

If that is true that the board is a Roman Catholic board. Any religious instruction desired by the board of trustees may be given.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. Does my hon. friend pretend to say that is guaranteed by the present law?

Mr. SPROULE. I do not know, but here is the ordinance that provides for it. I am only answering some of the remarks that were made by the hon. member for Labelle. If the Roman Catholics are in the majority there they have the same right to teach the religion of their church in that half hour as the Protestants have in the public schools.

Mr. BOURASSA. It is not guaranteed under the statute.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not know if it is guaranteed or not, but the contention of the hon. member for Labelle was that what was being guaranteed was what was done under this ordinance.

Mr. BOURASSA. I never contended that. On the contrary I contended that everything which was guaranteed under this amendment was what the minority enjoyed in respect to separate schools only.

Mr. SPROULE. And it did not guarantee this at all?

Mr. BOURASSA. No.

Mr. SPROULE. Am I correct in understanding that the hon. member for Labelle contends that it does not guarantee this right?

Mr. BOURASSA. Certainly not; only in the separate schools, not in the majority schools.

Mr. SPROULE. I am not going to quarrel with him over that. If it does not I will be the better pleased, that is all. I say it is because of that—

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It is hardly worth my hon. friend's while to talk for two hours and reach such a conclusion. My hon. friend does not understand what he is talking about.

Mr. SPROULE. I am afraid that all the brains in the House are not in the cranium of my hon. friend, although he tries to leave that impression. He says there should be equality for all. I take as an example a family. Suppose I am in the domestic circle and there is a family of 12.

Mr. ALEX. JOHNSTON. All boys?

Mr. SPROULE. All boys or girls, and three or four of the family should say: I will not eat at the same table with the others. I want a different diet; a table to myself and rights to myself. What would the father say? He would say that was not equal rights to all. He would regard it as doing something for these few members of

that family and he would say: We must have equal rights for all of them. Is it not the same here? If any portion of the community says that they will not be satisfied with the public school but insist on separate schools, that they are too good to sit with Protestants in public schools, and insist on being among themselves only, that is not equal rights, that is special privileges to some, which are not asked for by all and are not provided for all by the law. I say equality before the law, equal rights to all and special favours to none. That is the correct principle. The hon. member (Mr. Bourassa) quoted it, but the whole tenor of his argument was in contradiction to it from first to last. This Act, if passed, is sure to breed discontent, because it is interfering with the rights of the people of a province, whether the majority or minority, as provided under the constitution. If it is passed will it settle the thing for all time to come? We hear a great deal about settling this once for all. Will this settle it once for all? You may satisfy the minority, but what have you done with the majority? If in satisfying the minority you create a grievance on the part of the majority as great or greater than the satisfaction which you give to the minority, will there be other than discontent in the new provinces? I say it is the most unlikely thing in the world; it will not settle the question to take away the rights of the majority so as to give special rights to the minority. The principle still holds good that the majority must rule, as enunciated by the First Minister in 1896. He then said that is a truism that cannot be denied, the majority must have their way. He was applying it to Manitoba, and I ask him to apply the same language and logic to the new provinces and he will find himself sadly in conflict with the Bill now before the House. Who are the people after all that we should seek to satisfy by the constitution we are giving? Is it not the majority of the people in these two new provinces? Is it the people in Quebec? Is it not more important that we satisfy the people out there? Does the Minister of Finance remember that at one time in the history of his province, because his province was compelled to come into confederation without the people having a say in it, or being able to negotiate for their entrance, he saw fit to run his election on secession. Take the same conditions in these new provinces, and the same results are likely to follow. If you ignore the rights of the people there, if they are not consulted or allowed to take part in these negotiations and their rights have been disregarded, I say it is not reasonable to suppose they will be content in the future and that there will be no grievances out there. You are compelling the majority to submit to the minority and to give what the majority may not want to give—I do not know whether they do or do not. Do