

—returned a member in opposition to the Greenway government, and pronounced against the agreement which we are told has been accepted by the whole community, and that, too, mark you, although the government candidate had given a written declaration at different polling places that he accepted the opinions and declaration of Archbishop Langevin upon the question, and that he would vote, if elected, to have them carried out; while in Winnipeg and in other portions of the constituency he was pronounced to be an admirer of Mr. Greenway and an ardent follower of Mr. Laurier's, and that he accepted the agreement which had been effected. I mention these facts to show that there has been a system of hypocrisy in dealing with this question, from beginning to end, that there has not been a straightforward, manly stand taken with respect to it. First we should see whether it is a constitutional question or a religious question. If it were simply a religious question, I should not take the position that I hold to-day. I hold it to be a constitutional question, in which the minority of Manitoba and all minorities are interested. My course has been suggested by thoughts of this kind: if the minority of a province who do not think as I do are to be deprived of their rights, may it not lead to a similar interference in some other province with the rights of a minority with whose views I am in accord? I make this explanation because I desire to be fully and fairly understood in dealing with a question in which race and religion are too apt to be mixed up. Now, what is this settlement which has been made? It is somewhat singular that that same system of contradiction should have been carried on to the present day. Mr. Laurier told the people of Montreal a short time ago that he had obtained more for his countrymen and co-religionists than the late government offered to accept. Mr. Cameron, the Attorney General of Manitoba, when introducing the bill to give effect to this agreement, told the people that there was no comparison between the demands made by the late Conservative government and the concession which had been accepted by Mr. Laurier. I leave it between those two gentlemen to decide who is right, and to the public to say which of them tells the truth. There is the same system, I repeat, of contradiction, uttered to suit the circumstances of the case, and the locality in which the

person who utters the sentiment happens to be for the time being. In order that this agreement may be fully on record—I will read it. It is as follows:

1. Legislation shall be introduced and passed at the next regular session of the legislature of Manitoba, embodying the provisions hereinafter set forth in amendment to the "Public Schools Act," for the purpose of settling the educational questions that have been in dispute in that province.

2. Religious teaching to be conducted as hereinafter provided.

1. If authorized by a resolution passed by a majority of the school trustees, or

2. If a petition be presented to the board of school trustees asking for religious teaching and signed by the parents or guardians of at least ten children attending the school in the case of rural district, or by parents or guardians of at least twenty-five children attending the school in a town, city or village.

This clause gives the right, on petition or by a vote of a majority of the school trustees, to furnish religious teaching, provided there are ten children in a rural district or twenty-five in a city, attending the school. Let me ask those who conscientiously believe that religious instruction should accompany secular education, why the limit of ten children in rural districts and twenty-five in cities, towns and villages, should be fixed? If religious instruction be necessary for ten children, why should nine be deprived of it because there does not happen to be a tenth pupil? Or in the case of a city, town or village, why should twenty-four children be deprived of religious instruction because there does not happen to be a twenty-fifth pupil? If religious teaching be recognized at all, and if it be necessary for the welfare of the children, then it is just as important that one child should receive such instruction as the ten or twenty-five should; and it is an outrage upon the feelings of the parents if they cannot have the same rights and privileges as though there happened to be the number of pupils specified in the terms of the agreement, attending the school. I leave it to any reasonable man to say whether there is any concession in that, which should not be extended to all children attending a school. I am one of those who believe that the fundamental principles of religion should be taught in all our schools. I do not pretend to say that I would approve of sectarian instruction, but the fundamental principles of Christianity, in which we all believe, whether we are Catholics or Protestants, should be taught