

his own way, he would leave the provinces absolutely free. But he recognized the strength of the argument on the other side. He was certain that those who did not agree with him would never be convinced to his way of thinking. Then what were they going to do? They could not exercise the force of a brute majority. There was a certain distance that he was prepared to go in the way of compromise, to the extent which is embodied in the amended clause now before the House. He was willing to do so because he believed that the essential principles of a first class, thorough national school system are not impaired, "and the taint of what I call ecclesiasticism in schools, and which in my judgment always produces inefficiency, will not be found in the school system of the Northwest under this legislation, unless the people of the Northwest choose to have it, in which case it is their business and not ours."

Mr. Sifton seems to think the new clause a form of honorable compromise and he concluded by announcing that he would support the Bill, "though not with any great enthusiasm."

Mr. Bourassa resumed the debate on Tuesday in a brilliant speech, dealing with the education clause which he claimed rested on section 93 of the Constitutional Act. He quoted Lord Carnarvon when moving the second reading of the B. N. A. Act as saying that the legislative powers distributed by the Act were four-fold:—

1. Subjects relegated to the central authority.
2. Those assigned to the exclusive jurisdiction of the Provinces.
3. Those that were subject to concurrent legislation.
4. A particular question dealt with exceptionally— education.

The then Secretary of State for the Colonies said that clause 93 had been framed after consultation with all parties and that "the object of the clause is to secure to the religious minority of one province the same rights and protection which the religious minority of another province may enjoy, placing the minority on a footing of entire equality."

Appealing to a sense of justice Mr. Bourassa eloquently set forth that this protection to the minority granted by Mr. Mackenzie, Sir John Macdonald, Mr. Blake, Alexander Campbell and the parliament of Canada should now be respected when after 30 years provincial autonomy is being granted. He relied more upon the honor of parliament and the good faith of our public men than upon any quibble of law. He was particularly severe on the lawyers who cheere-pared over nice points of law when national and religious feeling and good faith were concerned. Provincial rights were a sham if the constitution could be trampled on. With great warmth he defended the Roman Catholic hierarchy in Quebec as the bulwark of British sovereignty in Canada. He argued strongly that the Roman Catholics settled in the Northwest were entitled to as fair a treatment as the Protestants in the Province of Quebec. Dealing with the claim that we should trust the new provinces to accord justice, Mr. Bourassa said that Premier Haultain was one of the first to move the Northwest Assembly to petition parliament to grant them power to abolish separate schools. Again, they could not tell what might be the public policy of these new provinces 50 years hence. The majority then might not appreciate that British tolerance displayed by British statesmen.

He entered upon an exposition of what Catholic education had done for the world and dwelt upon the value of the influence of the Catholic Church upon the working classes, in view of the alarm felt by Protestant countries such as Germany and the United States over the plague of Socialism and the forces of unrest and disorder. He also pointed to the generous and fair treatment always accorded to Protestant education by the Catholic majority in Quebec. By reference to history and by felicity of language as well as by reason of force, eloquence, and wit, Mr. Bourassa lent dignity and interest to what may be termed a great speech. He spoke in English to crowded galleries.