ally have been people of different faith to my own. I believe the educational clauses as amended are generally acceptable to them and if adhered to, as we are told by members of the government they will be, they cannot but be satisfactory to people of my own faith. On the other hand, many contend that they do not go far enough. There are certain members of the church in the province of Quebec and members of the government who are dissatisfied with the amended clauses of the Bill. The following article giving an account of a sermon by the bishop of Three Rivers shows that gentleman is dissatisfied:

Monseigneur Clouthier, bishop of Three Rivers, in a sermon preached last week in the cathedral of that city, referred to the school clauses of the Autonomy Bills as follows: The original Bill was far from assuring to Catholic children that Christian teaching to which they are entitled. The amended Bill now before the House gives, it is true, separate schools, but teaching submitted to the will of the state will be almost neutral in practice. The teaching, as a matter of fact, will only be given in English, and the half-hour of catechism after school is only a decoy and can in no way satisfy the pro-

per formation of Catholic children.

The confederation pact certainly assures us more than that, or Catholics would never have consented to form a part of it. We may ask what will become of the confederation should such a measure become law. The amended Bill, which hands over to the new provinces the absolute control of their schools, is not acceptable to Catholics. We must have federal legislation that will guarantee to the minority the right to have schools of their choosing, both as

regards religion and language. The object which a certain number of people have in view, of establishing so-called national schools, tends to stamp with the same imprint every citizen of this country. Now, this fusion of races, as far as the French Canadians are concerned, is a dream, a utopia, for it would mean the renouncing of their providential mission, and we have every reason to hope that they will be faithful to that mission.

Our duty for the moment is to live alongside our English fellow citizens, respecting their rights, but forcing them, as the occasion may

require, to respect ours.

It is, therefore, the imperious duty of all Catholics to work courageously to obtain confessional schools for the two new provinces and not to let up till we have obtained full and ample justice.

This gentleman and others to whom the educational clauses are unsatisfactory, I would respectfully refer to the right hon. First Minister and the members of his government. Had they adopted a different attitude in 1896, this sermon would never have been delivered. But with a thirst for power and a policy that changes with dates what can be expected? In connection with this sermon, I would like to say that his Excellency Earl Grey is reported to have said, in the course of a speech delivered during his recent visit to Toronto, that in the union of our two great races lies the secret

the words of the reverend gentleman from Three Rivers, I am forced to hope that there are other secrets and other sources of strength available, otherwise our future, this dream, this utopia about which the reverend gentleman seems not over sanguine, may be indefinitely postponed. And who is responsible for this postponement? I do not venture to suggest that the reverend gentleman is responsible. I do not venture to suggest that the right hon. leader of the government is responsible. I would rather on the floor of this House assume the responsibility for our fathers who instead of making for union at the beginning in their wisdom, made provision for separation, not only on race lines, but for separation between people of the same race and with each succeeding government for political reason, aye, and through honesty of purpose, there has been a tendency to accentuate rather than minimize this mistaken wisdom of our fathers.

Even the views of the Liberal organs have changed within the last few years. I will read from the Montreal 'Herald' of May, 1896, which after discussing the tariff, goes on to say:

Can Montreal afford to have Canada rent and torn for the next decade-perhaps for the next generation—with racial wars, with sectional enmities, with religious conflicts? This is the question which every voter in Montreal who has a real stake in the country should seriously ask himself. A triumph for Sir Charles Tupper means such lamentable divisions. It means an attempt to pass at Ottawa, in July, a Remedial Bill, against which will be arrayed a strong contingent of members from every other pro-vince. If by the use of means now threatened, which will be repugnant to the enlightened sentiment of Canada, the support of Quebec to such a measure is solidified, the hostility to it of the other provinces will be all the more intensified and we shall have in parliament a lamentable division, in the main between Quebec and the other provinces. The measure may not pass, in which case the agitation in its favour will be continued. Nor will the question be removed from parliament if it should pass, as so many people affect to believe. That would mean the opening of the second stage of the struggle, the preaching of a Protestant crusade through the length and breadth of Canada, the appeals to prejudice and passions, which if aroused will run their course untempered by aroused will run their course untempered by cooler considerations; and the inevitable political cleavage of our people not into Liberal and Conservatives, but into Protestant and and Conservatives, but into Protestant and Catholic camps. The possibilities of such a crusade are of the gravest; they may involve (we speak in all seriousness) the breaking up of confederation and the shedding of blood.

And this, Mr. Speaker, from a newspaper under the control of that harbinger of peace who lately on the floor of this House, but like the voice of one crying in the wilderness, enunciated the blessed tenets of his religious ethics 'Do unto others as ye would that they union of our two great races lies the secret should do unto you.' Mr. Speaker I would and strength of our future. But as I read commend these blessed tenets to this hon.