

cathedra style, gets up and states: Oh, the merest tyro of a logician, the veriest fool who has any knowledge of law, would not use the argument my hon. friend did. My hon. friend uses his argument correctly; following the judgment of the Privy Council in England, who said that it was perfectly legitimate to consider the two Acts as taken together for the purpose of understanding the clauses in the Manitoba Act.

The hon. gentleman states primarily that the jurisdiction is vested in the province of Manitoba. It is true that it is so vested, but did he not know, when he was making that statement, that that clause in the Manitoba Act which allows the power of appeal to the Governor General in Council and to this Parliament, the judges of the English Privy Council say has to be read as part of the constitution of this country. They say that it is perfectly easily understood. The whole question of separate jurisdiction in reference to education was discussed before the Privy Council, and they decided that the two Acts should be read together, and that jurisdiction in certain cases was vested in the Dominion.

We hear about coercing Manitoba. No one but a demagogue—I care not who he may be—could use any such language as that? The constitution imposes the obligation on the people of this country, and it gives them the power to legislate in the matter. That power is vested in the Parliament of Canada, and we have the right to legislate in the manner and direction we think proper. The hon. gentleman admits that we have the power to pass a Remedial Bill. He raises no question as to the law in the matter. But he asks is it judicious to do so? The question of jurisdiction then is decided. It was decided by the Privy Council. The hon. gentleman was careful to dwell very little on the decision of the Privy Council. You notice that he did not say a word about section 6 which was submitted to the Privy Council—that is the question of fact. The whole facts were before the Privy Council, and they decided, upon the facts of the case, that the minority in Manitoba had a grievance and they described what that grievance was. The hon. gentleman talks in a very decided way about wiping out one of the clauses altogether in the Manitoba Act. That clause reads:

Nothing in any such law shall prejudicially affect any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools which any class of persons have by law or practice in the province at the time of the union.

The hon. gentleman says that the decision of the Privy Council virtually wipes that out, that there was no use talking upon it now, that the Privy Council had decided it had no effect whatever. The hon. gentleman, I remember well, in his argument here a year ago, discussed very fully whether there was a parliamentary compact or not. He dis-

cussed at length clauses 1, 2, 3, and 4, and he said that notwithstanding any mistake which might have been made in the Act or legislation, if there was a parliamentary compact, then even at this day he would see that it was carried out. What is the meaning of the words "by law or practice." What was the intention of the legislature? The judgment of the Privy Council in the Barrett case decided that beyond doubt. The Privy Council decided that the minority of the province of Manitoba expected that their educational rights had been secured to them and that the duty of the Privy Council was simply to decide upon the meaning of the words; and if it did not get the meaning of the words expressed correctly in the clause of the Act, it was not their duty to decide what was the meaning of that clause. I mention this merely to show that the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) and the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) and the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) said that if there was a parliamentary compact at the time they would, even at this late hour, give the minority in Manitoba the justice which they demand. The hon. member for Montreal West (Sir Donald Smith) can tell them whether separate schools were promised or not. He was one of the delegates at the time. The whole question has been gone into thoroughly and ably by my hon. friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Powell), who showed, that the parliamentary pact and agreement at that time was intended to give the minority the right to their denominational teaching through their schools. If that is so, why does not the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), why does not the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon), why does not the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), following out the line of argument of last year, grant this simple demand at once. No man of sense who has read the correspondence, who has read the bill of rights, who has read the telegrams in reference to the whole matter—

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Which bill of rights?

Mr. HAGGART. There are different ones. Under the first bill of rights and the second, schools were provided for. A certain sum of money was to be given each year for the purpose of assisting the schools. There were none but the denominational schools at that time, the Presbyterian, the Roman Catholic and the English Church schools. Does the hon. gentleman think, that, where these two bills of rights mention schools, they mean public schools? Does he think, that the Roman Catholics, who were making that parliamentary pact and agreement, intended that the money should be given to the public schools, and that they should keep up their denominational schools themselves? As to whether Father Ritchot forged the fourth bill, or altered the terms of it, or whether Archbishop Taché was a party to it or not, on reading of all the cor-