

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Hon. members on the other side of the House from the English-speaking provinces have described themselves in nearly every case as extremely tolerant, so I have no doubt that if the Minister of Inland Revenue appeals to them now he will be met with a response which will surprise him.

Mr. BOURASSA. If my hon. friend wants my straight and candid opinion I am fully convinced that if this question had been put squarely before the true Liberals of this country, as it should have been, instead of seeking subterfuges as we have seen during the last three months in this parliament and in the country, justice would have been done. I know that the elections of London and Oxford have been carried on just as if this amendment had not been presented. Did the electors in London and North Oxford enter into all the fine distinctions that have been made by the lawyers in the House? No, Sir, they were appealed to by gentlemen on the other side of the House: Don't vote for Hyman and the Pope and Sbarretti. So I say, Sir, if the electors of London and North Oxford have shown themselves intelligent enough, as I was sure they would, to resist that cry, is there a true Liberal in this House who will contend that if it had been proven that justice was not going to be done by the amendment forced upon the government by the member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) they would have gone back, they would not have voted for Hyman and Sbarretti and the Pope just the same? No, Sir, I repeat what I have said. In the discussion on this whole question on both sides of the House there has been shown a lack of courage and a lack of sincerity that is not to the credit of the parliament of Canada at a time when we are going to constitute two of the largest provinces of the Dominion. This language which I have quoted from Sir John Thompson and the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Brodeur) disposes of that argument which is now made in Quebec by the government's organs, by 'Le Canada' and 'Le Soleil,' that if we are now bound to submit to the terms dictated by the member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) it is because the Conservative government in 1892 did not disallow the ordinance. That is no excuse; it does not excuse the government of 1905 for not doing their duty because the government of Sir John Thompson was not up to their duty.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Do they take the ground that the refusal of parliament and the executive of 1893 amounted to a compact?

Mr. BOURASSA. That is not my ground.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. No, that is the argument that was made.

Mr. BOURASSA. Certainly, that is the argument—that the Conservatives not having disallowed the law, we cannot make any

Mr. BOURASSA.

change in it. That ordinance of 1892 remained for some time. In 1896 it was re-cast, but without any material change. In 1898, again, the ordinances of the Northwest were re-cast, but the School Ordinance remained in all important respects what it was in 1892. In 1901 the ordinances which are to be the basis of this honourable compromise were adopted, and it is necessary for us to consider what are the most important dispositions of those ordinances. As was stated by the Prime Minister this afternoon, the only important change in the management of the schools was that the old system of the government of the Northwest forming practically the board of education with the addition of two Catholics and two Protestants, was abolished. The new law created a department of public instruction, at the head of which was one of the ministers of the government. In clause 8 it was enacted:

There shall be an educational council consisting of five persons, at least two of whom shall be Roman Catholics to be appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council; who shall receive such remuneration as the Lieutenant Governor in Council shall determine.

This educational council as well as the preceding one was only an advisory board, and the whole management of the law remained in the hands of the commissioner. The selection of text books, the inspection of schools, the normal training of teachers—all these dispositions remained, what they were under the law of 1892 and the succeeding ordinances. The disposition as to the French language was practically the same as it was in 1892; but on this point I would like to have my mind made clear by some higher legal authority than myself. The other day I understood some member of this House, I do not know on which side, to speak of the guarantee given to the minority that their language would be taught in the future, in the separate schools or the public schools, and I understood the Minister of Justice to say that there was no guarantee whatever, either in the clause now submitted or in the previous one, with regard to the teaching of the French language. May I ask the minister if I am right on that point?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The law respecting that question as it is now in the Territories will be continued in its present form.

Mr. BOURASSA. I wish to understand if the clause, stating what is guaranteed to the minority with respect to separate schools, covers a guarantee that the government of the Northwest cannot deprive the French-speaking people of the teaching of French.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The question of religious education and the question of the French language are entirely different. There is no connection between them.