

days, you placed a chasm between them that could never be bridged over. Has not the unity of our people, at all times, proven the fallacy of this assertion? It was said, too, that a system of separate schools would destroy the little red school, and with its destruction the whole public school system was in danger. Has not the experience of over fifty years proven how utterly groundless was this fear? The word went forth that the petitioners for and supporters of separate schools were the enemies of the public school. Speaking as one of the petitioners for and a supporter of the separate schools, I deny that statement. We are not the enemies of the public school. We recognize with pleasure the noble work it is doing in the direction of dispelling mental darkness; we say, "withered be the hand and pained be the tongue that would say aught against it;" we want to be your allies, we want to emulate and even excel you if we can, in all that you are doing for the spread of secular knowledge and, after having done that we want to go one step further. We want freedom of conscience to give our children religious instruction. Now, after fifty odd years of experience, can any one be found bold enough to say that the separate school system has ever been a menace to the public school, or that the public school has ever been a menace to the separate school? The answer must be in the negative. Under separate management, each having its own board, both have flourished. Friendly rivalry there has been, but this only served as a stimulus for greater efforts on the part of both.

Would it not be within the bounds of possibility, without injury to existing systems, to add another; call it bi-lingual or French if you will, but let it be an additional stimulus for greater efforts on the part of all. I care not what the solution may be, so long as it does not impair existing systems, and that it solves the problem of freedom of conscience for the Ontario minority.

Freedom of conscience for the religious minority of Upper Canada (now Ontario), was obtained only by the support it received from the French-Canadian members of Lower Canada (now Quebec). By their votes on that occasion, I was given the right which I availed myself of, viz., the right to educate my children as my conscience directed. For this right I have always felt grateful.

I will show my appreciation by supporting this resolution.

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS moved that the debate be adjourned until Tuesday next.

The motion was agreed to.

#### PROHIBITION OF NET FISHING IN LAKE OF TWO MOUNTAINS.

##### MOTION.

The Order of the Day being called:

By Hon. Mr. BOYER:

That an humble address be presented to His Royal Highness the Governor General, praying that His Royal Highness submit to the Senate, copies of all correspondence, telegrams and documents exchanged between the Department of Marine and Fisheries and the Minister of the Naval Service and the Department of Colonization, Mines and Fisheries of the province of Quebec, relating to the rescinding of the prohibition of net fishing in the waters of the Lake of Two Mountains, St. Francis and St. Louis, as per Order in Council (197) passed in Ottawa, Thursday, 28th day of January, 1915.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—Does the hon. gentleman submit this as a question or does he propose making observations on it?

Hon. Mr. BOYER—I would like to get the papers first.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—I should be glad to read to my hon. friend what the department states upon the subject.

The SPEAKER—I suppose the proper way would be to have the motion adopted. The hon. member asks for an address, and if adopted this address will be presented.

Hon. Mr. BOYER—Then I move that the motion be adopted.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—If my hon. friend should desire to avail himself of the information which I have, and which I presume covers the points on which he wants information, I should be very glad to lay it on the table. It reads as follows:

Re Correspondence relating to cancellation of prohibition of Net Fishing in Lake of Two Mountains.

On the 12th January last, the Minister of Colonization, Mines and Fisheries at Quebec, wrote urging that the regulation which, as it then existed, prevented net fishing in Lake of Two Mountains as well as in other waters, should be amended so as to allow net fishing in that lake. He intimated that representations had been made to him that the fishermen in the locality were in a precarious position, and if they were allowed to carry on a limited amount of net fishing until the spring it would help them a great deal.

As the provincial government is administering the fisheries in the non-tidal waters of the province, and as it could prevent over-fishing by restricting the number of licenses, there seemed no objection to having the regulation