

vince us, he immediately gave the opinion of two of the most eminent laymen of the Northwest Territories; two fathers of families, two representatives of the people, one the Lieutenant Governor to-day and the other a judge of the Supreme Court. These were the members of the hierarchy quoted by the hon. member from Brandon. These gentlemen came here and they said: 'An injustice has been done us; we are deprived of the right of giving to our children the education which our conscience binds us to give; our money is taken for the support of schools we cannot attend.' But, they were sent away from Ottawa; they were not numerous enough probably to obtain justice. Then they went to the provincial assembly and again they laid their case at the foot of the Crown—as the Crown was represented there—and again they were found to be too weak and too few. Because they did not rebel in arms, because they accepted the established state of things; a state of things which was a breach of the compact, a state of things which in the words of Sir John Thompson and the words of the member for Brandon, constituted a legal encroachment upon their rights; because they did not rebel in arms; because they followed the advice that has always been given by the hierarchy to the Catholics of this country to be peaceful: now they are told: 'You are satisfied; ask for nothing more because you can't expect it.' To my friends who are saying to us: 'Be conciliatory; let us cut in two what remains,' I shall cite a little illustration which may perhaps help some of them to realize the situation. Suppose that Canada stands in the position of a father having two sons, big Peter and little Paul. He gives \$4 to big Peter and \$2 to little Paul and he says: 'Now, boys, agree together, work together, do the best you can with the money I gave you.' Once they are on the street big Peter gets after little Paul, beats him and takes \$1.50 of his two dollars. These gentlemen opposite stand up and say: Don't tyrannize big Peter; but force little Paul to give Peter the 50 cents he has left. And hon. gentlemen on this side of the House get up and say: Be conciliatory, take those 50 cents left to Paul, and divide it with big Peter, for after all big Peter is a good fellow.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Little Paul comes from Nova Scotia.

Mr. BOURASSA. I am not going to be dragged into provincial limits just now. Now, Sir, there is another subject which is much talked of in the public press, but which has not been treated of in this House and I think one voice at least should be raised in parliament to protest against it. It is said: 'Admitting that the constitution allows you to grant separate schools to the

Northwest, yet you should not fasten upon these people such a bad system of education which has made of Spain, of Italy, of France, of all Catholic countries, the scum of the earth.' And we are told: Look at the province of Quebec, look at the south of Ireland, a degraded population, a low-minded ignorant people.

I propose to deal for a few moments with the subject of Catholic education, with what it has done for the world, in what way it has succeeded and why it has not always succeeded. Here again I am tempted to ask: What kind of history is taught in the public schools of this country? I know as well as any man, and I have learned to know in the Catholic schools where I was educated, that there is such a thing as the evolution of nations, that nations in our own age as well as nations in the past and as well as nations to come for all time, have and will have their periods of prosperity, and their days of decadence.

The race from which I sprung has done so much for the enlightenment and civilization of this world that I can, without undue baseness, admit that the Anglo-Saxon is now ahead among the nations. But I may remind my English speaking friends that three centuries before there was anything like English civilization, Catholic Spain had covered the world not only with physical power, but with civilization and enlightenment—with schools of higher education and primary education and with a knowledge of all then available sciences that no nation has since surpassed; and this is no disparagement of the English any more than the present pre-eminence of the Anglo-Saxon is a disparagement of the Spanish. May I remind my English-speaking friends also that three hundred years ago, in Venice and Genoa, those Catholic-ruled states, the system of book-keeping, of stock exchange, of currency, of everything which the Anglo-Saxon is using now with such success, was practiced to an extent which brought to those little republics a degree of prosperity and civilization which, considering their time and their size, has never been surpassed. I could go on with examples like these; I could make a history of the world with such examples, after the manner of a speech which was made in this House some years ago by I think my hon. friend from Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Sam. Hughes), who began at the creation and ended with the end of the world. I will content myself with stating the truism that nations grow, develop, prosper, and then pass into oblivion. The Greeks have passed; the Romans have passed; the Italians and Spanish have passed. Let the Anglo-Saxon look to the Slav and the Japanese before he concludes that he possesses the world for ever. But this is not the point. The point is, what has Catholic education done for Catholic countries? If our friends