

judgment against the solemn decision of a Province in a matter entirely within the control of that Province. The constitution which had hitherto worked so easily and so well could not survive the wrench that would be given if the Dominion Government assumed to dictate the policy or question the action of the Legislatures of the different Provinces on subjects reserved by the British North America Act to those Legislatures.

Hon. Sir GEORGE-É. CARTIER said his co-religionists in New Brunswick would not doubt his sincerity in upholding their interests. The only question which the Dominion Government had to decide was whether the Act interfered with rights previously enjoyed by Catholics in New Brunswick. The previous Acts had never conferred the right of Separate Schools but there had merely been a legislation from year to year. He regretted very much the action of the Local Government but as the old Act granted no Separate Schools to the Catholics, and no special rights he believed the passing of the present Act would tend to set the matter right, for if the Catholics worked and persevered, bearing in mind the struggle through which the Ontario Catholics had struggled, and if they went to work properly, not fanatically, but justly, they would obtain the same right of Separate Schools that had been granted in Ontario. Let the Catholics of New Brunswick use the argument how in Quebec the great majority of Catholics had treated the Protestants with such liberality and generosity, and let them persevere and they would not fail to obtain their just rights.

Mr. BELLEROSE said it was understood when the Act of Confederation was passed that the rights of minorities in the matter of education would be preserved; but by the legislation of the Local Legislature of New Brunswick this wise provision had been lost sight of, and a sort of injustice had been perpetrated toward Roman Catholics, against which he protested. He characterized the proceedings of the Local Legislature as an outrage to his co-religionists, and he would earnestly oppose them. In Quebec there was liberality toward the Protestant community and he insisted upon a similar liberality towards Roman Catholics in New Brunswick. Under the old law the parishioners had the right to state what amount of education they might have conferred upon their children, but now they were wholly at the mercy of the Protestant School Commissioners. There was, in truth, no law for Catholics in New Brunswick as far as education was concerned. The law was compulsory to the extent that all the moneys were sent into the County Treasurer's hands, the interests and wishes of Roman Catholics being to that extent, at all events, completely lost sight of. Some persons who laughed now while he was speaking of Roman Catholic rights in New Brunswick, spoke themselves somewhat energetically about the people's rights in Manitoba. The Catholic minority in New Brunswick may not have any rights in a legal point of view, but, honestly considered, they had rights which they would not readily cast aside. They had, or rather were entitled to privileges which no Government could properly infringe upon.

It being 6 o'clock, the House then rose.

AFTER RECESS

The debate on the motion of **Mr. RENAUD** for correspondence relating to the School Act passed by the Legislature of New Brunswick was resumed.

Mr. BELLEROSE resumed his remarks. He observed that the Minister of Militia (Hon. Sir George-É. Cartier) had said that it remained with the Catholics of New Brunswick to contend for their rights; but he (Mr. Bellerose) held that the Catholics of that province were not in so favourable a position to contend for their rights as were the Catholics of Ontario. He observed for example that by the British North America Act, 24 seats were reserved for the representatives of the Maritime provinces but only two of these were occupied by Catholics. He alleged that the Catholics of New Brunswick had been deceived by means of the difference that was made between the resolutions of the Quebec Conference and those of Westminster. In conclusion, he protested against the want of liberality in the Maritime Provinces, and said he would bring up the matter at a favourable opportunity.

Hon. Sir GEORGE-É. CARTIER said that while provisions had been made in Ontario and Quebec for the protection of minorities, no such provision had been made in New Brunswick. During the discussion no suggestion had been made as to the rights of Roman Catholics. The Roman Catholic Bishop of New Brunswick had written letters in favor of Confederation, but in no case was there a provision made for protection to the Roman Catholics of New Brunswick. He contended that there should be exactly the same privileges granted to Roman Catholics in New Brunswick as there were in the Province of Quebec.

Hon. Mr. GRAY wished to correct a statement made by the member for Laval (Mr. Bellerose), that the Roman Catholics of New Brunswick had been deceived by that which took place at the Conference at Quebec being changed by the proceedings at Westminster. The practice of the Legislature of New Brunswick had been to give, by an annual vote, a certain subsidy to each denominational school, but there was no law by which that grant was sustained, and it was not incumbent on the Legislature to give it. The policy adopted at Quebec was confined to the two Provinces where such a law did exist, but at Westminster it was proposed to extend the same provision to New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, as Ontario and Quebec. As a representative of the Province of New Brunswick he declined to enter into the propriety of that Province legislating on the subject under discussion, which he considered was a matter exclusively for Local Legislation. The Roman Catholics of that Province were a large and influential body, and it was quite in the power of the Province to legislate as the interests of her people might demand.

Mr. BELLEROSE said that the words "have by law" had been added at Westminster, and it was to those words that he took objection.