

and everything is known. That the general policy such as I describe it, was generally known all over the whole country is beyond any doubt whatever. Well, the elections came on, and it is in Catholic Quebec that the Liberal party obtained its great majority.

An Hon. MEMBER—Why?

Hon. Sir OLIVER MOWAT—Because their principles are sound principles, and because the people of Quebec believed in those principles, and thought that this country would be better governed by the Liberal party than by the Conservative party, and because, so far as this question had any influence on the election, they believed the Liberal policy was the sounder one, and one by which the Catholics would gain the most in the long run. The settlement was necessarily after the general election. I want to remind the House that since the general election and since this settlement has been effected, we have had by-elections when the country knew exactly what had been accomplished, and in those by-elections the people showed most emphatically that in Catholic Quebec and in Protestant Ontario the same view is taken. The subject was brought up at these elections and discussed on platforms and in the newspapers, and the result of the elections demonstrates that the public sentiment is that it was a wise thing to accept that settlement. And why was it a wise thing? My hon. friend points out that we did not obtain this concession or the other concession, or some of the provisions are not what they should have been; and that the settlement contains some things which are useless; and he objects to a French teacher being provided for.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—No.

Hon. Sir OLIVER MOWAT—In a certain case my hon. friend did.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—No, I made no objection. I pointed out that while there was a provision for teaching French there is no provision for teaching English.

Hon. Sir OLIVER MOWAT—My hon. friend knows that the schools are English schools; the school laws are based on the

assumption that the people are English people. We were not providing for the English people nor for the people who were non-Catholics. We were providing some additional guarantee for the French population, and some additional guarantee for the Roman Catholic population. That tenth clause expressly shows that English was to be taught. My hon. friend suggested that that clause only provided that those speaking either French or some other language than English should be taught English. Would it not be ridiculous to suppose that they were the only class to be taught English? Could any court put such a construction on the statute? I do not think my hon. friend would say so, and I am quite sure no lawyer could. None of us who are responsible for that settlement and had to do with the negotiations say that the settlement is the best possible. None of us say that. Each of us, from our own standpoint, might prefer an agreement containing other provisions, and perhaps not containing some of the present provisions. But we say it was the best settlement obtainable, considering public feeling in Manitoba, and it is far better that this settlement should be accepted than that it should be rejected; that it was best for the country; and best for the Roman Catholics themselves; best for those who are dissatisfied with the settlement in its present form, because it is hoped and confidently believed, that the working of the system will be managed in such a way as the experience in Ontario and the experience in the maritime provinces justify us in believing. If that settlement is effected I have no doubt that there will be no further strife throughout the country. I have no doubt both parties will find the advantages of it, and that the cause of education in Manitoba will be greatly advanced. It is impossible, in dealing with this question, not to keep in mind that the Catholic population in Manitoba is a very small one. There are but 20,000 Roman Catholics, including women and children, scattered over a country larger than England and Wales. How could it be expected that so small a population could maintain, except in two or three cases perhaps, efficient schools for their children? It could not be done. The whole population is so small and so scattered over the whole country that it is difficult, even in large places, to maintain separate schools. All these things have to be taken into