

Grant,	Scott,
Guthrie,	Sinclair,
Hall,	Smith (Oxford),
Hughes (King's, P.E.I.),	Talbot (Bellechasse),
Hunt,	Talbot (Strathcona),
Jackson (Selkirk),	Telford,
Johnston (Cape Breton	Turgeon,
South),	Turriff,
Kennedy,	Wilson (Russell),
Lamont,	Wright (Renfrew),
Papointe,	Zimmerman.—106.
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	

PAIRS :

Gordon,	Clements,
Harty,	Reid,
German,	Ganong,
Mulock,	White,
Logan,	Lefurgey,
Tobin,	Maclean (York),
Sloan,	Osler,
Lancot,	Lancaster,
Lavoie,	McLean (P.E.I.),
Lemieux,	Tisdale,
Sifton,	Haggart,
Smith (Nanaimo),	Pringle,
Hyman,	Macdonnell,
Fielding,	Foster,
Borden (Sir F. W.),	Ward,
Watson,	Avery,
Dyment,	Ingram,
Findlay,	Broder,
Stewart,	Armstrong,
Greenway,	Bristol,
Bole,	Bland,
Carvell,	Fowler.

Amendment (Mr. Sam. Hughes) negatived.

Mr. H. BOURASSA (Labelle) moved :

That the Bill be referred back to a Committee of the Whole House with instructions that they have power to strike out clause 16 of the said Bill and substitute the following therefor :

16. The provisions of section 93 of the British North America Act of 1867 shall apply to the said province as if, at the date upon which this Act comes into force, the Territories comprised therein were already a province, the expression 'the union' in the said section being taken to mean the said date.

2. In the appropriation by the legislature of public moneys in aid of education, or in the distribution by the government of the province of any money arising from the school fund established by the Dominion Lands Act, there shall be no discrimination against the schools of any kind organized according to law.

He said : I need not explain that the object of this clause is purely and simply to enact the provisions submitted by the government in their first clause No. 16—that clause which was qualified by the hon. the Minister of Justice as an ideal one. The only difference is that I leave out the middle paragraph, which the Minister of Justice said was absolutely unnecessary. The position I take upon this question is the same as that which the government is taking upon the question of the taxation of the Canadian Pacific Railway lands. If this parliament is pledged by contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway, it is equally pledged to the Catholic or Protestant min-

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

ority in the Territories. I do not see how we can respect one pledge and not the other. Moreover, clause 16, as it has been amended by my hon. friend from Saskatchewan (Mr. Lamont), to my mind, will create a very strange position indeed. Of course, I voted for the amendment of my hon. friend when that amendment stood by itself before the committee because it was based on the true principle that it is the right of the ratepayer and the father of a family to decide what kind of education his children shall receive. But when that amendment is connected with clause 16 it brings about a state of things which should be well put before the House and the country before a final vote is given. According to clause 16, as now before the House, it will be the right of the majority of every school district in the new provinces to decide what kind of religious teaching shall be given in the public schools. The legislatures will have no right whatever to interfere ; and the result will be that if the majority should happen to be of any denomination other than Protestant or Roman Catholic that majority may decide that the religious education given in the public schools will be one that will suit neither Roman Catholics nor Protestants, and neither this House nor the legislature will have any power to interfere. In that case, where will be the minority ? My hon. friend to my left says they will not send their children to the schools. Then what becomes of the right of the minority to have the school teaching such as we are promised by this amendment ? The government press have been saying that the effect of the amendment of the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Lamont) will be to secure to the Catholics the right of having everywhere such religious teaching as they desire. But in a district where the Greek Orthodox Church, or the Mormons, or Jews, or others who are neither Protestant nor Roman Catholic, are in a majority, they will be able to dictate what kind of religious teaching will be had in the public schools, and a separate school cannot be formed by the secession of either the Protestant or Catholic minority. If the majority should be neither Catholic nor Protestant, you will deprive the Catholics of any religious instruction in the public schools, and they will be deprived of their right to secede under section 41 of the ordinances. So that their position would be worse than it is now. This answers the argument of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition who said the amendment of my hon. friend from Saskatchewan covered my point and something more. What he should have said is that the amendment, connected with clause 16 of this Bill and with clause 41 of the ordinances of 1901, does not cover my point, although it covers something never asked for by me or anybody else. It will prevent the local legislatures from dealing with the matter of religious education in the public schools.