Government whip, then, Sir, I thought to myself that there is very little hope for getting much. Here is what the Government whip (Mr. Taylor) said:

For myself, I think the requirements of the constitution and the decision of the Queen's Privy Council would be fully met, if, when the Bill gets into committee, it is amended in this That in the province of Manitoba there shall be one national school system, that there shall be one school, and that in that school no religion shall be taught that will be offensive to the parents of any child. That would be my view; that, I believe, would settle the constitutional grievance, because it would place the whole of the community on the same footing. That is the view I shall take, when we get into committee on the Bill. But, I presume, the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) would oppose that view, because he says, that he prefers separate schools to secular schools; and I believe there are others in this House who take a similar view. But, in my epinion, the requirements of the constitution would be met, if this Parliament passed a Bill of that nature; because, if the Christians in that country, Catholic and Protestant, cannot agree on a form of religion that will not be offensive to any man's child, then, let them wipe out the whole thing from the schools, and let the religious training be given in the churches and Sabbath schools. Sir, I think it is a reflection on the plous fathers and mothers, on the clergymen of all denominations alike, and on the Sabbath school teachers of all denominations, if the religious training of our children has to depend on twenty or thirty minutes daily of state-aided religion taught in the schools.

## And further on he said:

\* \* \* The hope of the leader of the Opposition, in moving this amendment, is, that, if carried, it would put him in power, and then he will settle the question by a still stronger Bill. Does he promise, either in his speech or in his amendment, that, if he were in power, and the government of Manitoba refused to settle this question, he would not come to this Parliament and ask us to pass a stronger Bill. a Bill that will restore the schools as they existed previous to 1890? No, Mr. Speaker, he says just the contrary; he says, and his supporters from Quebec who have thus far spoken on the subject also say, that this Bill is no good. that it is not strong enough; and they will support his motion with the object, that, when he gets into power, he will bring in a stronger Bill. They can go back to their constituents and say, we did not vote against the Bill, we yould to put the Government out and to put the leader of the Opposition in and he will give us a better Bill.

## And again :

If the leader of the Opposition wants to settle the question for all time to come, and remove it from this House, not to remain as a question, as the hon, gentleman has often said, out of which political capital could be made, then let him withdraw his amendment and substitute a motion reading like this: That this House is of the opinion that this Bill or any

committee composed of such men as the Manitoba to deal with it as it may deem best Let the hon, gentleman move such a motion, and he will satisfy the House that if the question is not settled now, we at all events will not deal with it, and it will be left to the province of Manitoba. If the leader of the Opposition should move a motion like that, he might reasonably expect the support of hon, members in this liouse who are opposed to the re-establishment of separate schools as they were prior to 1890. lint the hon, gentleman cannot expect that hon, members entertaining such opinions will support a motion for the six months' hoist preceded by a speech to the effect that the grievances in Manitoba must be removed, and that the claim of the minority that separate schools be established must be conceded and attended to. This being the case, I cannot support the amendment, i cannot do so in view of the statement made by the leader of the Opposition and repeated by his followers, that the only object they have in view is to defeat the present Bill with the hope of being able to pass a stronger Bili.

> Sir, if there are many in this House like the hon, gentleman (Mr. Taylor) I see very little hope for the Bill being made any hetter in committee than it is now. The Government all along have maintained the position, and it has been asserted again to-night by the ex-Minister of Justice (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) that they cannot expect anything from Mr. Greenway and the government of Manitoba; that, in fact, the Manitoba government had sent notice through Mr. McCarthy, while they were hearing the case last spring, that no matter what order the Privy Council would pass, or no matter what Bill this House would pass, the government of Manitoba would not obey it. Well, Sir, if the Government believe that, and I assume they did, then I say, Slr. that this Bill before the House is a Bill which puts in the hands of the Manitoba government the full control of its administration. If this Government had at heart the interests of the minority, as they profess, and if they believe as they asserted over and over again, that the Mani, oba government was hostile, then, Sir, it is not only inconsistent, but it is heartless and ernel, to hand over to the tender mercles of the oppressors, the downtrodden oppressed,

> Now, let me say a word or two about some sections of the Bill. The first section gives the appointment of the school board to the government of Manitoba. If they undertake to put into operation the provisions of the Bill, they would naturally select Catholles who are opposed to separate schools. And to show this House that I am not alone in holding that view, I will read another extract from the Antigonish "Casket," which, to say the least, has all along been strongly in favour of the position of the Government on this question. It says with regard to this section of the Bill:

We cannot, however, in view of the attitude of intense hostility to Catholic educational rights other Bill dealing with this question be not read taken by the government of Manitoba, but anti-now or six months hence or at any future time, cipate grave difficulties from the placing of the but the whole question be left to the province of administration of the proposed schools almost en-

And ot get

d that

d it is

t, it is

nugget there

d that refir-

l goes com-

ing it.

notive

Gov-

f this

order

ie pro-

y had

en the

repair

uggets

nce of

r Into

to be

ration

in the

mnary

e mill

ened?

ns the

ablnet

ed to.

e fore-

it able

y had

Janu-

be de-

e they

nd on

read-

word letter.

hleh 1 ili get e only gives nittee. m the ıll the nxious o say of the rill be quesne difar as v sunted to lt all other ember overnheard

hen I 'oster) to a