was but a boy at the time, but I was proud to stand by Sir Oliver Mowat and help in his campaign for justice and equality.

Well, let us see what this campaign of Sir Oliver Mowat's was, for justice and equality. The Protestants of Ontario never attempted to prevent the Roman Catholics perpetuating the separate schools, nor did they ever attempt to do away with separate schools in that province. What they did object to was the illegal, unfair, and unequal concessions given to the Roman Catholics of that province, and I am very much surprised to find that this gentleman who tells us he was but a boy at the time, started out in such a bad cause as to advocate the campaign of Sir Oliver Mowat. One of the things that grated on the ears of Protestants was, that we were classed with the negroes, because the third section of the Act says:

Protestant and coloured separate schools, may be established in the province of Ontario.

We were classed with the darkey. Where we were in the minority and the negroes were in the minority we could form separate schools, and that is one of the things we objected to. Another thing we objected to was this: Where a Protestant separate school was established in the province of