

the provinces. In the list of those subjects without any distinction is the subject of education, except as regards the provinces of Ontario and Quebec, which were then called Canada East and Canada West. No doubt it will be said: What of that? we find the British North America Act was amended in England; we find that it did not strictly adhere to the lines of the resolution. It was amended by somebody. Who amended it? That is the question. I listened carefully to the First Minister speaking on that subject, and he went on to say that Sir Alex. Galt was anxious about the rights of the Protestants in the province of Quebec that he desired to have an amendment in order to secure their rights. But that was not the only amendment. The other amendment went further, and who was responsible for introducing he did not know. But we know one thing, we know that there is always an eye that never sleeps, a vigilance that knows no recess, that the one party and the one church always seems to be provided for in every law that passes, that somehow or other it gets its work in, and I am afraid that that is the explanation of this amendment. That is the reason why to-day we have that departure from the original resolutions. It was never contemplated, except as regards Ontario and Quebec, that there was to be any control or interference with the exclusive rights of the provinces regarding education; and in accordance with that understanding all these provinces have enjoyed that right ever since. From time to time that right has been sought to be interfered with. One time the attempt was made in the province of New Brunswick, another time in the province of Manitoba, but this federal parliament has put itself upon record as declining to interfere with that right. We have to-day the contention put forward, as it was expressed to me by an hon. member of this House in 1896. We understand confederation to mean this, that in every province the Roman Catholic minority shall have the same rights in every province in the Dominion with regard to education as they enjoy in Ontario, and we shall never cease to fight until that is accomplished, whether it be gained early or late. Our experience rather justifies our belief that the desire and intention and the aim of that church is never to cease that fight until it secures that right in every province of the confederation. It will have succeeded in bringing a large proportion of the Dominion under that right, if it succeeds in putting this clause through. In the Yukon it has had that right introduced without any sanction of law, so far as I can find. Then you have the proposed new Act, which is to create a government for the Peace River and Mackenzie river district. If I know anything of that proposed law, it is intended to extend that right to these unorganized Territories and force separate

Mr. SPROULE.

schools on them for all time in the future. We have done that with regard to the Yukon, a country as large as one of these provinces, and it has been done under some kind of a pretext, but under no legal authority, and that privilege exists there to-day, and the same fight is intended to be kept up. Can we come to any other conclusion when we take into account the pronouncements made with regard to this question by Archbishop Langevin in St. Boniface and another bishop in British Columbia only a few days ago. We are therefore justified in coming to that conclusion, and the people of Canada might as well understand what they are face to face with, what is the intention and the aim and what is going to be the fight for all time to come in the future.

Will it be pretended that by the Act of confederation it was intended to give a constitution to these Territories before they become provinces? Why, a Confederation Act which professed to give each province a constitution before it came into the confederacy would be only a farce. That certainly could not have been its intention, and we are now providing a constitution entirely different from what the confederation Act intended when it was introduced and when we confederated the provinces.

The hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) said that there is an anti-Catholic wave passing over the province of Ontario to-day. He declared that all the intolerance seemed to be on the other side, and the young member for Montmagny (Mr. Lavergne) said, 'hear, hear.' He appears to be the only follower the hon. member for Labelle has got.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. He has several on your side.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. We have quality if not quantity.

Mr. SPROULE. That is rather doubtful. I heard the cheers and could only find one cheering. If there are other supporters of the hon. member for Labelle, they must be ashamed of him, because they did not cheer him.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. There was one alongside of my hon. friend, but as soon as my hon. friend began he ran away.

Mr. SPROULE. I was speaking of the other side of the House. What evidence have we of an anti-Catholic wave in the province of Ontario?

Mr. BOURASSA. Is the hon. gentleman trying to make out that I said there was an anti-Catholic wave in the province of Ontario?

Mr. SPROULE. Yes, the hon. gentleman said there was an anti-Catholic wave passing over that province.

Mr. BOURASSA. No, but what I said was that there was one raised by hon. gentlemen opposite and that hon. gentlemen